5412C23

Renumbered 14 for „*The Solution To Entrapment*" cassettes

HAVINGNESS AND COMMUNICATION FORMULAS

A lecture given on 23 December 1954

I asked you yesterday to see if you couldn't reduce something on somebody. We've had one example here, processing „*the face saying hello.*" And the manifestation which I told you about occurred, of the fellow moving out automatically in front of his face and all that sort of thing.

Another example here of the preclear getting a foot which had been injured to say „*hello,*" and finding herself very fascinated and fastened onto - same thing - all of the various aches, pains and stubs of yesteryear, and finally discovering that the toe was not present at all and then processing the toe and getting some life back into the toe.

Now, just along that line, who else - who did reduce something?

Male voice: Muriel had an injury on her finger there. We worked with that a little bit. Some swelling, inflammation seemed to reduce in just a short time.

Uh-huh. An injury, this was an injury?

Male voice: Yes, a cut, injury.

Good, good. And that went down.

Female voice: Yes, we just had it saying hello. Not me saying hello.

That's right.

Male voice: Yes, it saying hello to her.

What was it saying hello to?

Female voice: To me, and to the rest of the body.

Good. Well, to you as distinct from the rest of the body.

Female voice: Well, sometimes it was one and sometimes it was another; it did seem to vary.

Oh, you got an automaticity there. You want to - you want - as the auditor, you want to make sure you define what it's supposed to say hello to. Although it will work with just the thing going around just simply saying, *„Hello, Hella-ha-ho!"* You know. It will work. Well, that's real good. Who else had some luck there? Yes.

Female voice: I lost some weight too, from yesterday afternoon.

Well, this is, this is one of the more fascinating facts as you will discover as you go along further.

All right. The problem with which we have been faced for some time has been the problem of the reduction of undesirable energy deposits and spaces. Remember we aren't just dealing with masses. Let's not get so fixated on a mass that we avoid the idea of space.

Now, undesirable spaces ordinarily suddenly turn up to have something in them, which is one of the more curious things. We find it is just jammed full after we run something.

Let's say we find a space. Now here's the question of the toe; the toe is absent. There is evidently a space in this toe, see? That's the way it looks to the preclear, doesn't it? Looks like just a space there, there's no toe, you see. There should be mass, and there is space. Starts to run it for a little while, and first thing that shows up is a somatic, and then the toe shows up.

That would be the way it would go. The somatic would show up before the toe would show up. In other words, there's something there that is saying, *„Don't you communicate with me!"* And the fellow starts in and it's all of a sudden spat! And he says, *„Well, I'm sorry I did."* And in the ordinary course of human events, just the effort to communicate with the area would send up some tiny little warning signal, and it'd say, *„Dzz-dzz-dzz-dzz-dzz, dzz-dzz-dzz!"* And the fellow will say, *„Well, I'm sorry,"* only he wouldn't even think about it. His attention would simply wander over to a space.

Obviously nothing there, you see. Space. And his attention would come off of it very, very rapidly. Now, many, many moons ago, in 1952, I gave a series of lectures here, somewhere late in the fall, I think it was, if I remember rightly. No, no, that's right. It was probably that all those lectures were - undoubtedly some must have been somewhere around August, or something like that.

From audience: July and August. Yes, sir.

Yeah. Well, I described a phenomenon of asking a preclear to look around his environment, you know. Just look around his environment. And splat! He will get something in the teeth.

There is an engram known as the „*Tumbler*“ which leaves the individual's entire environment strewn with a hole. And if he sees this thing or looks in that direction, and if you ask him to look for it, why, it'll cave in on him All right. This is a curious thing.

You can take anybody. Particularly take somebody who looks pretty badly beaten up, or something like that. And you ask him, „*Now, look around, look around somewhere, look out there in front of you, look up, look over at the side,*“ and somewhere he's going to pick up one of these undesirable spaces. Just like that. He's going to pick up a space. And that space going to kick him hard.

Well, why didn't it kick him before you started to audit him? Well, that' because it always did kick him. See, that's why. His attention would go over on it, you see, and it'd just start to get in the vicinity, and it would tick-tici tick, you know, and attention would come right off of it, without his knowing he had put his attention on it. You see?

Now, there is the (quote:) „*unconscious mind*“ (unquote) at work. There an unconscious impulse, an unconscious reaction. It is a place you shoulder better communicate with and it appears to be a space.

Now, there is the anatomy of inversion looking right at you, there; the anatomy of inversion. It's a space and it turns out to be an object. And processing the object will then make it turn out to be a space. And then processing that space occasionally will make it turn out to be another object. And processing that object, with just communication, acknowledgments, answers and origins, you would then get it into a state of a space. And in time it would be a space.

Now, this spooky manifestation is what has all of us as thetans spooked. This is really the only really spooky manifestation that really bothers a thetan. He runs into this space, it's apparently a perfectly good space, he starts to go in communication with it and it bites! So he says, „*Space is dangerous.*“ And therefore he doesn't want anything to do with space if he can really avoid it. Now, do we see this space manifestation? Hmm? You got that?

There is, you might say, an allergy to space. All right, let's take Dianetics: The Modern Science of Mental Health, the example of the fish. A little fish, he goes into yellow water, yellowish water, and he starts to eat something, and powie-powie, he gets bit. As far as he's concerned, thereafter, this empty water - you might say spatial water, had no object in it - is dangerous! Why is it dangerous? Well, it has an object in it! And he learns this lesson so well that he will thereafter avoid that space.

And this is the automatic avoidance of spaces. An automatic avoidance of spaces. He puts up - actually, he does this trick - just so that it won't happen again, just to remind himself; and so forth, he puts up a facsimile of the incident in that space, to occupy that space, as far as he's concerned, forevermore, and so serve as a warning to him not to enter or get into that space. You see what he does? And this is the mechanism. Definitely is the mechanism involved in restimulation, as far as spaces are concerned. That is why an individual will not approach an area easily where he has been injured.

Now, if you know this mechanism, you can lick it with great ease just by knowing about it. But let's say you had an automobile accident or you've gotten arrested by a speed cop or some other trivial affair, and the next time you pass that spot you will think about it. Why do you think about it? You got a facsimile sitting in it.

Do you carry your facsimiles around, hanging on you? No, you don't. You leave your facsimiles parked all over the flam-damn universe! You see what you do with them? You hide them. So in case you ever look at that space again, you won't look at that space again, and that's the way to be safe. And the moment individuals get fixated on the idea of being safe, heh-heh, they're dead! See, it's a lie that you have to be safe. See, that is a lie.

That is a lie which is making neurotics out of school kids and juvenile delinquents out of high school kids. What are they saying all the time to them? Safe, safe, safe, safe. Safety campaigns. The prevention of injury. Prevention of traffic tolls. Prevention of this, prevention of that. Do you know they're creating them?

Male voice: Sure.

They're creating them, just as easily as though they were taking kids out and throwing them underneath the wheels of cars.

