

5501C13

Renumbered 25 for „*The Solution To Entrapment*“ cassettes

DEFINITIONS: GLOSSARY OF TERMS - PART II

A lecture given on 13 January 1955

I am going to go through with you, as we go from day to day here, with fair rapidity now after the little introductory talk on the first few of these, these definitions. You know a definition can be for its own sake and it can be for the instructor's sake and it can be for the auditor's sake. And we hope to a marked degree that these are for the auditor's sake.

We went right on up to ARC and now here on January 13th, 1955, we are going to cover from the ARC line of this particular glossary on through.

An auditor: This is a compound word taken from listening. The one thing auditors don't do is listen in practice. If they did they would acknowledge what the preclear said. The biggest failure in auditing is failure on the part of the auditor to listen. That's a fact; that's a horrible fact. It is the biggest failure.

Of the failed cases, momentary stops on a track and so forth that I have checked of last fall, of all of those cases, I found no single exception to this. The auditor had not taken a moment to listen to what the preclear was trying to tell him and the preclear trying to originate this communication was then thrown into apathy. Some of these people had actually exteriorized. Some of them had suddenly put a beam against the front of their foreheads and pushed themselves out. Some of them had actually had enormously glaring balls of fire suddenly start to move in on them. Some of them had had enormous squadrons, you might say, ranks of bodies appear all beautifully stacked up in front of them. Startling phenomena, real enough in several cases to require that the preclear get a quick grip on reality because they were realer to him than the room. And yet the auditor had not acknowledged.

So here we have the word auditor. It doesn't merely mean to listen, it also means to think.

The word auditor has been taken from the English language, not from an accountant. I am not quite sure why an accountant is called an auditor. But an auditor earlier was a legal term. It was one who listened to the complaints. They have a similar grade to this in Arabian countries - a kadi. He listens; he's a court - he's a street court, you might say. He is out in the street and he listens to complaints and so on.

Well, this auditor was that evidently, very thin derivation on this, and then finally was somebody who kept accounts and that strayed a long way from the word. But auditor is getting better and better known as a word. It is getting well enough known now so that people are not completely associating it with Dianetics and Scientology. An auditor is somebody who does psychotherapy. And I have had it said - heard it said actually that auditors should use Dianetics; they should find it and use it. Actually, by people who weren't being sarcastic at all, they had the word auditor much closer to them than psychotherapist. So, to change this word at this time is an impossibility, and it's gotten solid. It's an agreement.

Now, a Scientologist is the definition given here, but the basic definition of auditor is one who listens and computes.

This definition here, by the way, a Scientologist: one whose technical skill is devoted to the resolution of the problems of life, is the proper definition for a Scientologist, not necessarily the proper definition for an auditor. An auditor is one who listens and computes.

Now, we have the Auditor's Code, the Auditor's Code of 1954 is what is meant here. The early Auditor's Code was taken out of chivalry, lock, stock and barrel. And those parts of it which were discovered to be practical were practiced very hard, but a great deal of *modus operandi* was accumulated in four years on all the reasons cases fail and we found the common denominators to that and I sat down one day and wrote the Auditor's Code from these accumulated notes. And the Auditor's Code of 1954 will keep both auditor and preclear very definitely out of trouble.

I understand the other day Burke said that there wasn't any real reason whatsoever for an individual to know the Auditor's Code, no, no real reason to know the Auditor's Code, as long as - yeah - as long as one knew just one factor of it. There is line sixteen now is coming out in *The Creation of Human Ability* which is „*Maintain two-way communication with the preclear.*“ And he says, as long as he maintained two-way communication with the preclear - see, there is no reason to know the Auditor's Code as long as the auditor did maintain two-way communication with the preclear. But the Auditor's Code was how you maintained two-way communication with the preclear. So if you want to really maintain two-way communication with a preclear, you follow the Auditor's Code.

