

5403C29

EVOLUTION AND USE OF SELF ANALYSIS

A lecture given on 29 March 1954

And this is March the 29th, 1954. This is a talk on the evolution and use of Self Analysis. This book is relatively misunderstood. In the first place, it is obvious that a process as simple as that contained in Self Analysis would not do anything for anybody. That's obvious. And in the second place it's obvious that everybody's in better shape than this book calls for.

The various processes which are available to an auditor as we go up along the line - include one that is about the lowest rung you can hit, which is mimicry - treatment of psychotics. You mimic them. You mimic them physically; that is, not verbally but physically. They're lying down doing nothing; you lie down and do nothing. They'll get irked after a while. You've gone into communication with them. That in essence is communication, duplication. So that's about as low as we can get beyond some mechanical aids for psychotics.

Now, we go up the line from that and we find out there's another process known as Contact SOP 8, Step VII. [See Standard Operating Procedure 8 in the appendix of this volume] And Contact is just find something real and reach for it and withdraw from it. That's a surprising little process. Now, SOP 8, Step VI is actually this book. And SOP 8 is written to do a lot of work for a lot of auditors without a tremendous amount of instruction. And the instruction itself on SOP 8, VI is in this book rather than SOP 8, Step VII.

Well, SOP 8, Step VI, Step VII, Step V - all of these things are a case level. I want you to get this rather clear here. SOP 8 has case levels and is a structure of cases. SOP 8-C [See SOP 8-C Formulas and Steps in the appendix of this volume.] has nothing to do with case levels. Although it approximates the same processes, it is designed to be run on somebody who is exteriorized, SOP 8-C.

All right. But SOP 8, Step VI, means neurotic, a neurotic case. SOP 8, Step VII, means psychotic case level. SOP 8, Step V, means resistive, occluded. SOP 8, Step IV is somebody who is having problems with havingness. They're having problems with ownership, havingness and so forth and do not exteriorize until these are remedied. This person probably has a little bit of visio, spotty and so forth. SOP 8, Step III is simply somebody who is nailed down because he can't tolerate space easily. And once

you've remedied space on him, why, he exteriorizes easily. SOP 8, Step II is somebody who is exteriorized simply by getting him to get a mock-up of his body. It's a case level. The fellow is using a little more energy than he should. And a Step I simply exteriorizes.

SOP 8 is actually a rundown of "*How much inside are they?*" And "*What are these case levels?*" See? SOP 8. Now, that has to do to a large degree, then, with Homo sapiens. That is, thetan-plus-body, thetan-in-body - that sort of thing.

Now, we get over to 8-C and we're taking it for granted that somewhere along the line, why, we're going to make a Theta Exterior. But with SOP 8-C we depend on exteriorization techniques, some additional techniques.

Now, we have in addition to SOP 8 and SOP 8-C, we have what was being used in Unit 4 and which we're simply calling Unit 4 procedures. It's just some elements put together which are used. That's a fairly easy setup there. It's fairly easy to audit. It's very simple. But there is a new thing in there. There's two new things in that SOP - pardon me, Unit 4. You call it SOP, Unit 4. There are two new things in it, really, and one of those is Beingness Processing and the other is Universe Processing. These are very important processes. We're going to spend a lot of time with those processes.

But with Self Analysis we have a medium which (1) will not get people into trouble, (2) which is very easy to use and (3) which cuts across practically all the cases you will encounter. In other words, there's a certain security in using it because it wouldn't matter who walked up to you, Self Analysis would do something.

Well, now Self Analysis does an awful lot of things. But it also has some limitations. Let's look at the limitations before we go into what it will do and how we use it.

Those limitations are very, very marked. On a great many cases - I would say the majority of cases - Self Analysis works for quite a few hours. It works probably very, very well for about fifty hours and then slumps, and in many cases will slump earlier than that. But by slump, that doesn't mean the person goes back to his original state. That merely means the process hangs fire. The person just doesn't improve. His IQ doesn't improve above a certain point, and so on. It'll improve him up to a certain point, in other words, and then hang fire.

Now why does it do this? Well, he probably ran up to and including - with Self Analysis - all of the situations which could easily be remedied without recourse to universes. We didn't... just neglected any problem of universes or anything like that and we just cleaned up everything we could clean up with relationship to universes and that's it. This fellow is stuck, let us say - without getting too technical - let's say this fellow's stuck in Mother's universe. Well, we've cleaned up everything he can reach in Mother's universe. And he really sort of is using up the same energy now, over and over. He just gets up to a point where he marks time.

This you can expect with this process simply because that's what happens when it's used on children. Now, there's no better test of a technique than its use and results on children. Because children are usually in better shape, in one lifetime, than adults, by a long ways. So if a process will hang fire on children after twenty-five or fifty hours,

you can certainly expect it to hang fire on an adult. Therefore it has a limitation. It's actually a limitation of the amount of energy which a person can easily invest into mock-ups.

