

## VALENCES, CIRCUITS

A lecture given on  
18 October 1961

Yeah, you see, that's all for Mary Sue. That's good. That's good.

All right, this is what? The 18th of October, AD 11.

Now today, you are dealing with Problems Intensive, and so forth. And the modus operandi which we are following, very ordinarily, can be considered to be finding somebody's goal; finding somebody's terminal; giving them a Problems Intensive; giving them runs on the Prehav Scale on the found goal; flattening off two/three levels; spotting and assessing some engrams that have been turned up during that period; running those; flattening some more levels on the Prehav Scale; and then probably giving a whole track Problems Intensive; and then flattening off a few more levels on the Prehav Scale. If they're not Clear by that time, run a few more engrams, and then run some more levels.

Now, the truth be told, they had a barnyard one time and they had an election. I thought that would wake you up. And they had decided that all animals were equal. And this is perfectly fine, but they had decided all animals were equal and they're having an election, and the pigs were finally elected as chairmans and governors of the barnyard. So, life went on along the barnyard way, very nicely and smoothly and everything was going along fine, except most of the animals began to notice that the bulk of the feed was going into the pig trough. And so they complained about it and were overruled by a point of order. And then they noticed that the pig quarters had been moved to the warmest part of the barn. Oh, by this time it got a little bit rough. And finally it got to a point where there wasn't anything to eat anyplace but in the pig trough, so they had a big meeting. And the animals wanted to know why, if all animals were equal and all had equal rights, the pigs should be living in the warmest part of the barn and should be getting practically all the food in the barnyard. So, the pigs had a considerable meeting amongst themselves as an executive committee and finally came up with this conclusion, which they published: that some animals are more equal than others.

This thing about equality comes up amongst preclears. Are some thetans tougher than other thetans? Are thetans all of 61.1 grasshopper power, or you see, and so on. That is by the way, an unanswered question. But the basics of the thing are that some people are certainly . . . all cases are rough, but some cases are more rougher than others. And in this particular wise, all cases will now be found to respond to what we know, but some require more of it than others.

And regardless of the equality of thetans and how some thetans might be equal to some thetans and all thetans are more equal than other thetans . . . in spite of these problems, which are unanswered . . . you'll find that all thetans who are here at this time on this particular time track in this universe (you must qualify it in that wise) are suffering from exactly the same levels of aberration.

The difference is magnitude. And that is the only difference. Now, this is an important conclusion because it doesn't give you Kraepelin's . . . I think it's probably pronounced differently, but I prefer the pronunciation of "Craplins" . . . Index of Insanity. Now, his Index of Insanity goes on for some pages, and it's all the different kinds of insanity that people have. And it's very interesting, and it was developed many, many decades ago in Germany, and then was exported and arrived almost simultaneously on Park Avenue and Madison Avenue. On Park Avenue it was applied to the rich and on Madison Avenue it was applied to the advertising world.

And they expanded it. And in most insane asylums in America . . . I prefer that, too. I prefer that derogation of "insane asylums." I think they're insane, don't you? And they have expanded this. Believe it or not they've expanded this almost unexpandable list. Well, it begins to look like Kraepelin's list originally was quite simple compared to the list which they now have of the numbers of types of insanity.

Well, these different types are only manifestational. It's how does the basic aberration manifest itself? And that is the only question which is answered by a long classification of types of insanity or aberration.

Manifestational . . they manifest themselves differently; they are the same aberrations. So you have different manifestations and different orders of magnitude and you have no difference of insanity.

In other words, this is what we have been working for, for some time in Dianetics and Scientology, is to understand all of these various types and responses. But basically, you have the condition of all aberration arising from the same causes, but manifesting itself differently and manifesting itself to greater degrees of magnitude or lesser degrees of magnitude. It's the same thing, you understand, but it can look different and it can be greater or lesser.

And what are these manifestations? Well, we've talked about them for many, many years; there have been many points of address to them. But the reason why we are clearing people, broadly today, and the reason why you can clear people, is because you are taking people out by the same process that they went in. At the beginning of Book One, *Dianetics: Modern Science of Mental Health* . . actually its third volume, not its . . I think it is . . not its first volume; it's the third book of the first book. It says if you can just parallel what the mind is doing, why, you can lick most anything. So you have to parallel what the mind is doing. That's one of the fundamentals.

Actually, the fundamentals with which we operate are expressed in that book. And also many of them, of research, are expressed in *Dianetics: Evolution of a Science*, and *Dianetics: Evolution of a Science*, as a little short essay, is basically more important than it looks, because these are the various indexes which are used in sorting out data, and it's the only place they've ever been expressed. But here today, we have a process in Routine 3 of becoming aberrated . . the process of becoming aberrated. And we, in Routine 3, you see, reverse the process of becoming aberrated.

And it sort of works like this . . it does work like this: A thetan, doing and acting in this universe, loses confidence or conviction of his own strength, independence or power. A thetan loses confidence . . basically in himself. He loses confidence in his ability to do and to survive. Having lost that confidence, he then assumes an identity which he considers will stand instead of self. He himself goes down into degradation.

Now, what he is overwhelmed by or what he has overwhelmed consistently is adopted by him as a full package of behavior, and that stands in lieu of self. And that is a valence. And that's . . technical terminology for that is a valence: A valence is a substitute for self taken on after the fact of lost confidence in self.

Now, as a thetan sinks into degradation . . lost confidence in self . . he goes down into personal oblivion, so that he himself has no further memory of self, but has only memory as a valence. Now having . . having taken on this valence, he then carries it on as a mechanism of survival. This is the thing that is surviving. He is doing a life continuum actually of what he has overwhelmed or what has overwhelmed him. This is a valence.

Now, at the point of degradation you will find it backtracking this way: Now, just before he assumed the valence he had a problem concerning his own survival, which he himself could not solve. He could not solve it as himself. Now, just before that problem, there was a tremendous confusion in which, by processes of overts and withholds, he became enturbulated as himself. Usually these overts and withholds were . . well, always these overts and withholds . . were against the various dynamics.

Now, that was the route by which he went in. He missed his way and he had some overts and some withholds, particularly against the mores of the group in which he was operating. And then he lost confidence in himself completely. He felt he couldn't go on as himself, and this gave him some tremendous problem relating to survival. He felt he couldn't solve this problem and he adopted a valence to solve this problem. He adopted an identity he thought would stand as a solution to this problem and then he went on as that identity.

Now, that identity in turn, as the millennia progressed, submerged by the same cycle. As the identity, while a member of a group, the thetan committed overts and had withholds from other members of the group, and this finally mounted up into a tremendous unsolvable problem. And this problem, of course,

was solved by him by actually the acceptance . . usually, not of another valence . . but the acceptance of a change or a different status.

Now, there are several ways with which he can face up to this situation. Now, I've described the most basic one. The most basic one is represented by Routine 3, which is to say he had a certain goal line of some kind or another, he did not succeed in this particular goal line, while part of a group he accumulated overts and withholds, and this amounted to a tremendous problem. This problem was solved by him by the acceptance of an identity.