Let's take such a thing as „*Don't process the preclear when he's hungry,*“ the line that approximates that. And we find out that an individual whose attention is very badly abstracted because of hunger, whose burning rate inside the body is very poor, is in an

interesting condition of inattention and we don't then find him conversing well. Just like a preclear sitting on a tack, it's very hard to audit. Same thing. All of these various points are the tacks the preclear is sitting on.

Now, nearly every bog that we have run into, occurred sometime after 10:00 P.M. This is an oddity. Now, I have found, by the way - though, I have occasionally disobeyed this by auditing somebody up to 10:30, just trying to wind the case up. But that's why it's 10:00 P.M. The actual hour is 11:00. But if you decide to stop the session at 10:00 you can certainly get rid of it by 10:30. You got the idea?

But if you were ever - under any circumstances - if you were ever to process somebody up to 11:00, you would discover this interesting thing occurring.

Let's say you have pulled a boo-boo or the preclear has or something or the other has happened and we discover that we have in our preclear less and less present time. He's sort of skidding; he's sort of dragging back into the muck and the mire and we don't quite know what's going on here but we decide we'll patch this up. If the clock says 10:00, pat him on the head, no matter what comm lag he's in. You'll find out he's skidding-skidding-skidding and you're going to patch him up and it's 10 o'clock. No, you won't. No, you won't.

I have had this experience several times myself of trying to patch somebody up late in the evening so that they could go home! And the next thing you know it was 2:00 and the preclear was worse and worse and worse and worse and worse. And I finally had to quit at 2:00 with the preclear in much worse condition than he had been in when I had originally tried to stop the session about 11:00.

Now, one night an auditor sent a preclear over to me that was in the most screaming fit I ever saw in my life. Every once in a while this will happen. An auditor will call me up and say, „*Oh, my God!*“ Do you know that I noticed one day that the hour at which I was being called was about 11:00, 11:30, right in that area. Hence, 10 o'clock. Very curious. But the ability to recover deteriorates almost by the cube from 10 o'clock on. What's the reason for this?

The body is built of cells which were once plankton or something like it. When the sun went down their source of power as they floated upon the sea was diminished to such a point that they just lay there and suffered and waited for the dawn. And the most dismal hours of the night are those when the stretch has been carried on to the very horrible degree; they've drained their last tiny bit of resource, maybe 4:00 or 5:00 and the sun comes up maybe at 5:30 or something like that. And then „*Ahaaa.*“

I don't know if you've ever stood a night watch or not, but a body reacts just as regular as can be right through that cycle. More people die at 2 o'clock. You see, it's too many hours till dawn. If they can only get until 3 o'clock or 3:30 they would realize that they only had to hang on another hour or two, and the god-giving, life-giving, breath-giving sunlight would hit them again. This is dependency upon the flow of photons. The body gets conditioned into this pattern, it believes in this, it's convinced of this and so it starts to get more and more despairing the further away you get from sunset. We get first a frantic activity. You know, „*Well, we won't care anyhow. You know,*

we'll go on somehow. "That's fairly early in the evening. And that frantic activity will calm down at about 10:00 - gone. Have you ever noticed the terrific tumult that a kid goes into just before he gets ready for bed? Well, that's standard. Tearing around to all the night clubs - same deal when he's little less a kid, little more of a kid and a little older.

Now, there is that curve and so it is with each - you know, the individual is just less and less recovery as you advance later and later into the night. And if you start fighting this factor, you're not fighting his case, you're not fighting anything, you're not fighting anything but one of these confounded old curves that has been produced by the rising and setting of the sun over the many eons. And there is no sense to fight that curve, just let it go to another day.

An awful lot of technology sits in back of the Auditor's Code to such a degree that I have often wondered if the Auditor's Code wouldn't produce line by line a process, see? And then if you resolved each one of these frailties in the preclear, demonstrated by that, if you wouldn't have a real clear Clear. It would be a neat experiment, we will try it someday. Not by auditing him at 2 o'clock, however. We will put him in a dark room and audit him.