Now, you get somebody who's still creating energy and you could go on making mock-ups forever. But you get somebody who is depending on other things to create energy for him and you simply use up the available store of energy and reinvest them into mock-ups. You just change the frame and pattern. You've handled just so much energy and after that he doesn't handle any more energy.

It isn't that his mock-ups go off. He'll go on getting mock-ups, he'll do the same thing. But you'll notice a curve upwards - a rather steep curve right up front - a curve so steep in terms of advancement in the early stages of the use of Self Analysis that it's almost a vertical line. It's a tremendous advance, you know, in its first uses on almost any case. Because it, in using it, cracks through the neurotic level. And it just cracks through it. And it cracks through it on the same level as firing a rocket. But like a rocket, it runs out of fuel in a hurry.

So we can crack somebody up through a level of his immediate workaday world. The problems of havingness, his surroundings, immediate conflicts, things like this have a tendency to diminish. And he gets less worried than previously. And life goes on much better for him. But if we just kept on using Self Analysis, he would get up to a saturation point. Because you're just handling energy that he's already handled. In other words, we've taken up the available supply in the universe in which he finds himself and there we have it.

All right. The fact that it's limited, though, doesn't immediately preclude the use of Scientology. You know, just because a pair of pliers won't build an automobile is no reason you wouldn't use a pair of pliers on an automobile. I think that you would be rather embarrassed if in trying to keep an automobile running you didn't have a pair of pliers. And similarly with Self Analysis, auditors commonly and continually neglect this book.

And something else happens. When somebody writes in and says, "*We have a desperate case on our hands,*" that person is dramatizing Q and A, duplication. This person is just dramatizing the fact that he's being desperate because the case seems desperate and therefore what's indicated is that we must use a desperate process. So he says, "*Where is the auditor?*" or "*Where can. . . what nearby asylum uses Scientology?*" or "*Let's immediately call for ambulances,*" or something of the sort - "*because the person with whom we are dealing is frantic*." Therefore, we must have frantic means. He doesn't ever add that phrase; it just reads through everything he's doing.

All of a sudden somebody's wife is in terrible condition. She maybe just had a baby or something like that and she comes back home and mutters to herself quite long and arduously about how she's going to kill the child at the earliest possible moment or something like that. And it's ... of course this is a desperate situation. So everybody wants to get desperate. Well, they'll occasionally write the HAS desperately. And I get the letter and the same reply always goes back. And the reply is as follows - because such an emergency case and so forth actually is not something that would find an

auditor immediately going out and looking up. In the first place, these cases are temporary. They are very hard to audit. And it generally is the rest of the family that needs auditing. It's not a case of auditing a case. Yeah, you'd have to audit the whole family. Now, we have group processing, that's possible.

All right. So we write them a standard letter and I say, *"Well, now there's a little book, Self Analysis. I'm sending you a copy of it. And what you want to do is read its instructions and then sit down and read this to the person."* Normally these people are not out of communication; they can do such a process. All right. Days go by, weeks go by, we hear no more about it. Maybe about a month later we get this letter and it says, *"Well, we took .." - see, just forget about Self Analysis. "... we took this patient to see an auditor and the patient was audited for two hours and isn't Clear. And the problem seems to be very bad and so forth, and what do we do now?"*

Well, this isn't the kind of a case, you see, that's going to surrender in two hours. Well, you say, *"Well, get some interested member of the family and take the little book which we sent you and sit down and read the book to them."* And see if you can get them to do this. And you know, every once in a while after about the third or fourth letter, somebody gets interested enough to do it. Just about that far off.

Now, there's ... a professional auditor would know many processes which would do better or maybe faster work. But, you know, the fact of the matter is that case after case he would crack up through a certain level, you know, he'd push them up to a certain level faster if he simply opened a copy of Self Analysis and started in anyplace - particularly its next-to-the-last list.

Now, over here in the next-to-the-last list, it says, *"The following usually stabilizes any of the above conditions."* And here we get the most important process in Self Analysis. It says:

1. Recall a time which really seems real to you.
2. Recall a time when you really felt affinity from someone.
3. Recall a time when someone was in good communication with you.
4. Recall a time when you felt deep affinity for somebody else.
5. Recall a time when you knew you were really communicating to somebody.
6. Recall a time when several people agreed with you completely.
7. Recall a time when you were in agreement with somebody else.
8. Recall a time within the last two days when you felt affectionate.
9. Recall a time in the last two days when somebody felt affection for you.
10. Recall a time in the last two days when you were in good communication with someone.
11. Recall a time in the last two days which really seems real to you.
12. Recall a time in the last two days when you were in good communication with people.
13. Recall several incidents of each kind.

Now, that process, basically, is just this: *"Now, let's recall something that really is real to you." "Let's recall a time when you were in good communication with somebody." "Recall a time when somebody was in good communication with you." "Recall a time when you felt some affinity for somebody." "Recall a time when somebody felt some affinity for you."*

Those are the basic questions. And there you have the snap-point between upper psychosis and neurosis. The first time some of the people you work on... You wouldn't

suspect these people were really batty. They probably would grow bat wings with the greatest of ease and the smallest amount of hormones. These people are apparently all right and you go ahead and you work them. And after you've wasted yourself two, three, four hours of work, you find out that their case isn't advancing anyplace. Well, this is a question of first things first. You were going to build an automobile or something but you neglected to pick up any iron to build it with.