If you get traffic so beautifully regulated, for instance, if you get traffic so beautifully regulated, they expect kids only, and pedestrians, only in certain areas, then they're not going to be very alert in other areas. So you run up trolls. You know most of the accidents that you see are actually in prevented areas. They're at street corners where everybody is supposed to stop or where you have crosswalks. They've done an inversion. The area where they have accidents are the areas that are supposed to be safe. And the most regulation, well, of course, that is the most incidence of traffic at that particular area so of course you'd look for the accidents to be in that area. But there is something else that calls this a lie. And that is the fact of the distribution of the little white crosses that some states put up to mark motorists' deaths. You'll see a cross, and every time you see one of these crosses, for goodness sakes, look during the next hundred yards for the second cross. And then look for the next one, and if that early cross has been there quite awhile, you will have a whole string of crosses.

Just the fact - you get the stimulus-response character of a driver anyhow - just the fact that he sees a facsimile, that little cross tells him a facsimile of death is sitting here. And the stimulus-response mechanism - this is as easy to understand as an adding machine - the stimulus-response mechanism throws in to bring about a death there, see?

Male voice: Too many deaths death.

Death, death. But let's look a little bit more at what we know about it now.

We know that the thetan customarily parks in an area of injury and hides a facsimile of warning. Very cute mechanism. It won't obstruct his view; he can look straight through it. If he looks through it! But if he looks at it or starts to look at it he will be

steered away from the area just as easily as a bug is steered to an electric light bulb. See, the same type of automaticity goes on there.

So we put up a little white cross and this tells the thetan, *„Hey! There's a facsimile of death sitting there. "* Wham! Well, look it. This thing defeats itself; doesn't it? It is not a security mechanism at all. It sure gives a guy a lot of games! Get the idea?

Now, he could have put it up to be secure. He could have put it up to have further games. He could have put it up just to be doing something. But life at large uniformly employs this mechanism. Spaces have something in them. Of course, that's the one thing a thetan can't duplicate easily. Somethingness. You see, nothingness, that's easy. So let's make the game a little tougher by having all nothingnesses contain somethingnesses. So that makes it very hard to duplicate everything and sure keeps you working.

Well, whatever rationale we have, we do have a mechanism which is in common in life and is the mechanism of the facsimile and does tell us that the facsimile sits where it occurred. But wait a minute. If it sits where it occurred, how is it going to get into action against the individual who is now someplace else? How is it? There has to be two facsimiles, doesn't there? There must be two facsimiles involved. So that when one changes, the other changes. Right?

Why, this dirty, slinky, little cur of a thetan makes two of 'em. And he holds one to his chest and he leaves the other one on the site. Therefore any disturbance at the site will alert him. But any time he looks toward the site the picture he's carrying with him will activate, won't it? Oh, but this is very, very easy to do because there isn't any such thing as space.

So you have to have a double idea of every facsimile, or two facsimiles, one or the other, it doesn't matter. So after we erased it, in 1950, after we erased it on the track we had to erase it in present time if we really wanted it to be gone, completely and utterly, didn't we? We were erasing two facsimiles.

Actually there were three. There was the facsimile of erasing the facsimile at the site. And actually there were four! Because there was the facsimile of erasing the facsimile at the point of auditing, present time.

Oh, no, wait a minute! There were five, because we had to - we had to erase the erasure of the last erasure, didn't we, huh? Oh, no! No, you really think it over though, there are really six. Because the action we just undertook also made a facsimile. Well, the fact is, we get a dwindling spiral as far as the facsimile is concerned because we're making it communicate all the time. The erasure, the mechanism of erasure, is a very crude mechanism, a very crude mechanism.

I mean, our activity in erasing an engram. But pretty terrific. Actually hypnotists at one time or another have made a person recall something several times, and so forth. Not the same as a Dianetic erasure. But the Dianetic erasure, although very crude, was still better than nothing. And it still worked better than we had in the past been able to handle these things.

All right. Now, let's look this over, and discover that we have undesirable masses, and undesirable spaces. At the same time we have desirable masses and desirable spaces. And this would merely be whether the space was pro- or contrasurvival, whether the mass was pro- or contrasurvival, and again falls back on opinion and opinion only.

Therefore, the auditor, in auditing, has to make some decisions along this line himself. You could overtly erase a great deal of prosurvival mass. Let's say we erased all the money in the fellow's pocket, we erased his new suit, we erased what good looks he had - get this - and we sure left the Fac One sitting there, see. And we left the wart on his shoulder. Get the idea.

Direction of erasure is under the control of the auditor. It always has been to some degree but never like it is today. All right. The auditor then can erase at will. If he can erase at will, he will discover the preclear will change his mind about creating. Why did a preclear stop creating? He stopped creating because there was just too damn much. Get the idea? There's too much! That was the basic worry. He made this and he made that and he made something else and it disappeared, and so he made a lot more and he made a lot more and the next thing you know he finds himself in the middle of too much space or too much mass.

And he says, *„Now, wait a minute. If I go on creating, I will get into a bad way."* Let me give you a very modern, present time example of this sort of thing. We take somebody who is overweight and we have him remedy havingness. We can shoot this poundage out of sight by the remedy of havingness. We can just make him mock up and pull in, you see - not the whole process - mock up and pull in heavy and dense masses. And mock up and pull in heavy and dense masses. We never let him get rid of one, you see, we're not really remedying havingness at all, we're just adding mass as distinct from remedying havingness. An auditor should know that very sharply, that remedy of havingness is the remedy of the need to have, not mocking up masses to get the preclear lost under.

All right, so we mock up, have the preclear mock up and pull in and mock up and pull in and mock up and pull in and mock up and pull in and mock up and pull in and mock up and pull in, and oh, boy, oh boy, oh boy, oh boy. If you were to put him on a scales before the auditing session, put him on the scales after the auditing session, you would discover that you were not dealing with mental energies entirely different and distinct from physical energy - *„Ha-ha! We're all sane, us scientists! See, the mind is something else. Ha!"*

Today, I am trying to find something that is not the mind! Different problem. I just completely did an inversion here on all of scientific theory. Scientific theory started out with a complete inversion that it was all matter and mass and space and the chemical combinations out of a sea of ammonia and other such seas finally produced the accident of chemical life. And they prove it to you, too. They'll show you that crystals will grow. And they will. They'll grow an inch or two and quit, soon as they run out of fuel.