Axiom here is a self-evident truth. And it becomes self-evident after you know it. There's some real, real queasy mathematical terms like „*axiom*.“ An „*axiom*,“ a „*maxim*,“ several items and words in that category of vocabulary, all of which are unsatisfactory to describe what you are doing.

I invented the word logic. There is no such thing as „*a logic*.“ But I invented the word logic trying to throw a word somewhere into this morass that would mean something. There is no adequate English to describe one of these little laws unless you simply say it is a law.

Barrier. Of course, the barriers are matter, energy, space and time. Barriers are consideration or idea that limits other considerations or ideas. This of course includes emotional and physical universe barriers. A barrier is a limiting idea. If the idea happens to be as solid as a wall, it's no less limiting.

All right. We get this old word charge. It's the energy being held in present time in relation to an incident or chain of incidents. And that's a precise definition for charge. An incident has charge in it. Well, you know it'll have charge in it. Did you ever run a screamer? Well, this fellow is sitting in almost total charge.

Also, we call - we use the word charge to indicate the amount of grief the fellow would spill if he ran a secondary, also the amount of anger which he would release. In other words, it's an outburst withheld or outbursting. He released a lot of charge. It's a word taken straight out of a terminology from batteries. It actually is too. Some fellow will have some old-time facsimile that's got an awful lot of energy in it, actually balls of fire and every other darned thing, you know, and if you don't think those things are charged, the preclear practically crackles and pops. And when you release them, you are releasing charge. Chronic somatic is one of the oldest words we have, next to aberration. It is a substitute word from psychosomatic. Psychosomatic is rather overdone in many degrees and we desired to dodge this word psychosomatic so

we had this thing called chronic somatic. Of course, a somatic means a physical feeling; it doesn't mean physical pain. A somatic is a physical feeling. So a chronic physical feeling however may be objected to by the individual. And so just feeling alive might be called a chronic somatic by some stretch of the imagination, if it's a chronic feeling with the fellow. I've often wondered if a fellow didn't go to sleep simply because he was tired of feeling so alive.

Here it's defined as a suboptimum physical condition or a pain which resists change and remains over a long period of time or recurs frequently; which of course is a very precise statement of it.

Any statement of that, though, that it is a feeling existing across a period of time, a person objects to, any such sense as that defines definitely and adequately chronic somatic. Circuit. Spelled s-u-r-c-u-i-t. No, it's spelled here as c-u-r-c-u-i-t, c-i-r-u-i-t. Circuit. Best explanation of circuits - or pardon me, the best description of circuits to date is still in Book One that we have on this - circuits, demon circuits. A circuit is a very interesting thing. It means just what it says in the mind. And if we try to get too technical about it we lose it. It means just what it says.

Do you know that most thetans are putting out fitter to pull it back on themselves? Do you know that? All right. Now, you put out an impulse over to the right and then it travels over to the left and it travels back and hits you and that's a circuit. Got that plainly? And it is just what it says. It's an impulse that goes in one direction and then goes in another direction and then comes back and hits you. And that's a very adequate, direct definition of a circuit - or hits the preclear. It makes a circle, an irregular circle I would say, but it's like an old circuit rider, it goes over here. You say, „Hello“ and then through various machines in the mind, computers and so forth, this „Hello“ is relayed until you've forgotten that you emanated „Hello“ and enough time lag is put on the thing so that it finally comes back and you are quite startled to have something say, „Boo!“ And that is exactly how a circuit operates. It doesn't operate any other way. It behaves as though it has a life of its own. See, that's an accurate statement. „*It behaves as though it has a life of its own.*“ Actually, it is a circuit.

Why is it a circuit? It's the guy who puts out the impulse that makes it go live and that is the most fabulous thing. You got that? And he has to actually put out the original impulse that livens it up. He is furnishing it every piece of energy which it has.