This person's havingness is in terrible condition. Ordinarily this is true. So what condition do we find immediately? We find that this person cannot have a past. This he's certain of. This is the most thing he's certain of. Although he is living in the past, he cannot have a past. He is out of present time. You will see the mechanics of this very adequately in Universe Processing. The mechanics of psychosis just lie straight out in front of you. Why a psychotic goes into the past and so forth. Mainly a question of energy.

But here we have an individual who can't have any past. Well, if he's a little short on energy and he can't create any, the only place he can look for it is in the past, isn't it? So, if he can't have any past and the only place he could have any spare energy would be from the past, why, he's on about the biggest maybe that you could get onto. He's got to reach into the past to get some additional energy because he can't create it anymore. Yet he can't reach into the past, because there's no energy in the past for him to reach for. No part of the past is touchable.

You could call this person a person with an untouchable past. Now, nearly everybody that you walk into who is in any kind of poor condition (I mean, you know, standard, normal) is badly out of contact with the past - badly! So you ask him to remember something that's real, and quite often this will amaze you. Don't be too startled to have a case - every now and then, a case appear which takes fifteen minutes to remember something real. Don't be too surprised at this.

You could help him out and fish around and get something just a moment ago and do it on gradient scales and so forth, but if you just suddenly ask him that... You don't have to do that, you see. Just ask him the question, *"Let's remember something that's really real to you,"* and he goes clouding around and fooling around and so forth and it's five minutes and ten minutes and fifteen minutes and all of a sudden, *"Yes!"* What you've done there is ask him for something that's safe to remember. You see that? Instead of... This is the way something real translates to him: something that's safe to remember. And he'll remember it with great reality, which is to say, great security. Which is great reality. And he will remember this and then he'll feel better.

And you can almost hear a case click when it does this and has difficulty in doing so. But on almost anybody that has never been accustomed or acquainted with auditing, you just come along and start asking him those questions one after the other, you get an astonishing result. Now, here for three years, that technique has been known and used - three years. Every now and then I get ahold of some preclear that's having a lot of trouble - been audited a lot, lot of trouble. And I ask him this question, *"Has anybody ever asked you to find anything real?"*

And the preclear quite uniformly says, *"No. Nobody ever asked me that question."*

And you say, "*All right. Remember something that's really real to you.*"

And every now and then - not in each case - but every now and then, why, one of these persons will go click, snap and relax about existence. They found out there is a part of the past. They can have a past. And this is something to have. They did exist yesterday. Well, if they didn't exist yesterday, you see, and they're definitely worried about whether they're existing now, it's a certainty that they're not going to exist in the future.

So here we have a case of straight survival. No future. See, if they didn't exist yesterday, they can't have any proof that they're going to exist tomorrow either. They're trying to prove that they can exist tomorrow by saying that they existed yesterday. Well, they can't do this because there's nothing real in yesterday. Yesterday didn't exist. So now let's call your attention to that very sharply.

How long could you carry on that process? Now, that process isn't as limited as the rest of Self Analysis. How long could you carry on that process? I don't know - five hundred hours? Doing what? Saying to a preclear, "*Let's remember something real to you. Now, let's remember a time when you were in good communication with somebody. A time when somebody was in good communication with you.*" You could just go on and on and on and on. But it's an individualized process, because it takes people different lengths of time to recall something, you see?

So it's really not a good group process and actually will bog people if run on a group. I've watched it bog a group. You "*Remember something real,*" and then the 50 percent of the group that isn't doing so well, they didn't get it because the auditor only took thirty seconds or something to ask his next question. And that was much too soon on this group. So it's not really a good group process. But it's an excellent individual process.

Now, what would happen if you ran that that long? If you just sat down and ran this on somebody that long - five hundred hours - what would happen? A very remarkable thing would occur probably at about thirty hours or something like that. They would run out of Straightwire for this lifetime. Call that Straightwire questioning; stringing a straight communication line. They'd run out of material that was immediately something grand, and they'd crack through into things that weren't quite real but were getting more real in past lives. Now, this is a spooky thing. And auditors don't like to run things on people that make them too spooky. And it takes too long to produce this effect. This is one of those slow effects.

I had it tested out one time. I had two auditors testing it for me over a weekend. And these boys audited about twelve hours apiece over the weekend just with that process because they had a busy week ahead of them otherwise. And they almost audited themselves into the ground. And at the end of that time just the thought of somebody remembering something real made these boys want to scream.

But both of them, on their test cases and so forth, cracked through into complete reality on incidents in earlier lives. In other words, they just ran out of material immediately available in this life. Now, of course they were auditing a medium grade of pre-

clear. You could audit twenty-four, twenty-five hours on some preclear who was very bad off. A Step V is not terribly bad off but a Step VI is pretty bad off, a Step VII is horribly bad off. You could audit this on a Step VI or a Step VII for probably twenty-four, twenty-five hours and they would get back finally to last month. I mean, you could - it'd just take so long.