Now, he is in trouble because he himself has gone into oblivion and the identity knows, the identity knows, but he doesn't. All right, that's the most fundamental. But how many ways can this then work out thereafter? Now, having committed that basic error, how many ways can this work out thereafter? Fortunately for us there are not very many of them, but the cycle is always the same: While a member of a group having certain goals, he commits overts and has withholds from other group members, from which arises a confusion, which summates into a problem, which he then solves by... Now you name it, see? And there's the only variable, is what does he use to solve the problem.

Now, he has always used a valence, early on the track, to solve the problem. He always has done that. That we're sure of. So that you always have a thetan that you're processing who has adopted a valence. That's for sure. See, you know that. And you can take a look at any person, any human being, anybody walking around, and you know that he's had some goals and he's . . as a member of a group, he's had overts and withholds, and this has amounted to a tremendous-problem. And that he has solved this by assuming a valence, and that this valence is greater than himself, and that he himself has disappeared into an oblivion while the valence is dominant and paramount. This we know about every human being we meet who is not Clear. That's fundamental.

But remember now, as this valence, with certain goals, while a member of a group, he has developed overts and withholds which have culminated in a problem which he then solved by . . . And we've got the next variation; we've got the next thing he did.

Well, now, the common denominator of it all is change. And of course he's always solved the problem by changing. By changing what? See? We don't have to say what. We just say he solved the problem by changing. There change came about in his lifetime.

Now, that is equally true of the first assumption of a valence. You see, that was a change of identity. And life after life, as he's gone along he's shucked the old identity . . the dead body . . and he left it lying there in the coffin with the relatives weeping about, or left it stashed up underneath the dashboard, rather poorly preserved meat. He's done something with this body and he's gone ahead and he's picked up a new body.

Now, the whole of the Buddhist concern was the life-Reath cycle. The birth-Reath cycle of Buddhism is their total fixation, and actually is probably the greatest wisdom that Earth had up until we came along. It wasn't much, they ran it kind of backwards. But nevertheless it was a lamp burning.

Now, here, an interesting thing: The whole goal of the Buddhist is to escape this cycle of birth-death, birth-death, birth-death. And he's very afraid of making a change. The Buddhist is afraid of causing something, and he is afraid of making any change in life because he might then change somebody else, and he might then become responsible for broader changes. You see? Now, actually he's doing all this on the basis of "If I shirk enough responsibility, why, I will somehow or another float out of my 'ead." Well, unfortunately, it doesn't work very well. If Buddha did it sitting under the Bodhi tree, he didn't write it down on rock. He wrote it on men's minds and that is writing as upon quicksand, because there's something, something missing. Now, it is true, that occasionally, accidentally, a thetan can sit down and be very quiet and go out of his 'ead, bong! You know how he does it? He's so concerned about escaping from dead bodies that he will actually set up an ejector mechanism, like a fighter plane ejects the cockpit and all at the press of a button, you see? The fighter pilot in these modern jet planes . . the better governments build them this way at least . . presses a button and the whole cockpit flies out into space on a shot, and a parachute bangs open and he floats to earth.

Now, you'll find every once in a while . . while you're processing a thetan, you'll find one of these things. And you'll know when you find it because he got an awful start, something happened, he exteriorized, it's all very mysterious, it's exactly what happened. We are hard put to find out unless we know that we have simply run into one of these ejector mechanisms. Accidentally we've pushed the button.

Well now, they don't work. Usually they're . . most of them are broken and they haven't been functional for ages and they're quite silly, actually. Now, one fellow was so afraid . . . You see, they get all mixed up. If they got into severe pain they should be able to die and get out of their heads. See? So they will set up some kind of a mechanism like a guillotine right above their foreheads . . actually, it's a mocked up, heavy-energy guillotine. And at a certain time, when they experience enough pain, they feel they won't be able to think while they're doing this, so they trigger this to respond to pain. And they get enough pain and this guillotine will go . . clank! And it's supposed to knock off the body. And nearly everybody has wound up at this stage of the track with the belief that you have to kill the body before you can get out of it. That is very interesting . . you have to kill a body before you can get out of it. And people will just work like mad trying to kill a body so they can get out of it. And, of course, it has nothing to do with it . . it is a via.

If you didn't have that many overts against . . on the body, you would float out of it anyway. You'd have a hard time sticking with it, unless you had a few overts on it. So in trying to get out of the body, they try to kill the body, and they're . . they're just all mixed up. And this is a silliness. They . . they're doing the exact thing they shouldn't be doing.

All right. You find people are gimping around, being ill and that sort of thing. They very often have triggered some of these ejector mechanisms. Mysterious how these things occurred. Here they are, twenty years after they triggered something that was supposed to blow them out of their heads, or knock off the body or something like this. And they're still in their heads, and it didn't blow them out. And this is a big defeat and it's a . . wow! . . it's a problem the solution of which failed. It's a failed solution.

Do you see now, there is the birth-death cycle. And the Buddhist believed that he could escape this cycle. He could leave this vale of tears and woe. Now, it's one of the mechanisms of that particular series of truths that they believed that the world was horrible and poverty-stricken and that it was pretty well all bad over there. Now, the basic truths which they were putting out are so interlarded with these other exaggerations, overts and unkind thoughts, criticisms, alter-ises, and so on, that it operates as a self-trapping mechanism. If you get a guy to be still long enough you will key him in like crazy. All motions of the past will come in and kick him in the head.

Well, why do you find your pc sitting in the middle of a problem? Or why do you find him sitting there with that solution? And why is it such a still solution? Well, it's a still point on the track. And every time the pc has tried to rest he's practically been overwhelmed. And then as soon as you get the problem out of the way and you look back for the motion and the confusion, the motion and confusion runs and, the still spot disappears. In other words, the still spot is held there because of the pressure and duress of an active spot behind or earlier than the still spot. Do you see that? So therefore, every time the man tries to rest, the motion threatens to overwhelm him. you see, the still spot is there to hold back the motion earlier. So, every time he goes still, of course he restimulates the earlier motion.

You run into somebody, he can't rest, he can't rest, he can't rest, he can't rest. He doesn't dare! He walks down the street, he doesn't even dare stop in the middle of the block to look in a shop window. All of a sudden something goes merrrrmmmm! He knows better! And a traffic light stops him as he's driving the car, he hasn't got any place to go. As a matter of fact, he's sitting alongside of a pretty girl; he would just love to have a moment to chin-chin, you'd think, you know? And there's the traffic light . . perfectly good excuse to stop, you know? Does he talk to the pretty girl? No. He says, "Well, damn the police department! Rrrrrr. And these traffic lights and so on . . . And look-it, there's nobody on the side streets anyhow. Rrrrrm." and so on, you know? And he finally throws it in gear and jumps the last instant of the light and goes roaring across the thing Why? Why? Because it's upsetting to him to be still. Because the second he goes still he starts getting overwhelmed by all the former motion. The former motion restimulates on a still. And this is an oddity. The still is there to prevent former motion. So of course, then, the still becomes the restimulator for former motion.