Well, regardless of that, we've gone over to this one: we've all - but we have not just reverted as a revolution. Actually we went up with great care, up the whole line. How

far can we get away from this mass theory? You see? We postulated there was such a thing as life, though we didn't know much about it. But we sure did know an awful lot about mass, you see, and space, and so on. So we started to move out of mass and space, gently and gradually, into more and more concept of what life was all about. And as understanding of life broadened, we have reached the point of where I don't quite know where to turn to find some mass and energy! You get the idea. I mean, they are completely contrary to the most fond scientific view of today, which view of course is very, very handy to have, if you're trying to make slaves out of everybody. You say, *„You don't amount to anything at all. You're just mud, fella! You're just a biological accident, that's what you are. And we have - don't have to take any responsibility for you, any more than we do a test tube or something in the laboratory, you see. You're just mass, and so therefore we don't have any responsibility at all! I mean, a test tube breaks, all right it breaks."*

I saw an army film not long ago. The army said - it's utterly fascinating; it was the rescue, airborne rescue unit. The army rescue unit goes in and picks up lost flyers and things like that. And it starts out with the fact that a man is only composed of ninety-seven cents worth of chemicals. It lists them, and it says it's utterly incredible that anybody would waste any time at all saving them, however, this unit does go ahead and do so. And that is not quite as brutally blunt as that because they're more covert. They aren't even, even blunt enough to make a nasty remark straight across the boards; they make it rather covertly. But that is definitely the message which you receive. And then they show all of the various mechanisms of rescue and several very famous rescues, and so forth, on this line as - almost as curiosa that anybody would bother!

Well, here we have shifted very definitely, and very, very markedly, very markedly, our viewpoint of this matter. We're trying to find something now that isn't life. And plutonium could be said to be life compressed and entrapped to such a degree that it'd eventually protest loudly. Well, plutonium acts like that! Plutonium acts just like a preclear. That was what fooled the scientists. See, it fooled them. You know, matter acted so much like life, and life acted so much like matter, that, of course, naturally everything was space and energy. You see the conclusion they drew? They had - they did. I'm not just gagging. They did draw this conclusion. So you take a - one of the big gags that was going around at MIT, while they were still overt and before the government had entirely taken over on atomic energy, they said they were going to invite the Atomic Energy Commission and everybody connected therewith to dinner. And they were going to serve their dinner on plutonium plates. And they were all going to eat their dinner off these plutonium plates, and at the end of the dinner, why they were going to make them a speech. And they were going to say, *„Well now, boys, we have an idea that there are better uses for atomic fission than blowing up Earth, and we want you to immediately and herein and hereafter agree to dispense with all war use of atomic fission and restore it to its proper industrial sphere. And if they didn't agree, they were simply going to stack the plates!"*

Because the only thing, you see, the only thing that makes plutonium completely intolerant, is the same thing that makes a scorpion completely intolerant of the presence of any other scorpion or anything else, see - proximity. It's dead against it! It protests with loudness.

Now, we take somebody who is black five, a good, solid, unprocessed-at-all black five, see, and we go over and we touch him on the shoulder. I did this one time to a fellow who had been - had the usual course of psychoanalysis - twelve or fifteen years. And he was sitting there minding his own business; he was very well aware of my presence. And I was walking around the room, picking up some books and things and I stopped alongside of his chair. He was still very well aware of my presence and that I had hands and everything, we will assume, and I - he made some sort of a remark, and I said, *„Uh, now, tut-tut-tut, that's not true!"* See, and I tapped him three times on the shoulder, you know. And this fellow went kind of white and he sat there and he - I said, „What's the matter?"

And he said, *„Oh, just a moment,"* he said, *„I'm working it out."* I said, *„You're working what out?"* Well, he says, *„I'm just a little sensitive to being touched."*

So an hour or so later, we resumed the conversation. See, he had worked it out by psychoanalysis, I guess rationalizing that in fact that he had probably been spanked for touching the private parts of his father or something, I don't know. Anyhow, he worked it out in some rationality and after that we could go on with the conversation.

The sting on a scorpion, the various other mechanisms that life uses, are, when life is very intolerant of existence, simply mechanisms of repulsion. *„Don't get too close, fella."*

The US started out with a flag of a rattlesnake that said, *„Don't tread on me,"* and I think it was Benjamin Franklin or somebody explained it very gently to the Continental Congress and so forth that a rattlesnake was not good to its young and so forth, and so they laid off the symbol.

But they - the main difficulty in life, is an intolerance line. And you have a whole strata of animal life which is on this intolerance line - utter intolerance. They will do something about proximity. See, they protest about proximity. And because one line of life is protesting against proximity, of course you would expect another one to develop which protested against distance. So there are two distinct stratas of life by-products, meaning facsimiles, spaces, chemicals, physical universe spaces, and so forth. There are two distinct lines there. One which believes that proximity is bad and the other one that believes that distance is bad. And between these two things you get the basic game called physical universe. You see, it's just the playing of one against the other.

Fly believes proximity is very bad, but he lands on the lip of one of these insect-eating plants, and it believes proximity is wonderful.

Now, we discover that the person, that persons in the human race follow one or the other of these examples. But they are not following it as an example but as a basic operation which life began in the first place.

You get a wonderful game of interplay where you say, *„Don't get too close! Don't stay too far away!"* See, between those two things. And so we have in the human race people who have either of these to an enormous extreme. It really has to be extreme before you really start to see it. These people have to be pretty dug in or upset or something of the sort. And they represent it physiologically. The very, very thin, the extremely -

and boy, I'm really talking now about extremes - the human skeleton sort of a person is objecting like mad to proximity. And even when they are (quote) „*feeling affection*" or (unquote), whatever you want to call it, they still have a draw-away impulse.

And there is the other kind, and again we would get this in extremes. We can trace both of them, by the way, in the nonextremes, see. But when we're looking for pure types, we'd have to get somebody who's up there around 350 pounds or something like that, to get the other extreme, and this individual would be absolutely incapable of staying away from anything or letting anything stay away from him.

Such a person runs a variety store up on the street up here. And he gets back and forth. He's, I don't know, about 380 pounds, I think, and he gets back and forth. And every customer that is leaving the store through the counters that check out the goods, every customer leaving the store, if he is on duty, is spoken to by this fellow. And this is of course very good ARC and all that sort of thing. But that isn't why he's there, really. It's havingness.

He sees those goods leaving his store. And it upsets him. And so he stands on the outer side of the counter almost preventing people from leaving the store, you see? And his common flow of conversation is to comment on some of the things which they had before they came into the store. You know, like their clothes, and so forth, and the desirability of these items, which of course is very flattering to the customer. You know, „*That's an awfully nice dress you have there, where did you get that?*" so forth, the terrific desirability of costumery. Well, this fellow just can't stand to see anything separate, and you can see the look of pain on his face, just flick, you know, every time he sees a bag of goods leaving the store. What he would love to see would be shipments coming in all the time from all the factories of the world, you see, to this huge variety store, you see. And they would get parked there, one way or the other. And customers would flow in the front door and the side doors of the establishment, and they'd never leave. And nothing would ever be sold or be moved out of the store. And this would be a wonderful state of affairs as far as he's concerned.

Now, most people mix these two things under this heading of pro- and contrasurvival items. Masses and spaces, see? They mix these two things. They still have judgment. They have criteria. In other words, they can still afford to be faithful to their basic postulates that things can be good and things can be bad. And these people are still exercising this criteria and as long as they do, we consider them sane and as soon as they don't we say they're nuts. But it's totally possible that somebody never had a pro-survival postulate. You see, this is a possibility that anything could be prosurvival. There is this possibility.