Because, you see, this is the one test which you use as an auditor - and you always use this test - is communication lag. It's what we call communication lag. The reply to the question, the reaction to the stimulus - how long does it take for a person to react to certain stimuli? Now, that is reaction time. In Scientology it's communication lag. Reaction time, my hat. It never did anything for anybody. It merely told somebody whether somebody was drunk or something like that. That's been its total use. Now, with an understanding of communication itself, you will understand very quickly in investigating this that it takes the preclear as long to answer as he has extraneous and unnecessary communication bric-a-brac kicking around between himself and the body. In other words, you see, it takes him as long to answer as he has extraneous, unnecessary mass around his body.

He's got a terrific amount of (quote) "*mental energy*" - stagnant, stuck, ridges, old communication lines, old computations, old machinery, junk, junk. And you say to him, "*Hello.*" Now, it's going up through a communication system which is going this way and that way and shunting over this way and through the resistances that way and on up the line, on up the line, up the line, up the line. It finally hits something which is pretending it's him. And he receives "*Hello.*"

So he turns that over. He hears "*hello*" and he answers immediately, actually. He says, "*How are you?*" And then this "*How are you?*" goes down all these lines and goes over to another line and over shunts and resistances and past this ridge and down through that ridge and through a couple of caves and into a couple of vacuums and through a couple of blank spots and comes into the voice box finally. And the voice box activates and it says, "*How are you?*" But what's.. . it sounded like to you, was you said, "*Hello.*" .. [long pause] "*How are you?*"

These people really, sometimes - most of the time they think they're answering right up. They don't realize there was that much time avoided. Now, most of the nervousness you have in talking with people is the amount of time you have to wait for this answer.

They're as dead as they have time in their communication system. How dead is a person? He's as dead as he has time in his communication system. If a fellow has a communication lag of twenty minutes, he's practically gone.

Now, you'll see a person's communication lag lengthen in sickness. You see this easily. Gets very weak and so on. But people walk around who are apparently feeling all right who have the same kind of a communication lag. Well, they're a case of not-thereness. You have to run up so many lines and over so many shunts and under so many railroad trestles and so forth in order to get to this person, that you'd think he lived about eight stars and twelve universes from you before you could finally get a communication back.

Well, now, how would you know then how long to go on asking a person to remember something real? How would you know when to quit? Well, you would quit when you got his communication lag markedly shortened to something approaching an acceptable communication lag. So that he could easily carry on a rather fast conversation, let us say, with a high-school boy. You see? Ever hear teenagers communicate? It almost gets completely stated and then it's answered. You know? Back and forth.

Well, if you could push a fellow through up to something like that kind of a communication lag - that's still a lag, by the way - you'd still have something. You'd really have something. Well, you don't have to get it that good. Get his communication lag down to about a tenth of a second, so that you say, "*Hello.*" He says, "*How are you?*" You know, it's received and it goes out again. Because he would be in terrific shape if you did that. He wouldn't be interrupting you or anything like that. He'd just be in terrific shape.

Well, if you took somebody off the street and you asked him to remember something real... By the way, you'd explain what you wanted them to do, you merely want them to recall something real. You'd explain it to them first so they don't have to fumble over this one. And then you say, "*Now, all right. Now recall something real.*" And you'd find out that you could say "*(One and two and three and four and five),*" and they'd say, "*Okay.*" About a five-second lag - six-second, ten-second, something on that order. That's horrible. That's awful!

This fellow, you ask him real quick, "*What'd you have for breakfast?*" - brdrdr.

He'd say, "*Well, let's see. No, that was yesterday morning I don't know why I'd think of that. Hmm. Let's see. Hmm. Hmm. Oh, well, yeah... Um... no, that was yesterday. Uh...*" and so on.

In other words, he couldn't possibly pinpoint data like that. The whole bank is sort of just shot gunned. He can recall something real as long as you don't steer him. But if you ask him suddenly something specific, you'd find his communication lag just going on out, out, out, out, out, out. Therefore, how well off is your preclear that you're administering that next-to-the-last list of Self Analysis to? He's as well off as he answers and recalls swiftly.

Now, if you think he's just faking - he really isn't recalling something - there's only one way that really would tell you accurately. That would be an E-Meter. You could see the E-Meter flick every time he remembered something real. You'd sit there and watch the E-Meter. And it would bounce right there at the moment when he recalled something real. Then right afterwards, he'd say, "*Mm-hm.*" Yeah, he's recalled it. So there is an accurate check you could make. Ordinarily isn't necessary. People aren't that covert about it.

Now, what about this thing of asking him... Why do we ask him just one question on "*Something real to you*" and then two questions on communication and two questions on affinity? Here we have a triangle, ARC. One is affinity and one is reality and one is communication and they're all interlocked. But why two questions on communication and two questions on affinity and only one question on reality? Well, that's because reality depends upon agreement. You have asked him two questions when you've

asked him something real. You know, he must have had a parity of communication at the time - he must have had an agreement, an intention, which was similar to another intention before something sounded real to him. He might have been the two things having an intention with each other but this is why the energy is hung up at that point. It is suspended. There is an agreement at that point.