Every thetan is subject to this. The Buddhist, he wanted to go out of his bloomin' 'ead, 'e did, and sail around in the sky. Now, the last time I was sailing around in the sky, do you know I was bored stiff! Interesting. I was just bored stiff. Interesting! There was nothing to do! There was very little to look at. There was nothing to participate in. But, of course, there's enough former motion to make me feel like maybe I ought to be in motion, or ought to be doing something.

That's all beside the point. The point is that there was nothing to do. So the basic goal of the Buddhist must have been "do nothing" That is the defeatist goal. Whenever you have people in defeat, they are telling you that they wish to do nothing Now, they will gauge it in many, many ways, and they will say it in innumerable ways and justify it in a thousand, thousand ways; but it still adds up to the fact that they want to do nothing That's what they think they should be doing.

Now, of course, the nothingness is the point of overwhelm. So people who yearn for nothing inadvertently yearn to be overwhelmed . . inadvertently, by mechanism. They get overwhelmed. And so you have every great culture working hard to achieve peace. And they achieve more peace and more peace and more peace, and it gets terribly peaceful. It's awfully peaceful everywhere. And then up jumps one barbarian with a busted slingshot and knocks over the whole ruddy lot. They finally achieve no motion. And, of course, that is synonymous with death.

So a thetan's ambitions can often be contrary to his best interests. But this is not surprising in view of the fact that there are no real liabilities to being a thetan, except the liability of inaction, of no interest, the liability of nothing to do, the liability of nothing to have, no place to go, nothing to be. Those are all liabilities. And when you see people around preaching these, you are seeing people in the finest possible games condition. That is the ne plus ultra of all games conditions.

When you see somebody preaching to everybody that they must be very still, that they must be very good, that they must be very, very peaceful, that they mustn't move around much, that they should settle down on the farm and never again do anything else, that they should content themselves with that little swivel chair in front of the desk, that they must not do anything else. Whenever you see somebody preaching this . . or "What you need now, Mr. Doakes, is a long rest." The fellow strokes his blood-stained lapel and gives you the business, you know? What a finer, finer way to kill a man, there isn't. That's the medico . . his advice is always in this direction, you see?

But when you see these people talking about peace, peace, peace, quiet, still, stay in one place, don't move, the best life in the world is for you . . is to stand there like a lamppost; look at the wonderful life a lamppost leads . . especially with dogs!

Anyway, you're ask . You're seeing somebody there who is in a games condition. He is playing a game in which he wants the other fellow to get overwhelmed. And he's using basically and fundamentally the mechanisms of the track which will best overwhelm the other person. It is not at all in the interests of helping somebody out. That is all part of the game. "The best way we can possibly help you out is to give you a long rest."

Now, the proofs of this are quite interesting. The proofs of this are all over the place. You take a soldier wounded on the firing line, and you put him in the first-aid shop, which is right hard beside the 155s that are slamming away, and you would think offhand that that would be the worst place in the world (because you see the propaganda is otherwise) for him to recover from his wounds. But what do you know! The death rate in the first-aid station alongside the guns is much lower for the same wounds than the death rate in the base hospital. Why, that's fantastic!

They move the guy back to the base hospital and they say, "Peace, peace, rest, rest. Now you take a long rest." And . . poof! There he goes! They got rid of that one right now!

Yeah, but what kind of care does he get in the first-aid station up alongside the guns? "Is this one gonna live, or is he gonna kick the bucket? Oh, well, tie him up a little bit, move him over there, we got three more in the tent! How you doing Joe? All right."

You know, just not, “You poor dear fellow. How are we possibly going to save you?” You know? People practically walking on- them with hobnail boots and the characters get well. Because nobody up to that moment has introduced the idea of quiet. Nobody has introduced the idea of motionlessness.

Now, they’ve attributed it . . the “psyrologists” of yesteryear . . attributed it to the fact that he did this. They had no explanation, except perhaps he felt he was still participating or something But this is one of the great puzzles, because the medical figures are so directly contrary to what the medical doctor does. If you leave him in the first-aid station between a couple of slamming guns, he gets well. And if you send him to the rear, he dies . . same wounds, same type of case. They know this, so they keep sending him to the rear.

Now, there are many instances of this. you take old Mr. Doakes. Well, he’s worked hammer and tongs in that lumberyard for the last forty-five years, man and boy, and he built it up himself, he did. Splinters in all ten fingers. And here he is, he’s working on the thing. And truth of the matter is he does know more about the lumberyard than the other people around there, and he’s going around just having a time.

And one day he gets gallbladder trouble or something . . one of the splinters got in his gallbladder. And he finally has to go down and he unluckily lands in the middle of “Peace, peace,” you see? And he gets a bit sicker. And he keep . . first few days he’s there he keeps fretting away, you know, and he’s saying, “I wonder if that damn foreman is going to load that pine up on the wrong truck again, and do you suppose they remembered to get the oak out of the rain?” You know? And worry, worry, fuss. And every time he starts worrying about it, what operation is run on him? Is “No, no, they’ll get along all right. Be quiet now, and don’t fret yourself.” Can’t you just hear it running off?

Well, it’s an operation. It doesn’t do him any good. The best possible thing that could happen to him is for the telephone call actually to come in, and the foreman has left the oak out in the rain. And they loaded the pine, not only on the wrong truck, but sent it to the wrong continent. No peace going on. Next thing you know, he says, “Well, hell with this gallbladder,” and goes back to work.

Well, now, you see examples that are pointed out to you as fellows who are dying from overwork. These are examples of fellows that are killing themselves with work. And the whole society subscribes to this. you see how a thetan lays the red herrings? He doesn’t throw red herrings across the track, he throws flats of red herrings across the track. Dumps truckloads of them . . because the evidence isn’t there. He’s dying from stills; he is never dying from motions.

How does a thetan . . how does a thetan get sick? You know yourself that the moment that you release the still that he is stuck in, he’ll get well. What is an engram but a still, you see? He’ll get well if you can release that still. Now you . . he’s lying there with a broken leg and it’s going to take him six weeks for the leg to get squared around . . well, all right, how about this? This is wh- . . We’ve done this so many times it’s just routine, practically. If you go in . . we go in and we get rid of the engram of breaking the leg, and we get all holds out of the thing and all resistances out of the thing and so forth; he’s out of there in about a week or so and the doctors are flabbergasted. They can’t believe it.

You’ve been around . . if you’ve been around where they’ve given lots of these assists, or if you’ve given some yourself, well, you recognize that you’ve run out what was holding him in the accident. Now, that’s well within your own reality.