So we might look into one of these extremely thin, drawn-in cases and find out whether or not this person ever considered the approach or proximity of anything, anyone, was good. And this other case, we might look into that and find out if he had ever made a postulate that the approach of anything could be bad. But he must have made a postulate contrary to it that the leaving of anything must be bad. See, he's made another type of postulate there. Anything departing is bad. Anything approaching is good. Judgment. He would welcome a bullet.

The other fellow must have made the postulate that anything leaving is wonderful. And I have seen such people, by the way, on definite inspection, I have seen such people be very relieved, extremely relieved, to see things that should have stayed there, depart. See, real happy about it. And have seen them get very efficient and effective the moment they had made up their mind to leave the whole situation. See? Leaving, departure, that was good, that was joy, and so on. So we just have these two combinations of things. Pro- and contrasurvival, departures and arrivals. That's about all it amounts to.

All right. We see all of these things, the cohesion, adhesion and dispersion - something, by the way, that the scientist has never adequately described or covered with language. The dispersion or the antipathetic action of similar particles. I guess he just - these things are far apart, so he never observes that they have an antipathy so that he speaks of cohesion and adhesion. He should speak of cohesion and unhesion. You see, he should have a word that looks just like that and is that simple sitting right there in his vocabulary. But he doesn't have that word. Tells you what those boys are fixed on.

Anyway, every time we get an extreme condition we get some kind of a basic postulate on the track just as one-sided as I've been talking to you about. Now, most people, as long as they're in good shape and as long as they're doing well in life, most people can accept or reject - aha! We were going someplace, huh? - most people can accept or reject according to their interpretation of pro- or contrasurvival or it doesn't matter. See, they can accept or reject things according to their judgment. And they have a great many arbitrary judgments.

Only when these judgments become reactive or automatic do we as auditors see any difficulty in them whatsoever. An individual who just can't abide spinach and doesn't eat spinach, but if he eats it nothing happens, he could be said to be operating on an analytical criteria. He believes that spinach doesn't taste good and that's his idea and that's all there is to it. That's his opinion of the matter. But let's take the boy who can't abide spinach and when he eats it becomes ill. Ah, we're into the reactive band, aren't we?

Now, there's nothing wrong with having these judgments. Quite on the contrary. We couldn't have a game at all unless we had somewhat fixed values of good and bad, good and evil. We'd have to have somewhat fixed values if we were going to have a game. A fellow couldn't have another game unless he could change his values. You see that? He couldn't have another game. He'd be stuck with a game as long as he was stuck with good and bad values.

So he keeps on playing this game and playing the game and the game gets more and more one-sided, and he's liable to move out into *„everything must move in and nothing must move away",* or *„everything must move away and nothing must move in"* categories - all on a reactive basis that he doesn't know what he's doing. He's exercising no criteria whatsoever. And this individual we would call in a very, very bad way, and we would say he has lost considerable ability.

Therefore, we have a process which fills this in and which is an effective enough process. This is one of those eight-star processes called Accept and Reject, is the name of the process. It's one of the R2's in The Creation of Human Ability. And this R2 is sufficiently strong that without particularly or materially upsetting anyone it has never failed to exteriorize a preclear. And I want to make that very advisedly, and I say that with good solid cognizance of what I'm saying. This is not a loose statement at all.

So much so that one preclear, who was supposed to be dead in about six months, and who actually was so thoroughly stuck physiologically in the embryonic state, who could not get into a two-way communication even vaguely, well, whose arms were actually only about, at the beginning of processing, only about eighteen inches long, little flippers, a grown man, been this way most of his life. Diagnosis: Multiple Sclerosis. Prognosis: death in six months.

He's not just alive right now. Of course, I will say that the auditor in this case, and I, rose to some rather heroic heights of figure-figure and predict with processes in order to get this boy into enough two-way communication so that something like this process could be run. And because we experimented with several processes while running him, we extended the auditing time materially. But the auditing time on this case to bring it up to a point where Accept and Reject could be run was unfortunately a hundred and thirty-five hours. All of which time was spent on two-way communication, a very, very flabby version of 8-C and, what really brought him into line was about - this had to be invented for him. It was invented by his auditor, Sanborn. Had - Sanborn was trying to get simple enough, to register. Preclear perfectly willing, you see, to go ahead and do this process, and all that, but trying to get simple enough. So he invented a simple elementary straightwire and that's quite a trick. And this simple elementary straightwire, which snapped him up to enough awareness and so on, so that we could run Accept and Reject on him, went as follows:

„Remember something. Now, remember a man. Remember another man. Remember another man."

Well, this fellow was going off onto systems continually. When you said remember a man, why, he would remember a man, and then he'd remember that this fellow was a newspaperman. So he knew a lot of newspapermen so he would just reel off the other newspapermen that he knew. See, he wouldn't remember them at all, he - he'd work it out in a system. So everything fell into place by classes. You've seen preclears do this. This is a real cute manifestation. I'll punch that up, because you'll see this manifestation often. And to hell with these systems, they're just not getting the preclear anyplace. You want him to remember another man and you want him to remember that man and when and where.

But, in this case we couldn't even vaguely have asked this fellow when or where. And, *„Remember a woman. Remember another woman. Remember an object."* And on this type of - he just went up the dynamics, by the way, as far as he could go with rationale. And before he'd proceeded about halfway through his program, the boy all of a sudden snapped into two-way communication. And oh, the amount of petting and pampering and so on. By the way, this case is terribly inhibited in his recovery by an antipathetic

environment, antipathetic to Scientology. Terribly inhibited. Probably multiplied the number of hours involved maybe by four, as any auditor around here will tell you. Nevertheless a hundred and thirty-five hours is no fantastic investment of time, when you consider a case like this.

All right. We got him up to this point and started to run Accept and Reject on him. Our auditing plan was as follows: Get him out of his head. Have him straighten up - had to get him in good shape, exteriorized - have him straighten up the anchor points of the body and dust off the case. See, zero. That's the end of that. We were working him up to a point of where we could exteriorize him and we knew what process we'd exteriorize him on, too. We'd exteriorize him sooner or later on Accept and Reject. And here, a hundred and thirty-five, maybe a little bit more, hours, we were able to get this plan into action on Accept and Reject. Took us that long to make sure that this man could even vaguely follow a subjective order, that we were even vaguely in two-way communication with him at all, see.

We finally pushed it in, finally got it working, and in one half of one four-hour session, he was exteriorized with good perception on Accept and Reject. Gives you some idea of this process. You see, this is a kind of a havingness thing. It is the basic considerations back of havingness, and the very considerations about which I have been talking to you, here, this lecture. See, here we have, you see, the fellow who, you know this is bad so it mustn't come in, and that's good so that has to come in. And we got acceptance level mixed up in this and some of the most incredible, some of the most horribly incredible acceptabilities, you see, existed. What was really good? Excreta. That was wonderful, see? And, oh, Freud would have loved this case, and would have been able to do nothing with it. He sure could have studied it, though. Now, all of these basic screens had inverted on this character. All of them had inverted. So that anything that was slimy or horrible, or miserable, or mean or cantankerous, and so forth, that was his slurp-level, you might say, that really came in. Well, we reversed all of that just on getting him to run Accept and Reject, and he changed his postulates with regard to this and that, and found out that he could Accept and Reject his body at will at which moment he was exteriorized. See where we worked him to?