The one thing a machine cannot do is produce space and energy. A fellow has to produce it himself So this is a curious and wonderful thing, isn't it? This fellow is being driven crazy by Mama, by Papa, by Joe, Bill, Agnes - it is only one guy. They might have given him the pattern that he could follow but if somebody is being hit in the stomach by an impulse of some kind or another, you know. By the way, we had a girl, one of the Advanced Clinical Course students scrounged her up around town and processed her. She was the most curious case. She burned the backs of her dresses. That's right, she burned them.

There was a short circuit would occur which would singe the fabric. And this clinical course student came around and we had a little conference about this thing and obviously this person was simply directing a beam of energy which would go around and

hit her in the back. So we had some kind of drill or another that alleviated this and it stopped right away. But this was a circuit. This individual was being hit in the back with a beam of energy sufficient to burn her dress. And she ruined more dresses that way. This was the awfulest thing that was happening to her.

Now, a thetan actually keys up his machinery in this weird fashion. This is a weird fashion. He fixes it so that every bit of energy which he puts out is nicely and neatly used and conserved somewhere in his machinery. It's the cutest arrangement you ever saw.

If you look at somebody sometime while you're well exteriorized, just turn your perceptions around and upside down, you'll see this ring of machinery around somebody sometime with its little lights and relays. And these lights and relays are the most curious thing because he thinks „*dog*“ Now, that's an energy expenditure you see and so he's got „*dog*“ keyed up, you see, so it will go through these various relays and it will activate something over on this side such as „*Wanting to paint*.“ See, he has got it so it will stage itself and disassociate itself so that he can have a synthetic playmate. He's got all of these darned machines. He can do every one of these things himself and the only energy a machine ever hits him with is the energy which he himself is producing at that moment.

Now, this is also true of facsimiles. Facsimiles don't stand around in huge charges. The individual has so split up his forces, has so split up and directed his abilities, is so remote from himself, you might say, that he is actually charging up pictures and the facsimiles are really made by some process of duplication, obsessive duplication of a thought or an idea.

When you figure the ability of a thetan, always include in it the ability to make these confoundedly complex circuits. The most gorgeous stuff you ever saw in your life, utterly incomprehensible. And he would be the most baffled person in the world to realize he was doing all this, which is what the circuit is based on - surprise. The basic game of a thetan is to mock up a little box, pretend he doesn't know what is in it, open it up, look, get surprised.

All right. Here we have the Theta Clear. Clear, Theta, it says. I don't know why we just don't have Clear here. What is a Clear? A Clear is a person who is not being influenced by his reactive mind, that's the first definition, earliest definition of Clear, still valid. Simplest, earliest definition. He is an individual who is not being influenced by his reactive mind. Well, then if you simply push somebody out so that he wasn't being influenced by his reactive mind - remember the reactive mind belongs to the body and you simply push somebody out so he wasn't close to it anymore - he'd be Clear, wouldn't he? That's that. Now, we assayed to make Clears at first by reducing the reactive mind. And then we decided all we had to do was detach the fellow from the mind, from this reactive mind, and increase his ability to handle it and control it and we would have a much better process of clearing.

Scientology signalized this reversal. Dianetics was erasure of the reactive mind so as no further influence and Scientology was separating the individual from his reactive mind and placing him in a state that he could control it. And that is the difference be-

tween - the most basic and fundamental, but too technical a difference for the public at large - the difference between Dianetics and Scientology. It's the real reason behind why I changed the word in the first place.

I was thinking, the second I started to get a sniff of this type of phenomena, I said, „*Oh-oh! I will never under God's green Earth convince anybody,*“ and I guess I have convinced a lot of people, but I very long - „*that Dianetics has now done a complete flipperoo and no longer has to reduce the reactive mind but just get somebody out.*“

I didn't know at that time that people had a very great difficulty viewing nothingness. They would get sick viewing nothingness and so I thought, well, it might be a good time or another to introduce this word. Then the word was introduced at a time when Dianetics was kicking back. It had become a sort of a circuit and it was kicking back sort of hard and so I changed the word to Scientology in order to carry on and concentrate the attention of those people immediately in my vicinity upon the fact that we were doing something quite different. We had moved up into an upper echelon that had to do with origin and formation of existence. And this was not Dianetics. Dianetics was a - had a different echelon.