Well now, he was suffering from a broken leg because he was held in the accident . . not because there was too much motion, but because there was too much still. It’s this motion before the still, don’t you see, which is crowding the still into being a still. And you could release it better by getting the motion before it.

But what has happened to him that he is not any longer in this condition? That he falls off a motorbike, hits the pavement, several limbs bend the wrong way to, he picks up the body, puts it back on the motorcycle and rides home. The punctures close in the flesh, and the bones go instantly back together again . . what has happened to him that he cannot do this? He’s been leading too quiet a life, that’s all. That’s all that’s happened to him.

Now, you get around, you get around very active people, you will see them taking fall . . . Well, get around a circus. That's not too good an example because they're on display. Another factor is entered into it, if they're giving other people mock-ups all the time. But you'll see these fellows take falls and flops, and so on, that would kill you. And they just pick themselves up again and they never think twice about it, you know? Of course, every once in a while their, the bull elephant, or something like that, will lean into an elephant man, and he will lean until the elephant man is pasteboard. But that's not the type of accidents I'm talking about.

But I also could add: what's the matter with the elephant man that, having become pasteboard, he now doesn't resume his former shape? Why is it that when you hit a body and knock it out of shape, what's the matter here that it doesn't come back to shape again instantly? Well, we say immediately, "Well, it's broken. Well, it's like a toy, or it's like a piece of wood, or something like that, it's broken." No, toys and pieces of wood are not alive.

Why doesn't the body come back to shape? Because we know the body comes back to shape slowly, why doesn't the body come back to shape rapidly? Because of stills. Because it is held out of shape. And that should be well within your reality as an auditor that if there is something wrong, it is being held that way with considerable magnitude of force. Those things that are wrong with people are held wrong at the expense of considerable energy.

How a man can stay crazy has often been a great deal of mystery to me. The effort it must take to stay crazy must be fantastic. And true enough, if you get the exact unknown spot in a person's craziness, you undo him utterly. He goes zoom, and he goes sane. I've seen it happen time and again.

The most fruitful source of these sudden recoveries of course are withholds. Withholds best overcome stills, because they're the motion before the still. The motion before the still was going on while the person was not participating with the motion. See, the person was withholding himself from the motion already, so while in motion he was being slightly still, in that he was withholding himself from the motion. Get the idea? He's practicing withholds.

So he's already dragged himself back out of the motion. And eventually he drags himself back so hard and so thoroughly out of the motion and he makes so many overts against the rest of the participating elements of the motion that he is no longer part of the motion. And what is there left for him to be but still?

When you haven't any right to longer be part of a motion, you have only one other choice. If you are . . cannot be part of all available motion, you can only then be still. If the only motion available to you in a group is motion A, B, C, D, E, F, you know, and yet you've withheld yourself from the group, and have overts against the motion of the group one way or the other, of course where can you go but still? There's no place else to go. If that's all the available motion there is, is the motion of this group, and you withhold yourself from that, you go still. And, of course, that is the basic mechanism by which you get a confusion, overts and withholds, winding up in a problem.

Well, the problem is the still. It's postulate - counter-postulate. It's idea - counter-idea. It is a held and timeless mechanism.

Now, everything I've been talking about problems this past summer is totally applicable. We haven't gone astray a bit. What we've done in a Problems Intensive is find just a better way to handle the same mechanisms. There have been a couple of new discoveries on the exact anatomy of those mechanisms. Exactly how do . . how does a problem hang up? That's what's been found. Very closely stated that the confusion comes before the stable datum on a time plot. The confusion and the stable datum are not in the same instant of time. It's the confusion, and then time lapse, and then the stable datum. The stable datum is always after the fact of the confusion, and that the overt and the withhold eventually culminate in a still. And, of course, that still can say it's a problem, it can say it's a this, it can say it's a that.

But immediately after the problem is a solution to the problem. Now, because the problem is held motionless in time, of course the solution becomes continuous in time. So you have a thetan with a

terrible problem: how to get some motion, how to have some excitement, how to do something, how to stop sitting on this condemned cloud.

Now, you could say, earlier, well, he must have had motion earlier that prompts him into this. No, we have to accept the fact that although moving is quite aberrative . . . obviously . . . thetans like to do it. And we sort of have to accept the nature of the piece that thetans will move around, and that they are happiest when in motion, although motion is apparently very foreign and to them and very bad for them. It's something on the order of a child gets sick every time he eats ice cream, but he does and will eat ice cream. You can say, well, motion is very bad for a thetan, a thetan likes to move. you c the Buddhist adds it up, of course, and these other people who are practicing this games condition are saying that motion is very bad. That is their first lesson: motion is evil, evil is motion.

So we get the concept of the Devil, of course, is fire and the concept of God is nothing. But the Devil is at least something, and the Devil is always up to something, and the Devil is always in motion, and the Devil will find something to do for idle hands, and nearly every . . . and nearly every phrase that we associate around, around Lucifer has to do with doingness and motion. So, the lesson which we should of course gain out of this is that if we want to be godly, we'll stop dead-still and do nothing. And that is the penalty. And, of course, the second you stop dead-still and do nothing, everything you have been doing then overwhumps you. That's the way it is.

You see, if you hadn't been going at . . . taking Reg's new car . . . if you hadn't been going at 165 miles an hour, having your bumper up against another car's bumper . . . nothing wrong with that, is there? You've got a bumper against another car's bumper. But if you add to that, just prior to it . . . that you were doing 165. Reg would have to get a new Jag! You get what I'm talking about, see? It's the motion before the fact that makes the impact. And there you have the . . . the mechanics of existence . . . you have the motion and the still.

Well, now, there's nothing wrong with a still, actually, if there hasn't been some motion. And there's actually nothing wrong with motion if a . . . if a still doesn't occur. But like oil and water, alcohol and petrol, these things don't mix. Motion is motion and stills are stills. And if you're going to live a life as a priest, for heaven's sakes, live a life as a priest! But if you're going to live a life; if you're going to live a life as an alpineer or an airplane pilot or something of the sort, well, for heaven's sakes, live a life as an alpineer or an airplane pilot. You got the idea? Unless you can adjust.

Now, if you can tolerate motion and if you can tolerate still, you never get into any of this trouble. But those are the two things that a thetan cannot do. There are certain motions he cannot tolerate and there are certain stills he cannot tolerate. Do you know that if you just put a huge boulder in the middle of a courtyard in an insane asylum, and just let this boulder sit there, and put a lot of seats around, and the patients could go out and sit and look at the boulder . . . Doesn't have to have any further significance than that.

You could blow this up and make it a temple, you see? You could have a . . . you could have an idol there, or you could have a piece of architecture or something of this sort there, but just as long as it's a big massive still. And they go out and they could sit and look at this still Well, some of them would at once be sort of overwhelmed, and some of them at once get terribly enturbulated. But I assure you that if they were permitted to do this, day after day after day after day after day after day, after a few years, in the wildest state, why, they'd all of a sudden go more or less sane. You're familiarizing themselves with a massive still, you see? Just familiarize them with a still, familiarize them with a still, familiarize them with a still. You could do that and you'd blow . . . you'd blow them up the track. You'd move them around and so forth, without ever processing them. It's something to do.