If you can't reject your body, you can't exteriorize. If you can't accept your body, you can't reject it.

So we worked out the automatic factors. Now, Accept and Reject belongs with the Remedy of Havingness as one of the Six Basic Processes. It is the consideration level of havingness. And it determines whether or not one wants to bring everything in or one wants to throw everything away. And it recovers to the individual his criteria; his decision to have something and bring it in, his decision not to have it and throw it away. This is what it recovers to the individual. It works out, actually, better on a postulate level, Accept and Reject, than it works out otherwise.

The commands of this process are a very, very simple thing. They are, „*What are you willing to accept?*" And the fellow will do a lot of figure-figure, you don't care. „*What are you willing to accept.*" „*Something else you're willing to accept.*" And he'll finally come around and start looking at the room! He'll extrovert to the room, you see. And he'll say,

„Well, uhhm. . .1 don't know, I. - . oh, those cigarette butts in the ashtray." See. *„Yeah, I can accept those. Nobody else wants them, so I could accept them."* And so on and so on and so on.

Then, when you had that good and flat, you would ask him *„What can you reject?"* Now, it sometimes takes quite a while to flatten this with the preclear. That acceptance. Now, *„What can - uh, what could you reject."* You want to make sure, though, that if this process is taking a long time that your preclear is running what you're asking him to run. Remember, it's a subjective process and you do not have a telescope into the center of his thetan machinery to find out what the hell he's doing now, see. Remember that. That's why you've got to work him up there to a point of where you're darn sure he can - knows you're there and can take your orders. And this, by the way, is something that's - a surprisingly large number of cases can't do, and don't do.

If an auditor errs, it is erring because he is an able guy, erring in crediting the preclear with an ability. He errs in that direction continually. If he could just think of his preclears before he starts to process them more or less as he thinks of objects, he would be a much happier auditor because it'd be much closer to truth, you see. Wind-up toys are objects. They're very, very stimulus-response. It's a matter of, *„what self-determinism?"* you know. After he's worked them for a while he actually does start to recover and discover in the individual this ability. Because he saw it there in the first place, he was able to work the individual better. So this is not all bad, you see.

He was able to work the individual better, but at the same time he isn't aware of the fact that the individual is actually changing, markedly and rapidly, because the individual is now becoming the individual he thought was sitting there in the first place. So he doesn't think any real change is occurring with the individual. All right. The auditor error which comes up in this is simply manifested along this line: He is confident that the preclear is doing what he told him to do on a subjective process and the preclear is not doing it. Every case which was not recovering even vaguely on subjective processes when closely questioned, and this was a large number of cases, when closely questioned on an E-Meter, admitted, themselves, that they had yet to run the auditor's command as given. Get that?

You say, *„Remember something about your mother."* He would forecast something about his father in the future, and answer - acknowledge to the auditor that he had remembered something about his mother. And this was every case that wasn't making progress under old-time processes. This was every case, you understand? I mean, we didn't have any exceptions along this line.

So, that's the one big snag that an auditor can run into. If he doesn't know that real well he's got no business handling a subjective process. This is the big snake pit of a subjective process. The preclear does not do the command. But you look at this person, this person is perfectly well groomed, this person is in fairly good condition, this person is fairly successful in life, this person is rational, this person is interested in things. And you say, *„Remember something about your mother."*

And this person forecasts something in the future about his father, and says, *„Yes, I remembered something about my mother."* Get the idea? That's why that old 8-C's got to be

in there; there's just no argument about it. It's something that I'm afraid we're stuck with.

You got no business running anything vaguely resembling a subjective process unless you know your boy is under control, or your girl, as a preclear. See, you just got no business doing it. You can waste more time as an auditor and have more heartbreak and more failures. You run the process, but the preclear doesn't.

All right. See, there were two liabilities in there. Very often the auditor himself couldn't duplicate the process. And so, then when he took his version of the process and gave it to the preclear and again it was not duplicated, you had hash! So, this is the - the business of the order being given to the first private in the line, and being whispered to the next private in the line, and so forth, and we find out that *„Zero hour is ten o'clock"* has been changed to *„Captain is having turkey for dinner."*

So, where we run something like Accept and Reject as a process, we know two things: One, it is not going to work if the preclear is not capable in 8-C. Two, it is going to work. You got these two? That's this Accept and Reject. Many other ways you could probably phrase the same thing but let's not go off the deep end and consider them different processes. They're not.

„What were you willing to associate with?" „What are you willing to associate with?" „What wouldn't you - what would you just as soon not associate with?" You see, this is Accept and Reject. *„What could you throw away?" „What do you have to have?"* This is Accept and Reject.

But the best auditing commands as has been worked out gradually - I managed to finally centralize these auditing commands - that might be given in this, and *„What are you' willing to accept?" „What are you willing to reject?"* This by the way is a good criteria because it's translatable just as such into practically any language I know anything about. So it must be holding true.

Every language has a basic word for *„accept"* and a basic word for *„reject"* which allows for no argument. Whereas they do have differences on such a thing as *„associate."* Look what Freud did with *„associate."* I'm being awfully hard on the old man this morning. There's no reason to be hard on the guy, he actually was the entering wedge into psychotherapy. But I'm young and cocky and I didn't have to write Psychoanalysis: Terminable and Interminable. I didn't have to write that. I will never have to write something, now, I know very well, called Dianetics: Terminable or Interminable. Apathy, apathy. Imagine a guy beating the drum, beating the drum all those years, having to sit down and write that essay. This was one of the last essays he wrote.

He knew he had failed before he died, which is the saddest thing that can happen to any man. The other sad thing that can happen to a man is knew he win - knew he won, absolutely and utterly, and completely, before he kicked off. That's just as grim! That's just as grim, unless what he won in itself solved the problem of having won. It's all right, don't have to worry, the hell with it! This is very, very fascinating.

All right. We've got Accept and Reject here, as one of the hottest exteriorization processes you ever ran into in your life. We also have, *„Mock up something and pull it in,*

mock up something and throw it away," as capable of remedying masses or straightening out masses. But if we just had those, there would be no reason for us to feel cocky at all. We know, definitely and positively, that the ARC triangle, as such, is the key to all this and that C of that triangle is the solution to the triangle itself. The inhabited space that has nothing in it is simply R subordinate to C. That's reality subordinate to C. When we introduce R, or further agreement, we would not get a resolution. If we were to introduce affinity we would not get a resolution of the inhabited space which has nothing in it. But if we apply C to it, with our knowledge of its formula, we then achieve resolution. And boy, do we achieve resolution.

Now, an auditor can demonstrate conclusively to a preclear that the preclear actually can get rid of; and reduce to nothing, a mass. And if the preclear becomes aware of this, and is very sure of this, then, and only then, is he really willing to create more masses. If he can't get rid of them, he doesn't want to create them anymore. He stops creating because he is afraid he won't be able to get rid of it once he creates it.