You get that? I mean, an agreement takes two parties. Reality is agreement. So we'd only have one... One question would hit two sides of the agreement which would give him reality. Because when you're asking him to remember something real, you're asking him for an effect upon him. So, of course, it must have been in agreement with him somehow or another, or it must have been his level of acceptance, to have had an effect upon him.

All right. A person has to agree to an effect before he can have one. He must have agreed to have been sick before he can be sick, and so forth. It doesn't mean that he suddenly can say, *"Well, I'm not going to agree anymore to be sick,"* and suddenly become well. Because universes complicate the problem a little bit more than that. But that's a basic rule. If we were just operating with one universe, a person could simply say to himself *"Well, I'm now self-determined and Clear,"* and he would be at that moment Clear. If he were only involved with his own universe, this would be true. But if he's involved with just one other universe, it isn't true. The thing to do would be to bail him out and then ask him to make up his mind about it.

One of the cruellest things you could do is get somebody who is in about eighteen universes and say, *"Well, now, all you have to do is make up your mind not to be sick anymore."* There he is lying on the operating table, you know, and he's just been cut to ribbons. *"All you have to do is make up your mind to be well, you'll be well. That's all there is to it."* *"It's your own fault"* - same thing. Society's always demanding people make up their own minds, and they aren't operating on their own minds. They're operating on a lot of other minds.

Anyway, here we have, in communication, the matter of outflow and inflow. Communication can outflow, can inflow. All right, what do we get then? A graph of communication runs like this: it goes cause, distance, effect. What is cause? Cause is source-point of a communication. What is effect by definition? It is receipt-point. What is cause? Source-point. What is effect? Receipt-point. What is communication? Cause, distance, effect; C-E.

Now, by the way, you just process by that definition. I mean, the definition itself is the process. We're trying to get an individual at source-point, and put what he's trying to effect at effect-point, and have anything that wants to be, be at source-point, and have the individual at E capable of being the effect of any cause. We want the individual to be capable of being the effect of any cause and capable of causing any effect.

Now, what is a very... perfectly well individual? It's an individual who is capable of causing - he's capable of it; he doesn't have to - he's capable of causing any effect, and he's capable of being the effect of any cause, without consequence. Capable of being the cause of any effect without consequence to himself. Capable of being the effect of

any cause without consequence to himself. And of course that in essence is communication: C-E.

Now, a conversation is, C - going from ... from right here to left, cause - effect. But over here on the left side, to make it a conversation, we've got to put a two-way line on it. And then we get it cause - (over here to the right) effect. In other words, you say, "*How are you?*" The fellow receives - he duplicates "*How are you?*" - and then he says, "*I am fine,*" right there where he duplicated "*How are you?*" And then the fellow who asked "*How are you?*" duplicates "*I am fine.*"

So we have: "*How are you?*" "*I am fine.*"

Now, that's a two-way communication system. A communication system does not necessarily go two ways. A complete communication goes from source-point to receipt-point. That's a complete communication. Just... If you go down and send a telegram, the fact that the telegram has left you, gone over a line, arrived someplace else - that's a complete communication. There doesn't have to be any answer to it. For business and military and the other social purposes, the distrust of communication is such that everybody expects an answer. It's only when communication had gone to pieces that everybody has to have what we call an acknowledgment.

So that we get on the bridge of the ship, we say to an individual who is steering, we say, "*Hard right rudder.*" And he is supposed to echo, aloud, "*Hard right rudder.*" He isn't supposed to just turn hard right rudder. That's because the officer of the deck doesn't trust the fact this individual will hear him or do it. So we get into the habit of getting acknowledgments on everything. And these acknowledgments are then a part of a two-way communication system.

But let's look at this kind of a communication: you pick up a rifle and you shoot this guy. Well, that's sure a communication! You were a source-point and he was sure a receipt-point. And he's too dead to answer. But yet it's a complete communication.

Now, what is a communication, then? It's the cause-point, the distance, the effect-point or the receipt-point, and in addition to that it is the particle or impulse which... particle or impulse; see it could just be a thought without any particle connected with it at all, or impulse - which goes from the source-point and arrives at the receipt-point. Now, that is the message. That's what is being communicated. So we have these component parts of a communication. Which is just source-point, distance, receipt-point and the particle or impulse which goes between. That's total as far as communication is concerned.

All right. The more lines, circuits, impasses, ridges, barriers that a person has had erected in him - you might say blocks - that a person has had mounted up in him by life, the slower he will go from one side to the other. You see that? From the C to E, the slower the communication.

All right. The communication system then in which we're involved in any event is a very simple one. The thoughts and impulses which are communicated, the particles, the quantity which is communicated - it doesn't matter how complex that is. Doesn't matter how complex the thoughts or the system or anything else is. What we are con-

cerned with is the system itself. And that's never complicated. The basic, the fundamental of a communication system is always simple. It doesn't matter how many complexities are communicated. That doesn't make it a complex thing. Does it?