But you say, never process a still. All right, that's perfectly correct. Don't process a still directly. But that hasn't anything to do with familiarizing somebody with an actual still. Processing a still in the bank and making somebody observe a still in the physical universe are two different actions.

Now, observing a still in the physical universe can be quite therapeutic, and observing stills in the bank without blowing them can really louse a thetan up. His bank has limited quantity and he loses havingness and other things happen when he observes bank stills.



Now, if we look carefully over how a thetan got aberrated, we will see that he went through a cycle of: action, confusion. Confusion is caused by overts and withholds against the people he's in action with or the things he's in action with. . . And of course he was in action because he wanted to do something. The mores of the group, his goal, the goal of the group, and so forth . . this is all part of motion and action; it's a goingness-doingness proposition. That is followed by overts and withholds, and that culminates in a problem which is a stop. And the problem which is a stop is then followed by a change which is a solution to the problem. Now, we get that anatomy repetitive. It goes over and over and over and over and over and over and over. And it's been going on for the last two hundred trillion years.

Thetan wanted to do something and he was in motion, and then while in motion along with others he developed overts and withholds from the others, and this culminated in a problem. Which problem he then solved by changing in some fashion, and having changed in some fashion he of course went off and set himself all up for a new cycle.

And he always set himself up for a new cycle, and every cycle is like every other cycle. And this is the . . this is the sameness which runs as the woof and warp of life. That is the cycle of action of a thetan's aberration and a thetan's doingness and so forth, but basically the cycle of action of his aberration. And it doesn't matter what aberration he winds up with or how that aberration manifests itself, it all goes back to the same anatomy. There's no difference of the anatomy at all.

All right. Early in the game he adopted a valence. That was the change which solved the problem. He had a goal, and that was a basic goal and that has been going on ever since. And then he got a problem across this goals line, and then this valence came along and this valence solved this goal. And here he is now. He's now somebody else.

Now, while being this somebody else, ever since, he still picks up new bodies who are somebody else. Oh, well, this masked the whole show. This really made it complicated. The thetan already is not himself. No, he's a valence. And as a valence he then picks up new bodies, each one of which is an identity. So he apparently would just stack up endless and endless and endless valences on top of his basic valence. Funny part of it is, he doesn't. That's what's amazing. The basic valence is in there so solid that transient valences from lifetime to lifetime don't overwhelm it. That's what's going on.

So while living these lifetimes he could subscribe to the identity which he had in the lifetime, but it still was underlaid by his valence . . the . . see . . key, central valence which was motivated by a basic key, central goal. And although he gets other goals and these goals come and go, he still has that valence; he still has that basic goal.

Well, that is the biggest single shift; that is the biggest single change that takes place in a lifetime that is available to the auditor. Now, that is a big one, and it is available on anyone with whom you can communicate.

That's available on anyone with whom you can communicate. That is a requisite.

Because you wouldn't have much chance getting the basic valence of a Chinese while you were speaking Portuguese and he was speaking Japanese. I mean, this is . . get rather adrift. So some communication is necessary to the resolution of this situation. Given that communication, you'd be able to do something about it.

Now, to a limited degree, you would be able to process the Chinese with the CCHs without the benefit of communication. So you have a whole strata of processes which one way or the other will work out things for somebody, called the CCHs, which are without much benefit of communication. Those things will work on . . those things will work on animals. You probably could process insects this way, maybe you could even process a stalk of corn or something this way, who knows. But it would be a CCH proposition. And we've got that whole band pretty well taped, and it's an important series of process, because it means processing in the absence of communication . . that is what that gives us. And that is really what the CCHs are used for, is processing in the absence of communication.

If you can communicate to somebody, or with somebody, and get that person to answer your questions, even somewhat laboriously, and so forth, you have no business using the CCHs. That's about what that amounts to. And the CCHs can be categorized in that fashion now only because we can get rid of hidden standards. Now, until 1A came along (1A did a little bit), and until prior confusion came along (which did it much, much more), we had only one method of getting rid of a hidden standard, and that was the CCHs.

Now, in view of the fact that we have Problems Intensives, you can relegate the CCHs back to where they came from, which is processing in the absence of verbal communication . . . you can process somebody you can't talk with. And that's where the CCHs belong. Well, therefore, they are important.

But now, what else could happen to this thetan? Remember, he's still going to go on this same cycle . . . going to have a goal to get something done; he's going to be part of a group; and then he's going to get overts and he's going to get withholds from this group; and then he's going to get a big problem; and then he's going to change.

Well, what other changes are available besides from valences? Well, the first and foremost one that you run into, as far as body line is concerned, is he can pick up new bodies. He runs into an awful problem in life so he decides to die. The solution to that, of course, the change of that, is a new body. And you have the Buddhist cycle of birth and death. And that is . . . the Buddhist cycle of, of birth and death is simply the problem of "How do we keep going after the fact of an unsolvable problem?"

You could say that every death is accompanied by, preceded by . . . that every new life is preceded by an unsolvable problem. Somewhere in the vicinity of that death is an unsolvable problem. Death was a solution to the problem. And then new life was the solution to the death. Because in between the life and the death he ran into the brand-new problem. Is . . . that is being an unemployed thetan. So he solves that problem.

And he goes ahead, then, by his action . . . desire for action and accomplishment culminates in overts, withholds which produces a problem which he then resolves. And then . . . we're talking now about . . . specifically about the resolution point. Well, it can be solved by death, couldn't it? And all illness . . . all illness of whatever kind . . . derives from unsolved problems. All illnesses dissolve . . . resolve or, or evolve from unsolved problems. That you must know pretty well, because that is the key to illness.

There is no illness in the absence of a wish to live. Illness is always a gradient scale of dying. Illness is always a gradient scale of dying. It is . . . expresses a resentment against life. It can be traced back to that.

The person is so overwhelmed by it he can no longer tangle it out, and we say, "Well, that person is ill because he wants to die." Well, it's a rather careless statement of it, because you're saying that only reactively does he wish to die. It's a reactive problem, and therefore not exposed to his analytical consultation.

So the person gets ill. He wins a football pool and they come around and after the government's had its cut, why, they stuff his pockets full of five pound notes, and shovel them into his living room and say, "Well, you won the football pool," and he gets very ill . . . in spite of the medicos. The medicos occasionally have written essays showing that every time you win a football pool you get well. Well, that is not . . . doesn't follow. It's too much change there. This fellow's goal line, long ago, was set up that you were safe as long as you were poor. And if you could just be good and poor then nobody would want anything you had, and so you wouldn't get stood up in the corner of the basement and hung up on raw ice tongs and be bled to death . . . which was the last time he had anything . . . what happened to him, you see?