A writer or a painter is apt to dramatize this. They don't write stories because they can't sell them. They don't write - don't paint pictures because they're afraid they won't be able to dispose of them. They will only paint a picture when they have a ready sale, or a story when they have a ready market. You follow this? This is just a vestige of the same manifestation. They don't dare create something unless they can get rid of it. That's all there is to it. And if they can get rid of a mass, if they can demonstrably get rid of a mass, then they become very, very capable in creating. And so it is safe then, to get rid of a mass, if you can create a new mass.

Where does it - this go? Reductio ad absurdum, it would go to the point of where the fellow would be perfectly willing to get rid of the body any time he could create one out of whole cloth. Now, let me give you - I mean get rid of a body entirely and utterly and have done with it only if he could replace it. Replacement is totally on his own creative ability and on nothing else.

So, we still, although we might have Accept and Reject as a process, we are still up against this: We are still up against the necessity to be able to reduce mass. And this is the other side of the problem. Origins, acknowledgments, answers created in abundance take apart undesirable masses. Remember that it is an undesirable mass that this takes apart. What a honey of a process. It does not take apart a desirable mass.

Why doesn't it? Well, you can mock up something and pull it in, can't you? If you can mock up something, is that thing a bundle of misplaced communication lines? No, it's just a mass, isn't it. Hm? It's just a mass. Oh, there is such a thing as just a plain mass, isn't there? So, you start remedying communications, you could just go on with this process and on and on and on with it, and you would find that it simply kept taking apart to a very marked degree undesirable mass.

Now, there could be - because your preclear was pretty batty or something of the sort - there could be some liability to this. There could be. Theoretically you could take apart the necessary terminals for the body itself So, cause something to happen with the body. That would only be if the individual's obsessively trying to get rid of the body. And if you run him a little bit on 8-C he won't be. He isn't obsessively trying to

get rid of this thing. Now, the way you take apart an ordinary and routine mass is by a perfect duplication as given in The Creation of Human Ability. You can make a perfect duplicate of any mocked-up particle and it'll go. Let's not start looking at all masses in the entire world as the result of a miscommunication. It's the result of a game, and that's the truth of it. But where you get masses balled up which the individual can't handle, the only time this occurs, it is because the C is absent. Not because the C is present; because the C is absent. Now, I'll Tell you immediately, a test which you should be interested in, and that is whether you should process toward life or death. Whether you should address entheta or theta. And that process is very simply given.

I will not ask any one of you to use this process experimentally because it is probably the most dangerous process I've ever developed. And it is a raw, rugged process. Wouldn't seem so. Well, we're hitting in so close to form, energy, masses and life itself that a process now can have considerable violence. If you don't believe this, take somebody you don't like and run it on him. But this is real wild as a process.

„Give me some things you do not have to stay in ARC with."

Now, look, that obviously is a logical process, isn't it? It's obviously true, there are a lot of things you would - really wouldn't have to stay in ARC with. Isn't that true? Do you know what it'll do to your preclear? You'll never see an individual go so down Tone Scale so exactly. He'll go down through rage, he'll go down through fear, covert hostility and into fear, he'll go down to grief; and he'll go down to apathy, and if you insisted, and if you still could process it on him, you could process him straight into catatonia, just like that! That's a fantastic thing, isn't it? *„Give me some things you don't have to stay in ARC with."*

He'd have to understand what you meant. That's murder! That's just plain murder! The whole bank pulls right in on him.

Now, you want to change somebody on a Tone Scale in a hurry when he's exteriorized, all you have to do is run Answer Processing. That's all you have to do. And he'll go up scale so darn fast, and sonic, visio and bells will ring and so on.

If you run it too long or too consistently or too continually in the body as such, and run it on the body rather than the remainder of the environment, rather than upon facsimiles themselves, the body has some tendency to become upset, mostly because you re not taking it out in balance. You're using your criteria there. You're saying *„Well, we should take it off here and we should do there and we should run it on this and we should run it on that."* You start running it on the top of somebody's head and the next thing you know his feet hurt, you know? You start running it behind his head and the next thing you know his nose hurts and his stomach hurts and so on. Nevertheless, it'll exteriorize somebody.

And here's another lead-pipe cinch exteriorization process: *„Have your body say hello to you."* Don't be more specific than that, just *„Have your body say hello to you."* It will blow the guy out of his head. He's never said hello to a body, I - pardon me, a body has

never said hello to him, he's always said hello to bodies. Just flip the flow. And he'll go on out of his head.

I have - cannot state at this moment, I have not made enough tests to tell you exactly which is the faster to get somebody out of his body - Accept and Reject Processing or Communication Processing. I don't know which one is faster. Every figure that I have on it is different, you know? I mean, there's too much difference amongst these figures. We can assume they're both batting high and we can assume that Communication Processing has somewhat the edge on the process as a process but the speed - one time why, Accept and Reject, why gee, that worked fast, and the next time why, Communication Processing, gee, that worked awfully fast, you see. And the reason why I don't have the figures and probably never will have them is because I never get a chance to compare the two processes on one case. And this was a happy failure, wasn't it? Never get a chance to compare these two processes. And then we'd have to have an enormous series of cases before we really came down to - as far as I would say, theoretically, that the one would work out will be Communication Processing. That will be the one that probably works out. But Accept and Reject is real hot.

It has another oddity. You've met the fellow who wanted to hold off from the rest of the human race, or something of the sort; the fellow who was too good for everything. We have a woman that came in here with a preclear - you haven't really sized this up, I'm sure, even though you may have talked to her - came in here with a psycho boy. Nothing is good enough for this woman, and that is what is wrong with her boy. He wasn't good enough for her. And that's all that's wrong with her. See, it's this manifestation continually, repeated and so forth. She's on an obsessive enforced *„nothing is good enough for her."*

Of course, you and I like to go into a good restaurant. We like to have a good meal served well. We like to have the appointments that we wear in good shape and so forth. But that doesn't mean that we won't get on some old greasy overalls or something of the sort and get mud on our noses once in a while, you know. We'll still do this. Watch it when you no longer will, when you no longer can with some glee put on an old coat.

They get on a basis of nothing is good enough for them and they move right on out to can't have anything. See, you get the route? Nothing is good enough for them so they can't have anything.

That is the condition of mind of a criminal, is one of the primary points in the criminal personality - nothing is good enough for them was the route they took. And now they can have nothing. A criminal can't have anything. He's got to mess up and get rid of or do something about anything, you see, that he has around. But if you plumb a little bit further and if you just talk to them and ask them about this, if you're - if you happen to be wandering down through the city jail or something of this sort, it's a curious beat if you ever want to take it.