But there's no difference between a Dianetic Clear and a Scientological Clear today. There is no difference whatsoever. It is a person uninfluenced by his reactive mind, period.

And if you wanted to go ahead - you want to go ahead and make a Dianetic Clear? Fine. It'll take you a long time.

I really think that what happened in the past was the individual simply ran - enough engrams until he suddenly realized that he could control these damned things and he exerted pan-determinism over these things and simply separated himself from them and we just didn't find any more engrams that had to be erased and we had a Clear. And as long as we were doing it in this fashion and as long as the ARC was good with the preclear, as long as - an unfortunate little lost factor in there - that two-way communication was being maintained with this preclear, we made Clears. And when we didn't do these things, we made him the prey of his engrams. So Dianetic processing in Book One, had the liability of bad auditing or the bank suddenly caving in on the individual and making him the prey of it.

All right. A Theta Clear, Dianetic Clear, what's the difference? You don't have to have any difference in there at all. It is just a person who is not influenced by his reactive mind.

By the way, this tells you that a thetan can still be influenced by his machinery and still be a Clear. Let's understand that nicely. Now, a machine is something set up by a thetan to amuse himself one way or the other. And the most unhappy thetan you ever want to meet is some thetan whose total machinery has been wrecked. You just ruined all of his machinery. One of the things that happens with somebody who is - liable to be the reduction of his havingness in terms of machines. And if you don't rehabilitate, when you are making an Operating Thetan, the ability to make machines and hide them and forget about them - .

It's very simple. You have him make a postulate that such and so is going to happen, „*Now hide it, now forget about it. Okay. Now do so and so,*“ which is the trigger. „*What happened?*“

The fellow says, „*Nothing Nothing happened.*“

You say, „*Now, listen, this is between us. We want you to make this postulate, to hide it, now forget about it. Now, got that, now? All right. Now do so and so.*“ And that's the trigger to the postulate. Such as „*Get the idea that every time you think of the word cat you'll get sent to Paris. You got that idea now? All right. Now, let's hide it. Let's forget about it. You do that? Okay. Think of the word cat. Now, what happened?*“ The fellow says, „*Nothing*“ He didn't make the machine, you see? You actually got to get a machine that works. And you work with him until he's finally willing to do this, and all of a sudden he says - you say, „*Cat.*“ You say, „*What happened?*“

„*I'm in-I haven't got the remotest idea why, but I'm in Paris.*“ Big game he plays with himself

The Code of Honor is the ethical code of Scientology. It's a luxury. It has nothing to do with enforcement. Anybody who ever tries to enforce the Code of Honor on anyone has immediately pushed it downhill from a code of ethics to a code of morals and it's unworkable as a code of morals. That's about all you can say about it.

A code of ethics is something which is not enforced. The difference between ethics and morals is enforcement. A code of morals is something which is enforced. This is a very distinct difference.

We had to reach back, by the way, to Greek and Roman philosophy. This world is in an interesting state today philosophically. It defines morals as ethics and ethics as morals and I don't know but, you know, people don't even think this is funny, but I can laugh like hell about this. This is the wildest thing you ever heard of. That an individual will take the Ten Commandments and confuse this with an ethical code. The Ten Commandments had nothing to do with an ethical code. The Ten Commandments are there because you'd better do them! Not for the good of anybody particularly. But they're there and this is the agreed-upon behavior pattern which we're supposed to have and things work better and so you had better do it and we have enforcement. And we don't have an ethical code, we have a moral code.

All right. And here we have a beautiful word, communication. It's the consideration and action of impelling an impulse or particle from source-point across a distance to receipt-point with the intention of bringing into being at the receipt-point a duplication of that which emanated from the source-point. That's communication.