So he solved this problem by saying, "I should be good and poor." And he's gone along being poor, and he's been a very successful poor man. I have . . . I feel like shaking a beggar's hand sometime, and when he's a really, he's really a mess, you see, and congratulating him, you know, on being such a successful beggar.

You'd be amazed, if . . if you congratulate somebody who is pretending to be a victim, congratulate them on being such an excellent victim, you suddenly do something . . bwww! of course, because they are doing that reactively. It's intentional, reactively.

So where you have this beggar being very proud, reactively, because of accomplishing the act of beggary, you'd have somebody who was being very proud of being a poor man. And then somebody fills his living par . . living room up full of five pound notes. Ooooh!

Oh, boy, this is the one thing . . this is the one thing . . that he shouldn't have. We are . . had case . . case here. I seldom quote cases out loud, but this . . this . . this fellow came into possession of something and has been sick ever since. But most everybody would consider that it was good luck to have come into this possession. And medically, and by all other rules, this should have made him well. But it didn't, it made him good and sick because, of course, it made him unsafe . . he felt unsafe. Somehow or another the possession of these things threatened his survival.

All right. So havingness is also the consideration of how much havingness should you have in order to survive. And, of course, you have lots of fellows that if you just filled their pockets full of gold they would be terrified. That is too much havingness to survive. And although they might say, "I'd like to have a million dollars," hand them a million dollars. And they go "Duhuh! Oh-oh! Um-hmm!" Just hand them a million dollars in one-pound notes, you see, or one-dollar bills. Whew!

The guy . . . Well, preferably do it about dusk, five or six miles from the fellow's home. And he doesn't have a car. Just do that to somebody, you see? Oooh! Why, the fellow wouldn't be fifty . . fifty yards from the house before he'd have a nervous collapse. Why every sparrow in every tree would be lining up its beak on him to drill him dead, you know? It's unsafe.

I just give you that as an exaggerated aspect of what normally happens. Some child suddenly finds itself part of a rich family and is terrified. How did he get there? Family wasn't rich when they were born into it, but got rich afterwards, and now the child's a nervous wreck. It's too much havingness.

Now, they'll solve the problem some other way: by dying, by getting poor, by wasting things, by . . by trying to make everybody else poor. I'm sure that Edsel Ford over in America, considers himself utterly overwhelmed by the magnitude of the Ford Motor Company, because ever since he's had anything to do with the Ford Motor Company he's done nothing but boob. He's a complete idiot. They've got a Mercury, so he builds another more expensive Mercury and calls it an Edsel. He's torn up every textbook and policy of the Ford Motor Company wherever he operates so as to do exactly the wrong things. You see? It is not safe for him to be in that position. So he can't destroy himself . . that's bad, so he's got to destroy the position in some kind of a fashion. How else would you account for the fellow?

The whole country is starved for a cheap car. The compact is on the way up so he builds a clunk that is exactly like another Ford Motor Company car, and calls it the Edsel, and sells it for too much money, and the dealers all go broke, and he goes broke, and everything goes broke in all directions.

Now, these . . thetans aren't stupid. That's the other thing you must recognize about thetans. One of their aberrations may be stupidity. But according to the computation on which they are living, what they are doing is very clever. And you will always ha always find, inevitably, that the very stupid have the most fantastic belief in their great cunning And you often find somebody who is very bright who has great belief in his own stupidity. But these are mostly survival mechanisms of one kind or another. These are ways of getting along, ways of surviving, ways of living.

All right, not to be torturously long-winded about it. How many changes could occur . . how many things or ways of change could occur . . at that point just after problem? You know, problem! exclamation point. Now, how many types of changes could there be? Well, you could think of billions of them in life. But how many mental changes could there be? Well, actually, very few. They could suppress or enhance certain characteristics or they could get rid of or adopt certain manifestations. And you've just more or less got the whole package in those two things . . you could get rid of or adopt certain manifestations. Characteristics, manifestations . . there aren't even two, see? . . there's just two of them.

You could get some kind of a manifestation or you could get rid of some kind of a manifestation, and that's about all a thetan could do mentally. And what's the earliest step of this? Well, he takes on a valence. He takes on his valence. And that, of course, is a manifestation. A valence both limits and exaggerates a person's own skills . . . exaggerates some, limits some others.

Anything a thetan has, a thetan can do. Anything a thetan is doing a thetan can do. you can put it down to that. A thetan can be stupid. It isn't thetans are always smart but they get aberrated and get stupid. No, thetans can be stupid. Thetans can be bright. If a thetan can fix up a circuit of stupidity, therefore a thetan can be stupid. You see? He can only set up what he can do. He only can do that. That's all he can do. That's his basic limitation. A thetan can never do any more than he can do. And a thetan can always do as much as he is doing.

Fellow comes in and he lifts a thousand-pound weight by his little finger on the stage and twirls it around his head a couple of times and drops it on the . . . on his toe, and flexes his muscles and walks off, and so forth and. . . Well, that's very interesting You say, "Well, he can do that because he has such a strong body." No. No, the body is just a via. That is just a via. No, a thetan can walk on a stage and pick up a thousand-pound weight and twirl it around and drop it. That is all there is to that. But he is so dedicated to the idea that it requires a strongman's body to do that, that he only walks on the stage and does it when he has a strongman's body. you see that?

All right. Now, your next little step on the thing is he only walks on the stage and does that in a strongman's body when he is feeling . . . when he . . . when he is in training. See, a strongman body has to be in training. Then he can lift the thousand-pound weight. You get the conditions he's adding on to these things?

All right. Now, he can only do that when he is in a strongman's body, when he is in condition, when he is well. Get the additional conditions that are added on to this. All right. Now we get this additional condition: He can only walk on the stage and do this when he has a strongman's body, when he is employed to do it, when his agent has permitted it, when the billing has been perfectly okay for him to do this, when he is in condition, when he does not have any problems with the manager or the family; when, you see, he believes in himself.

He's got . . . now got a new circuit. You see, he feels powerful tonight. But on another night he doesn't feel powerful, so you see, he only picks up a five-hundred pound weight, you see? And he gets very prima donna-ish about all this, you know? And this gets wilder and wilder. But these are all vias.

And in actual fact the basic truth of the matter is that a thetan can walk on a stage, pick up a thousand-pound weight, twirl it around in a circle and put it down on the stage. That's what this all basically comes down to. A thetan can do this. But these conditions . . . limiters, limiters, limiters . . . are each one of them the solution to a problem he couldn't otherwise solve.

So limitations or exaggerations are always solutions to problems which are otherwise relatively unsolvable and which are hanging up. And the problem got there because of: they wanted to get something done as part of a group, and in that motion had overts, had withholds, and these resolved in a problem. And that whole story goes back of each one of these problems which results in a solution like, has to have a strong-armed body, see? Has to have a strongman's body. All of these things are just more and more complicated, more and more complicated, but it's just a summation of problems. And each time that whole cycle has had to take place for him to wind up at the other end with some kind of a wild solution.