Ministers never show up where they're needed in the society. It's wide open and if you ever want to put your card in your pocket and show up in some interesting places, show up in such a place as the city jail and you will discover that as you talk to these

prisoners that the truth of the matter is, it's all bad over there, see, it's bad over there. And then you ask them about this and about that and they will turn up their noses at the darnedest things and you will see the fragments and end product of nothing is good enough for them. See, but now it's gotten all shaky and gelatinous, you might say. as a postulate. It's a - nothing is good enough for them is sort of a frantic sort of a thing. They can't even dream of something that is good enough for them. They're in a hectic, obsessive state, quite ordinarily, on such a thing.

You look this over, I can tell you in just a breath, that this is it, but you actually wouldn't be impressed with the ramifications that this „*not-have*" can take on this basis of „*Well, I can only have the best. I am a lord, I am a duke, I am not canaille.*"

Oh, I'm not going so far as to say that the boys who ruled Europe during the feudal system are uniformly all, every one of them, criminals. No, I'm not going so far as to say that. I'm only going so far as to say that those who did oppress and wreck their areas were. You understand that?

Do you know the guy who was really a good ruler has a hell of a time. He has a hell of a time. He hasn't got enough time. That's why he has a hell of a time. He wants to listen to all the beefs and all the good news and he wants to listen to all the complaints. And he's very chary of handing over to some flubdub waddy or - cadi rather - or some justice or some captain of the guard all of the complaints because he knows what this guy will do to them, you know. And he's perfectly willing to talk to the guys about how the horse crop is coming this year and so forth. Well, it's a different kind of guy, you never had any trouble with this boy. But the fellow who was „*My Lord*"; the fellow who just had to make a great impression of his great lordliness was a criminal. There's no doubt about that.

Now, this tells you you could look down the line of kings, various lands, and these boys who had to have their courts this way and that way and such another way and protocol had to be this way and had to be that way and so forth. You were looking at a criminal. If he appeared today we'd throw him in the jail. That would be an awful come-down for these boys, wouldn't it. Talked about the divine right of kings, and I would say that a king had divine right so long as he didn't thoroughly believe he was a king. It's only when he becomes convinced of his kingliness that he's a dead monarch. The country is then without a ruler. It has a rapacity in its midst.

Quite curious. But you really ought to, some time or another, look at this-this mechanism in the jail house. That's a good place to see it; wonderful place to see it. They steal things that they couldn't even vaguely use. And then they get rid of them as senselessly because they found after contact that they weren't good enough for them. Uhhhh. Real nuts.

All right, Accept and Reject run on these people would shake them to pieces. Literally. They would be in agony over this process or they would just avoid it entirely.

So therefore, Communication Processing - you could get them to have the wall say hello - Communication Processing then evidently goes lower.

I've actually tried it on such people. I've gotten around. I've been a real busy boy here the last couple of months trying to get a summation here of an awful lot of work. And although you've heard me say many times, „*This is it*", and so forth, if I were to tell you that there were no further developments to be expected in this field, why, I would simply be a liar or lazy. Of course, a liar is a fellow who was so lazy that he didn't actually make it happen before he told about it.

Now, been pretty busy getting things together. Didn't take very long to write the book, took quite a little while to plot the thing up one way or the other, I mean, to get the material involved. I can see immediately several lines of investigation that stretch out. But do you know that oddly, the greatest line of investigation that stretches out is in the ability: How many abilities can be restored to a thetan, you see? Most of these things are in that line.

As far as knocking off unwanted masses and unwanted spaces, as far as straightening him out and turning on sonic and visio and that sort of thing is concerned, this is real licked. I mean, this is where we should have been taking off from in 1950, see, we should have been taking off with this process. But I did what I could. The intervening four years are not too long to complete an investigation one way or the other. Of course, it's not completed, you understand. But we're definitely not any longer completely bogged down about the human mind, you know?

What can it do? This is the pertinent question. Now, we know that it can walk around and work on machinery and say „*Hello,*" and „*How are you, Joe.*" We know it can do this. We know that it can sometimes work a little bit. And we know it can put into action machinery, such as Cadillacs and rattle-traps. We know it can get in trouble and get in jails. We know it can organize. We know it can misgovern. We know it can do all sorts of weird things. We know it can invent a more base sort of game that ordinarily if we were looking at it analytically we would think *"A game like this! Oh, that couldn't be a game,"* but yet it is. We know all those things. Well, that's real good. Well now, what can it do? And that is the problem which we're trying to solve.

All right, now here's your class assignment. You have been processing right along with this. You have, I hope, gotten some acquaintance with this. Does anybody feel he has no acquaintance with Communication Processing yet?

Female voice: I don't feel like I don't have an acquaintance, but I did want to ask one question about - in regarding a - on a person exterior, what are some of the things that you would have them communicate with?

Oh, this is just up to you as an auditor. This is just up to the case. You don't have to be specific. I'm asking you as an auditor to use your judgment for goodness sakes. I am. We have a lot of set little processes. They are very, great trick processes, very nice. And you should know these processes and you should know them real well. And that's the Six Basic Processes. But when we move into Communication Processing beyond its basic rules and so forth, an auditor's power is so markedly increased that to not turn loose his judgment at the same time would be a cruelty. You see that? It would be.

Now, what do you run it on, we find out the individual is looking at facsimiles instead of looking at the wall. This is a kind of a dumb trick. He looks at the facsimile. He takes a facsimile of the wall and then looks at the facsimile of the wall, and you tell him, *„All right, now move that grain of dust there on the wall.“* So he moves the grain of dust on the facsimile. And you don't see it move on the wall, so you say *„Well, he didn't move the grain of dust on the wall,“* you see. All right. Let's take this case. Let's have him mock up something and have it say hello. See, this would be a wild one to do to him. He's got some kind of an obsessive machine of some sort or another. Let's have him cook up a machine - this would be a wild one - have him cook up a machine that made facsimiles so he wouldn't have to look at anything. Just have him cook this machine up and then have the cooked-up variety of the machine start saying hello to him. What do you think would happen? The machine that is doing this, naturally, will go boom, or it will start saying *„Hello.“*

Now, every piece of machinery, every piece of machinery a preclear has is an invisible object in an undesirable space according to his calculation ordinarily if it's really butchering him around. Facsimile machinery and so forth, very interesting.

The byword on this now is get them out and process them. You get that now? Get them out and process them. Now, how can you get them out? You've two methods of exteriorization: Accept and Reject Processing which is run only when you have had him do enough 8-C to know absolutely he's following your orders. Absolutely. No matter if those orders appear contrary, biased, upset or backwards, just have him follow your orders. I have never taught auditors to do that but I do it. And some guy - I can run 8-C further, deeper than I dare anyone else run it, tell you the truth, because it scares you after a while, just the lack of reason in the action. You keep taking reasons out of the actions.

Now, he's doing 8-C because he expects to get well. Supposing we worked it so far that even this reason seemed to be missing out of the action. He was merely doing it. That would be an interesting direction to run 8-C, wouldn't it, hmm?