Just because you put the Einstein theory between source-point and receipt-point does not make communication difficult. It doesn't. It merely involves the fact that something over here at receipt-point must duplicate what is sent at source-point. That just says something must duplicate it over here. And you will find this to be the case. You will go into universities and find mathematicians who have studied the Einstein theory, and you will find they are simply a receipt-point. There isn't an understanding of the Einstein theory. There isn't further thought on the Einstein theory and so forth. They're just repositories. Somebody dropped the Einstein theory into their ears and they drop it back at students and that's about the end of it. See?

That is what is mainly maddening about earthwise education; it's just that. Here we have this problem of a communication line and all they do is just communicate. You see? They just communicate. There is no creativeness, destructiveness or anything else that goes along with it. Because these things are the data or items or thoughts or impulses that are communicated. But basically as far as social problems are concerned, as far as the problems of command are concerned, as far as the problems of controlling oneself and as far as the problems of illness are concerned, these things become problems when a difficulty occurs in a communication system. If you could communicate directly and completely to some tremendous illness, it would vanish. This is 8-80. You know? And now you just ask somebody who has maybe got a sore hand, you just ask him to communicate with his hand, you know, just get a good communication line into his hand. The soreness more often than not will just simply go away.

Communication. It's getting in contact. But that is something else. He is communicating something else: he's communicating beingness and life to the hand. But you can communicate nothing if you don't have a line. So we have to start with a line. We have to start with C-E.

It wouldn't matter if we knew the most fabulous secrets that the pyramids never had chiselled into them. It wouldn't matter if someone sitting on the left hand of Moloch himself had simply come down and given us all of the information and the best secrets that were ever tailor-made to confound people. They would do nothing if they were not susceptible to being communicated. You see that?

For instance, I might know all about Scientology and not be able to communicate anything about Scientology to you. Well, it would just dead-end right there. Wouldn't it? Hm? Now, that is a simple thing. So that the problem of communicating Scientology is certainly on a parity with the problem of the existence of Scientology, if Scientology is going to do you any good. See that? Now, it would be all very well, I could make a bunch of mystic signs and say, *"Well, it's the extrapolated 1/c of the Einstein theory, goes out the left ear and this is the inverse ratio to the cat."* And then look at you and be very harsh and severe because you couldn't put it down on an examination paper. This would do nobody any good, nobody'd get well. The communication, if perfectly du-

plicated, would simply be a communication. But there would be no thought going over the communication line.

But let's get more fundamental than that. Let's suppose that an individual just refused to put up a communication line. Because a perfect communication would have to contain within it two other things to be a perfect communication leading to understanding. Now, we've got an addition. There's your communication, the graph C-E. Now, we'd have to have some affinity and some agreement, that is to say, some reality. In other words, we'd have to have these two things before we'd get a perfect communication.

All right. So much for that. There's quite a little bit, then, to delivering somebody a little bit of Self Analysis. What would you have to do? You'd have to be in communication with him in the first place. And the next thing, you would have to mark whether it was doing him any good or not. Now, how would you know whether it was doing him any good or not? Well, his communication lag would get smaller. He'd have less time lag.

Finally you'd get to a point of *"Remember something real."* And he'd say, *"Yup."* *"Remember something else that's real."* *"Yup."* *"Remember something else that's real."* *"Yup."* *"Remember something else that's real."* Pang, pang, pang! You see?

All right. So much for that. On communication itself we have a two-way flow. We've got an outflow and an inflow. Two communication systems involved. There are two communication systems involved, so that when we say C-E, and then where the E, is a C, and then another line where the distance is, and then E back at the person who originated the communication - that's two ways, so it takes two questions. You know, a very funny thing happens. You'll ask some people, *"Now, let's recall a time when you were in good communication with someone."*

And they'll say, *"Oh, yes. Yes. Yes."* They remember that. *"Yeah."*

"Now, let's get a time when someone was really communicating with you." Oh, boy! And I have seen a lag of thirty-eight minutes on that question.

You see, the compulsive thing to do is if you outflow fast enough and long enough and hard enough, then nobody will ever have a chance to inflow at you. This is a person who is afraid of being an effect. And he'll have all sorts of explanations. He'll say, *"You know, all my life I just have not associated with people who were at my level of communication and so forth. Nobody ever talked to me. Nobody'd ever give me any information. People talk, yes, but they don't say anything"* And oh, a lot of justification involved here. The point is the person is using communication lines themselves to fend off being an effect. He doesn't want to be an effect. That's what's wrong with the case.

All right. You start to audit somebody. You start to audit him, you start reading him some Self Analysis. And you say, *"Remember a time that's really real to you."*

He's liable to say, *"Well, now do you mean .. do you mean real? Or is it really real or which is real? You know, what do you mean by reality anyway? Now, a lot of philosophers have taken up*

reality. There's Descartes, for instance, he took up reality and so forth and then I think that one of the ancient Greeks tried to define reality and so forth. And uh... "

What are you doing? I mean, what are you talking to? That's a communication lag right there. You're just watching it roll. He knows what remembering something real is. It's just something that happened - something he knows happened, that's all.