Now, the solutions you are interested in, as an auditor, are not very many. you are not particularly concerned that he is in a body, because he's been in bodies before and he's gotten out of bodies before or he wouldn't be here. So there can't be very much wrong with him in this particular department. But what is he doing with this body? Now, that gets very interesting. In the first place he isn't being the body he is in. He basically and fundamentally, way back when, is being a valence which is in a body. Ah, he is not a thetan in a body, he's a valence in a body. He is a thetan who is a failed thetan, who is a valence which is a failed valence which is in a body. you get where this goes?

All right. Now let's move ahead just a little bit further, and recognize that there are new things that enter in which put you out of communication with him. Now, up to this point we'd find it very easy to communicate with him. There'd be no difficulty in communicating with him. But these new problems and solutions with their changes that come after, interpose such things as constant somatics.

A constant somatic is a solution to some problem, and you're auditing him through the problem. You've got a constant somatic so there you've got a problem, and you're auditing him through the constant somatic because his attention is on the constant somatic because it's on the problem. And his attention is not on valences so you can't run Routine 3.

Oh, you could find his goal, and you can find his terminal. But I fully expect there are some people that you'd actually have to run a Problems Intensive on before you could find the goal and terminal. You will not find them in Scientology, or able to do any kind of a job of auditing or anything else. They're really bad-off people. But you could find that condition. Now, they're just a total circuit, you know? And the valence just wouldn't be available, nothing else, you see. you won't find those, I repeat, in somebody who can walk up to the front door and say, "Here I am."

Now, he could be in a circuit. Well, what's a circuit? Well, a circuit is a kind of a subsidiary valence. A circuit is a mechanism which modifies a valence. A circuit is a solution to the realization that the valence can often be wrong, so therefore needs dictation to or needs things hidden from it. So you've got a circuit. And you set up a valence that can think, allegedly, and then you set up a circuit to modify the thinking of the valence. All of which happens, of course, when the . . . the thetan, as a valence, has run into a problem where the valence has failed. Do you see what could happen here?

You see, after the fact of the thetan failing, now everything he adopts after that is susceptible to failure. And each one of them becomes a barrier to processing And a circuit is something which modifies the thinkingness and doingness of the valence. It's a dictational machine. It's like you set up a tailor's dummy or something in a window, and the tailor's dummy is animated. And it's supposed to be able to turn its head backwards and forwards and shake its finger at the people who are looking outside, and it's doing this all the time. And now you set up a circuit to keep it from turning its head quite so fast. See, it's already built in so that it will turn its head at a certain speed, and will raise its hand at a certain speed. Now we'll put an entirely new machine over here. We will modify this dummy, see, with an entirely new machine over here, and wire it in to slow down the turn of the head, see? Of course, this is rather uncomfortable because the machinery in the thing is to speed the turn of the head at a certain speed, and then you put another machine on top of it to turn it at a slower speed, see?

Now, there's another machine there that, because it is turning its head so slowly, this new machine is fixed to turn the head up rapidly. So while . . . while it is turning its head at this speed, it's got a machine which turns the head at this speed, but this machine over here turns the head this speed. And after a while the dummy starts wearing out.

You see what these circuitry things are, you see? They're things to slow down or speed up. They're things to show or to hide things. They're occlusion circuits or demonstration circuits; they're picture circuits. They are all kinds of wild things. They're secondary thinkingness apparati that modify the basic thinkingness which is built into the valence.

Now, if those circuits get too wild and there's too many of those and it's all too complicated one way or the other, then the person can modify the circuit with a somatic in some fashion and do something there. So that, frankly, if he gets some kind of a circuit that goes operative, he gets a somatic, and that sort of makes him turn the circuit off. Soon as a circuit gets operative, and the somatic comes on, and off goes the circuit. And it's . . . all kinds of this weird via, via, via, via, speed it up, slow it down, hide it, show it, do this with it and do that with it.

Now, you get somebody that has this amount of . . . of bric-a-brac, additives and subtractives. . . You get this amount of bric-a-brac which is modifying the modifier, you see? You've got something that modifies and then something that modifies that, and then something that modifies that, and something that modifies that.

Somewhere down along the line, about the level of the somatic I mentioned a moment or two ago, or any one of these circuits, you would have a hidden standard. You could have a hidden standard. It knows more than the valence, which of course knows more than the thetan. Of course, the valence itself could be crudely classified as a hidden standard, but we don't so classify it because it is a whole package of thinkingness, doingness, beingness . . . that is a valence. It's a whole package. It's complete. You see that package when you get a profile. And when you don't move off that package you don't get a profile change. That's all there is to that.

Now, the modifications can be many without becoming hidden standards. A hidden standard is only qualified this way: It's what knows better, to which the thetan is paying attention. See, a fellow could have a hidden standard to which he was paying no attention, therefore it wouldn't be a hidden standard. You see, you could have a circuit that he never gave any attention to. Well, it has all the qualifications of modifying his thinkingness, but it would not slow up processing at all unless he paid some attention to it. Hey, if he paid some attention to it, then it would have a modifying characteristic on processing

Now, the difficulty is this: A concentration on this item . . . whether it is a circuit or a somatic or anything else . . . the concentration on this item can be so heavy, so thoroughly concentrated and the dependency on that particular circuit or item could be so tremendously heavy that the thetan only knew if it knew and if it tells him it's true, but if it doesn't tell him, it isn't true. And that is what we exactly mean by a hidden standard . . . must be a very heavy concentration on it and it must be what tells him.

Now, when you're auditing him, he goes into the cycle of only consulting it: He does not see you really; he does not hear you, really; he . . . it's all set up on vias to such a degree that you're really processing some kind of a piece of circuitry. It knows, he doesn't.

This produces some of the greatest oddities you ever saw. I mean, an individual could . . . he could be standing in the auditing room, as you often see a newspaper reporter do, and he'll see some demonstration and not even see it. But such a person could be standing in the room; a person comes in, sits down in the chair, you take two passes with your hand, and they grow two legs that they didn't have before, you see? And they walk out of the room, and the person would ask you, "What was the price of . . ." You expect him to say, "an intensive," or something like that. He wants to know the price of the cigarettes you smoke.

This used to absolutely drive me daffy, you know? I'd give some kind of a demonstration. It'd be a fantastic demonstration, some wild thing would happen or another, and some newspaper reporter would ask me, you know, very searchingly and so forth, what . . . what . . . what state was I born in. you see, he'd say . . . like it just had nothing whatsoever to do with anything observed, and it was non sequitur to anything he had observed. And seeing this originally got me onto the track of this sort of thing . . . not because I was not getting proper recognition from such people . . . I began . . . I began to wonder if they could see anything

To some degree everybody's attention is absorbed in various parts of the bank, to some degree. To some degree they're absorbed. But where a person's total overwhelm exists, attention is so absorbed that only it knows. So, they walk into a room, the person who is in the room sets somebody down in a chair, they throw a sheet over the body. The person who threw the sheet over the body picks up the sheet, and nothing . . . no change has occurred. And says, "There you are." And the person walks out. And you turn around to this person with a hidden standard and you say, "Isn't that wonderful?" And he says, "Yeah, I guess it is," and so on. "It's probably very wonderful." He doesn't even know what he's seen.