All right. So you can run 8-C in the most weird ways. You can have the guy go over and put his finger on the stove. Stove's burning. Well, that would burn him, wouldn't it? Well, you say, *„All right, go on over and put your finger on the stove.“*

„Why?“

„No reason. Just go over and put your finger on the stove.“

„I know, but it will burn me.“

„Well, go put your finger on the stove.“

„But, it will burn me.“

„Go on. Put your finger on the stove.“

„It will burn me!“

„Go on and put your finger on the stove.“

„Awwww. What are you trying to do to me.

„Go over and put your finger on the stove."

„I tell you that it will burn me."

„I know what you're saying. I understand what you're saying. You are saying that it will burn you. I know that and I know that you're afraid of this. Now, go over and put your finger on the stove."

„It will burn me."

„I know. Go over and put your finger on the stove."

„Uhhh. It will burn my finger off."

„Well, go on over."

„Okay."

„Go on over and put your finger on the stove." You know how far 8-C will run? He can go over and put his finger on the stove and it won't burn him. He has as-ised the consideration, if you work it right in talking with him. Otherwise you could convince him further.

You say, *„I'm going to show you. I'm going to show you. I'm going to make you burn yourself"*

„I won't burn myself"

Ooh! We make him resist getting burned. See, that would be another direction to run the 8-C. A lot of cute things that you can do with 8-C. That's a very extreme one; takes quite awhile. There's a lot to such a process.

But nobody's asking you to run 8-C to this degree. I just say there is more 8-C to be run. The only direction that you want to run 8-C is to get absolutely certain that the individual will follow your directions. And then Accept and Reject or Communication Processing to having the body say hello to him. You can vary this, you can have the head say hello to him. But once you decide on your course of action, follow it through. Follow it through very, very well. And you will get a considerable change in your preclear in just having the body say hello.

Blow him out and then don't pay any attention to the body. The second you've got this boy outside with any degree of certainty at all, forget about the body. Just skip it. I know it's still sitting in the chair, but don't continue to process it in any way. Now have him go through Route 1. All right. He starts through Route 1. And this is hard slugging, and so on. Interject Communication Processing any time that you find the slug too hard. See, just do Route 1; standard, standard Route 1. Communication Processing can be shoved in anyplace. Very fast way to resolve the fact that the guy seems to be able to get four feet from the body but can't get any further.

Many ways you could do that. You could have him simply - you just have him run the body saying hello long enough to get him out, you see. Let's say that everything is black after he gets outside or he feels rather degraded after he gets outside or something of this character. You would simply follow Route 1, this Route 1. But you could

get Route 1 over with in a hurry and then you could start picking up curiosa. Or you could have the wall start to say hello to him. What do you think this would do?

Now, a preclear will manifest many manifestations and outside of the fact that I tell you the proper process to run on a preclear after he's exteriorized is Route 1 or the use of Communication Processing in conjunction with Route 1 - I'd leave this up to your judgment.

We are actually, as a unit, investigating human ability. How do we get there? We got some set processes. They work. We've got one that works awful fast. Maybe just run Accept and Reject on him while he's exteriorized long enough, maybe you'd get up to an enormous stature, you see? How long do you want to run it?

But any trouble that he gets into, you can now get him out of in an awful hurry. Oh, an awful hurry.

All right, any further questions about this?

Female voice: We now have permission to run 8-C on a preclear?

Oh, yes, yes. I'm just turning you loose. After I tell you, that these processes are best worked by people who have run an 8-C, of course you have permission to.

Your difficulties with people are run into when you start disobeying the communication formula in running 8-C if you don't fully fill in all the parts of the communication formula in running it.

Somebody in the HPC the other day invented step D - it isn't step D but he called it so - by having alternate orders. The preclear gives the auditor an order and the auditor does it, and then the auditor gives the preclear an order and the preclear does it, and back and forth and back and forth.

You see, he's identified auditing with living. And this might be very desirable in living but this is a - this is an auditing session. If you couldn't come over - overcome all the liabilities and quirks of an auditing session with your processes, you ought to quit, you see? I mean, there's no sense to dramatize life with an auditing session. So it isn't step D. It isn't a necessary part of it at all.

It just makes - it would make the preclear very happy probably with you and with the auditing session but there are much more vital things that you can do. He's there to take your orders. If you can get him up to that point and get him sailing through processes where you can't closely supervise him and yet you're - know with great security that he's doing these processes, he's doing them as told and he isn't varying from them, and you suddenly realize he's deteriorating, he's probably now doing something else, you put him back on 8-C again, wouldn't you?

Male voice: Sure. Right away.

Tell you another trick about 8-C. 8-C was, by the way, originally invented for an exteriorized thetan. It's very curious but that was the process. Then we found out it works so much better, I did, found it out that it works so much better with a body that we pushed it over into body processing. And that's where it came from. It even works on

a body; it must be good. It isn't too successful while a thetan is exteriorized because most thetans are tremendously upset about the physical universe. They're afraid faces will suddenly appear.

I ran into a thetan one day who every time he went out someplace and mocked up something and was going to sit down for a long investment of the area and so forth, a face would appear. I didn't think anything more of this. It scared him. He was scared of people's faces and all sorts of things. Aw, he - you could say, boy, could you get causes on this, you know, you could trace reasons why way back to the beginning of time on it. But I was running *„Invent a game"* on him. And it blew. It was the most beautiful little machine you ever saw in your life. And it stuck up a suddenly visible but hitherto invisible, from an invisible machine, head or face each time different, machine. Cute machine. He sighed deeply when it went. But we invented a few more games and he said, *„To hell with it."*

I had a thetan - I had this thetan, by the way, inventing machinery. afterwards, remedying his machinery, and because I'd run *„Invent some games"* and *„Have somebody else invent some games for you"* and so on, because I'd run this in plenitude, his ability on inventing machines and his inventiveness on these machines was just appalling which gave me a terrific insight into what some people are using for machinery. Zzzzt.

„There's this machine that every time I start to say hello to some desirable or start to greet some desirable person, you see, will zap me." *„There's this machine that every time I think a woman has been insulted will make me angry."* It's a cute one; gets guys in more fights. He explained this to me.

He said, *„You know, that thing would get you into more fights, gosh."* Yeah, yeah, well, that's a good machine! Okay. You'll find, by the way, a thetan has a lot of communication lines that suddenly show up. Did you ever run into one of these? Communication line shows up, apparently he's going off to nowhere. Where's it going to? And you have him trace it down and it winds up at nothing. Process Communication Processing on that nothing.

Just the line to the machine is all that has come visible. But the machine is still invisible and it's out there and this line goes nowhere and stops. And he says, *„Well, isn't that interesting."* That in itself is very surprising.

The more he processes the more this line shows up. Only it doesn't go anyplace. *„Well, that's all right. We'll just skip the machine."*

I won't tell you who has machinery of exactly that character. All of his machines are arranged in that character - every damn one of them. He lets the lines go out to nowhere and then carefully says, *„Well, there's nothing there."* You certainly ruined some of his machinery, you see. Communication Processing would just butcher that poor man's bank. And he'd have to go to all the trouble of mocking up all this machinery all over again. Good!

All right, any further questions? Okay.

(end of lecture)