Well, he goes on this terrific outflow, see. That's ... He doesn't want to be an effect. That's all he's saying. You know, he's going to go C where he is to E where you are. But you're not going to go C where you are to E where he is. You get the idea? He's not going to be a receipt-point. Because it's dangerous to be an effect. If one thing has been learned by this individual throughout life, it is dangerous to be an effect. That's very irrational.

Do you know that eating candy and seeing Marilyn Monroe and... I could just start off on a very long list here that would demonstrate that effects were not all bad. And so, of course, this individual who is trying not to be an effect has laid aside any joy of existence there is. And the only pay you ever get for the suffering you do is to have some fun. This is good pay too. People will go two, three years through the most arduous hair-raising ardures simply to have some fun. It's the amount of time invested in fun repays an awful lot of time invested in effort and labor and so on. That's kind of the way the world runs.

Let's be very practical, let's don't be totally scientific about it. We find out that this fellow, then, must be denying all the joys of existence if he is compulsively communicating at you. If he's compulsively, obsessively communicating at you, he must be then denying himself most of the joys of life. So, he will complain to you that emotionally he feels dead. And that's the one thing he says and the one thing he knows: that emotionally he feels dead. He doesn't really get a kick out of life anymore.

Now, there's somebody else that is bound and determined that he is going to be at the E point of the line. And never at the C point of the line. So you ask this person, "*Now, remember something real,*" you see.

And he says, "*Yap, yap, yap, yap, yap. And what do you mean by the Einstein theory and trying to run it on me this early...*

"But, I didn't say anything "

"Ah, yes, you did. There's no question about it. You asked me right that moment to remember something real. And you yourself cannot define something that's real and you know it."

I mean, we just run into this reaction. Hah! Well, our communication didn't go through very well.

Now, supposing you ran into this one. "*All right,*" you say to somebody, "*All right. Now, let's recall a time that's really real to you.*"

And you just get plain eager but interested ransack through the bank. You just get nothing but "*It's that? No. It's that? No. It's that? No. It's that? No, that isn't really real.*" He's being silent all this time. What he's doing is a long lag, see? You're getting some-

body who is ransacking the bank so that he won't have to cause a communication. You just got the reverse.

Here's this fellow, he's sitting there, he will do anything other than put forward a communication to you. In other words, you've got a fellow who obsessively wants to be an effect. Now, if you ask this person what his life had consisted of he'd say, *"Well, I've been beaten. I've been maimed. I've been handled badly. I've been ruined. I well remember my father putting flu germs into my milk."*

He'll tell you all about this. It's what's known as motivator hunger. He wants to have something done to him. He doesn't want to put out anything. He wants it to flow in. Well, he's short on energy. He thinks if somebody beats him around enough, it'll give him some new energy or something. He expects things to happen to him. This, by the way, is... The obsessively communicating case would miss your eye as being a rough case. He'll sort of miss your eye. You'd say, *"Well, the person talks..."* It sounds like he's saying something, too. If you listen closely it all is connected and it's reasonable and so forth. Well the, yeah, you kind of miss that obsessively communicating person as a rough case.

But you'd certainly never miss this other one as being a rough case. Because that's what we mainly object to. Because that person's going to take things away from you and give nothing back. In other words, you can say things to that person, but that person is really not going to say anything back to you to amount to anything.

Well, remembering something real remedies that havingness in him without him having to pull your bank down or take energy away from something else. In other words, he can have some energy in the past. So we have the two-way question. And time when the fellow was communicating with somebody, this person who takes a very long lag and says absolutely nothing - this person's saying nothing and just sitting there and so forth - well, if we asked then, *"Now, give us a time... Now let's remember a time when you were communicating to somebody."* Boy, you'd really get a long lag then. See? Because that's what's really inhibited. He can't communicate with anybody. But you could find lots of answers on times when people were communicating to him. Oh, sure, he'll remember these rather easily. See?

Well then, what is this obsessive outflow but a communication lag? You didn't get an answer, did you? You didn't get an acknowledgment to your communication. You said, *"How are you?"* and the fellow said *"Yapity, yapity, yap. And what do you mean by the word how?"* That's just one manifestation of it.

Another manifestation of it would be change the subject. And oh, there's all kinds of things. But, *"What do you mean by this word how? Now, there's the use of the intransitive verb on the transitive side of the verb there. What do you mean, now, 'how are you?' You mean how am I now? Or how am I in the future? Or how am I in the past? Or, how ... Isn't that an Indian word in the first place?"* That's a communication lag. It's never arrived, has it?

Well, another way of nonarrival is you say, *"How are you?"* and the fellow says, *"Well, uh... hm, I don't know, but uh... uh... I'd hate to give you uh... a very accurate or positive statement on the matter because really, actually uh... I uh... Well, you say, I'm... I'm really not so... Well, after*

all, uh... I was talking to a fellow over there and he said I felt fine." I mean that would be a more reasonable thing for the fellow to say.