That is how you can fool such vast numbers of people. You can fool people . . . you don't really ever do anything Why? Because they don't see.

Now, this is more real to you in this wise: If you had any difficulties with your parents of any kind whatsoever, you had them because you were assuming they knew you. you were assuming they observed what you were doing You assumed they heard what you said. They . . . you assumed that the basis of their judgment was based upon the actual fact of your activities. And after a while you became very confused. Because if you were having very much trouble with their parents . . . your parents, they never observed

anything you ever did and they didn't know anything about you at all. They had somebody else there entirely different.

If you had asked them for a recount of what you had done in any given year of your life you would have gotten the doggonedest potpourri you ever heard of. It would have had nothing to do with any part of the fact . . . not because you didn't have a different memory, but because they didn't observe anything you ever did.

Now, their adjudications of what you did do . . . should do in life are usually based on not having observed anything you could do in life. So you get into a hell of a lot . . . if you'll excuse the French . . . get into an awful lot of confusion. You've demonstrated conclusively that you can't dig ditches, and your parents absolutely insist that that is the very career for you. And you assume, then, that they have observed that you cannot dig ditches. And the joker in the deck is, is they've never observed this. They have not seen you. They have never met you.

What have they met? They are running on a social circuit of some kind or another. They're running on a whole series of now-I'm-supposed-to that is dictated by some kind of circuitry. And it runs this way: "If I have a son or if I have a daughter, why, that person should go to a certain kind of school and they should do this and they should do that and in life they ought to do this and the best way for them to survive is that and so forth . . ." And if you don't compare with all these I'm-supposed-to's . . . the pity of it is, you see, you don't even know what these I'm-supposed-to's are . . . if you don't compare exactly with these, of course, you're a great disappointment to your parents. You're an enormous disappointment to your parents.

Of course, you get baffled in that you might be quite successful in doing what you are doing. You might be going along fine and be driven half out of

your mind all the time because they keep telling you you're not doing well.

Child goes out, wins a contest of some kind or another. Comes home just overjoyed, you see, covered with laurels and so forth, and Mama says, "You know your feet are muddy." And the little girl looks at her feet and, by George, she doesn't have any mud on her feet. And she . . . "What is going on?" and she gets kind of confused along about this point, you see? The truth of the matter is, Mama has a circuit that says "Children have mud on their feet." See, it just happens that "You should take care of a child's appearance at all times," or "A child should always be polite." Or there's something . . . some I'm-supposed-to circuit operating like this, you see? Hasn't anything to do with it.

And you could sometimes appear, you see, in total dishabille . . . never a word. The next time you appear, you're neat as a pin, you see, and you get all, all scolded. Why? Because what the circuit protests against, of course, activates the circuit. Now, a child is supposed to have good appearance. So any child who has good appearance gets criticized. You . . . the circuits are idiotic, see? They're set up on the basis that the thetan didn't know, so, what is set in its place is usually pure idiocy. "A child's appearance should be very good." So a child has very good appearance and he's criticized. But if his appearance is very bad he's ignored. See, it's an A=A, you know, it's not the reverse.

And this confuses children, and they don't understand what they're doing right and when they're doing wrong. You trace it back and you'll find out that it's just the awfulest mishmash of 8-C you ever heard. It's all reversed 8-C, and so forth. Little Johnny's sitting in a chair, and he hasn't made a noise for an hour, and all of a sudden his mother comes in and says, "Johnny, be quiet now!"

"Well, what have I been doing?" you see, big protest, injustice, betrayal. All of these things follow immediately in the wake of this sort of thing. But a circuit is most likely to go into activation on the thing it is trying to achieve. So a circuit most ordinarily protests when it has won. It'll protest its own end product at any time.

The basis of this is most circuits are set up on overts and withholds resulting in a problem and going over into, then, a change of some kind or another. And of course the circuit will dramatize the problem, or dramatize the overt and the withhold.

Most things that are protested against, the person will do. We call it hypocrisy. This fellow goes around, he's always on the platform, he's always beating the drum, he's always screaming at people, he's always jawing about secret drinkers. Well, he's got a circuit about secret drinking. He drinks secretly. See? It's all A=A=A=A. It defies logic because it isn't logical. Because circuitry is an escape from knowing. It is knowingness in a substitute for lack of knowing.

When a thetan escapes from knowing he sets up a circuit. When he no longer wishes to confront life he interposes circuits between himself and life, or valences between himself and life, or identities between himself and life. Get the idea? He makes an interposition of some sort. He has thinkingness done for him. He has beingness and doingness done for him. He wishes to divorce himself just a little bit from life. So he sets up an interposition of some kind or another. And when you start to audit him, this gets terribly important because you are part of life. Aren't you? You're right there in the room, aren't you, as the auditor? And if you were there in the room, as the auditor, of course anything you are saying or doing is liable to get an interposition.

So he sets up the interposition between you the auditor and himself the case. And you are auditing a circuit from there on. And that is why you cannot do a pure Routine 3. That is why only a few people go Clear on straight Routine 3 without preparation.

Now, by getting off his present time problems, his ARC breaks, by accustoming him to the room and getting his rudiments in, of course he is less susceptible to this particular phenomenon of an interposition between himself and life. you cut those things down and you can talk to him for a while. And that is the most powerful general and common mechanism to make it possible to talk to the pc, not a circuit. Because circuits go into action on PT problems and ARC breaks . . . withholds, that sort of thing, pop a circuit into view. So you're talking to the circuit, you're not auditing the pc when the rudiments are out. you get the rudiments in, and for a short time you'll be talking to the pc.

But people have problems of such magnitude on the immediate backtrack that it sets up as a permanent circuit. And you're always auditing at the circuit. And you are making very slow progress. Well, you now have a tool or a weapon with which to get this out of the road. Understanding the exact cycle that a circuit comes into being on, you can then get a circuit out.

You find any self-determined change, trace the problem immediately behind it, flatten that, get the confusion, the withholds and the overts out of the confused area immediately ahead of it, and you will find out that a circuit will disappear if done right. And that is a Problems Intensive.

Now, all a Problems Intensive does is pave the way so that you can at least audit the pc out of the valence he is in. It keeps scraping the top off so that you can actually pull the bottom out. Okay?

That is the system of aberration which has been operative on the whole track, and that is how it works and that is what it is, and you have the tools that get rid of it. And it's never any other cycle, but you have, of course, different tools that are effective on it. Okay?

Thank you.

Audience: Thank you.