Now, there's a communication lag. He's just putting off the time when he will have to be at the C point. This person would also tell you that the things that he did... if he were to do something in life, it would be bad. I mean, if he were to go out here and give some old lady a thousand dollars cash, the thousand dollars cash given in the purest charity would result, certainly, in her loss of her home, her family and an incurable disease. I mean, he would not be capable of good. He is somebody who feels that he should be or he could be or he'd try to be, but he can't. He mustn't communicate, much less be capable of evil.

Something would go wrong with his evil too. If he were to go out here and want to hit a little boy over the head with an axe, why, the axe would turn into candy or something like that. Or he'd find out the boy was wanted by the Federal Boys Institute chief, Edgar Spoofer, and that he'd receive a reward immediately for having killed Public Enemy Number One. He would be incapable of good or evil. Something would happen, it would go wrong. So the safe thing to do is just don't communicate. This also gives the appearance of *"Well, I don't want anybody to know I'm here"* sort of a thing. The fellow's withdrawing from sight.

Well, the other fellow gives the appearance of suddenly wanting to appear in sight. You know, he looms up. He seems to be the fellow who's obsessively outward communicating all the time. He looms up, he says, *"I'm here, I'm here, I'm here, I'm here."* He gets between you and things you like to look at. That's the least he does. See?

All right. In the handling, then, of Self Analysis, an understanding of the basic principles of communication are then necessary. And this to one reason or another is why auditors - when they have not known anything about auditing really and have used this book - may not have achieved the results they might have achieved with it. They didn't know about communicating itself. They didn't know about auditing itself.

All right. Let's take mock-ups themselves and we can go off on a very fast list of mock-ups. If you'll notice, they're non sequitur. They don't tell a consistent story. They aren't on a consistent subject. They change subject matter continuously. That is an invitation to the mind to differentiate. Those people who are in trouble are in trouble because they are thinking. They are thinking obsessively or trying to keep from thinking obsessively. And they are so worried about thinking.

Well, thinking is a parade of sequitur events. It's a gradient scale, a shabby thing called logic. And this gradient scale is actually a parade which goes on all through life with people who are not in good shape. What we know as a stream of consciousness would be a neurotic manifestation. That's normal, then. Well, is normal neurotic? I'll tell a man it is! I used to think it was up around 2.8. But we didn't have a minus Tone Scale at that time.

Now, here then we have things that are widely different and not related. And when you first give three or four mock-ups to a person as called for in Self Analysis, he will find himself a little bit trying to relate them one to the other. That's his effort to keep

on thinking in a stream of consciousness, obsessively. He's trying to relate these. Why is this? Why did you ask him to get a mock-up of the time when he found a ball, and so on? He's trying to figure, figure, figure, figure, figure.

Well, you just keep on going and you ask him for a time he was hoeing the garden and this time and that time and... Create a scene in which he's hoeing the garden, you see, is what it calls for, let's say, something like that. And then create a scene when he's young, and when he said goodbye to somebody else, and so on. When you first run this, he will connect them together. You get the most disrelated things imaginable here. *"You got out of the cage. Create a scene in which you got out of the cage. You enjoyed a new car. You didn't have to go there anymore. And you found your hands were adroit."* I mean, he'd string a story. Lord knows how he'd bend his brain around to string a story amongst these things, but he will.

And that is an obsession. And that's really all that's wrong with him. He has to connect everything logically with everything. And you just give him a lot of non sequiturs like this and he finds out he doesn't have to connect everything like this. After a while he can relax. He doesn't have to think, think, think, or stop himself from think, think, think, all the time. Now, it also handles energy and changes the energy in the bank. But the deep significance of these non sequitur mock-ups is to break down this obsessive stream of consciousness which people are worrying about all the time. With those two factors you have the reason for beingness of Self Analysis. And if you use it, you stay in good rapport, you obey the Auditor's Code and you use it on people, you can go forward a long way, and you will bring up cases a lot higher than you thought possible.

Cases go into temporary slumps, by the way. They go home and find their mother-in-law just came for six months. They do all sorts of things. And these slumps are very easily and quickly repaired by *"Remember something real,"* and so forth. Just put them in contact with the past and give them some mock-ups, non sequitur, like this: *"Create a scene, now, in which you found you had hidden without any cause. You frightened somebody. You overcame conservatism. You discovered a friend. You were friendly. You did something that was forbidden and got away with it. You showed somebody the door."* All of a sudden the guy is sprung out of the obsessive change of thought in which he's been hanging up for a long time.

The consequence is relief an ability to concentrate upon his environment, not having to look inside his head. So you extrovert him. And you'd really only run that long enough to extrovert the person so that he would be looking out into the environment instead of in at himself. And that's actually how long you would use it as a temporary assist. You just extrovert him. He'd be thinking of other things. He wouldn't any longer be concentrated upon these problems which were worrying him.

And that's the book.

(end of lecture)