Now, a two-way communication: You see, there is a communication and that's it. Then there is a cycle of communication and that contains this plus an answer and an acknowledgment which is a reverse flow. That makes a cycle of communication.

Now, the next one is a two-way cycle of communication. And you've spread it out just about as far as you want to go to be codified. So you've got first a communication. Now, therefore, soldier A shooting at soldier B with a bullet is effecting a communication. See that clearly?

A cycle of communication would require that soldier B now shoot at soldier A with a bullet. See, that would be a cycle.

Now, a two-way cycle of communication would require that soldier B now fire a bullet at soldier A and soldier A would fire a bullet back at soldier B. In other words, soldier B now has to emanate, originate a communication.

All right. We have this covered here. Live form is part of communication. If you think that a letter being shot out of a letter machine in a post office and down a chute to another machine is a communication, you are looking at an interesting thing. You are looking at a live point sometime or another going through a tremendous number of vias, going to a live point somewhere else. But boy, the vias on that line! The communication is not between machine and machine, it's between live form and a live form.

This helps us a lot when we try to understand aberration because a person who consistently and continually (quote) „*communicates*“ (unquote) with live forms is not likely to get very aberrated. But an individual who consistently communicates (quote) (unquote) „*communicates*“ - very much (quote) (unquote) there and not (quote) (unquote) in the first instance - with machinery, with a minimum of live forms, can get very aberrated as a couple of us have discovered in processing. Right?

Sitting there punching a linotype machine is gorgeous. I mean, you obviously are communicating, aren't you? There is the words, there is the sense and so forth. And yet if you didn't recognize and if you lost sight of the fact that the product of this linotype machine was going to be read someplace by a live form or if somebody convinced you that these forms were never going to go anyplace or be read, why, you would then be communicating, (quote) (unquote) „*communicating*“ with no live form and the aberrative consequences would be considerable. It wouldn't be, of course, if you knew this.

Communication lag is the length of time between the moment the auditor poses the question or statement (which is missing here) and the moment when the exact question posed is answered positively by the preclar; no matter whether silence or talk or incorrect answers occur during the interim. This is covered here later. It is also the length of time between the giving of a command and the moment when a preclar carries out the exact command correctly. And that is absolutely right. It's the interval of time between the statement and the answer.

Now, we look at a two-way cycle of communication we could find out there'd be a second lag. There is a second communication lag. It's the interval of time between the answer and the acknowledgment which completes the thing and that would - what would be called a second communication lag. That's the second communication lag. He had a bad second lag, you could say rather clumsily. In other words, you would give him an answer and then he wouldn't acknowledge.

You'll find a lot of people around who have pretty good first lag, it's not bad, and their second lag is atrocious. You give them the answer and you might as well have been talking to the air.

Consideration is the highest capability of life, taking rank over the mechanics of space, energy and time.

That's a wide definition.

See, a consideration actually includes such things as postulates; consideration. The word consideration includes such things as postulates, commands, thoughts, worries, anything. This is a blanket word and it means that quality of considering. And you can consider something with a postulate and you can consider it with a command and so forth. By the way, let's see. What unit was it where we considered considerations at such length?

Fourth unit? Fifth? No, it wasn't the fifth. Sixth?

Audience: Sixth.

Sixth unit. Sixth unit. A tremendous number of lectures there on the subject of consideration. A rather interesting - it's an interesting subject. If you think that consideration is an interesting subject, of course you're just saying life is an interesting subject.

The quality to consider is that which establishes life. A person is as alive as he can consider. It's a very valuable thing this consideration. A person who has lost his ability to consider is just that dead. So you have a gradient scale of the ability to consider which parallels the gradient scale of life and this becomes a very interesting thing to work with. So that - it gives you a great understanding, by the way, of your preclear - a great understanding. This individual is taking secondhand all kinds of artistic considerations and so forth. Boy, if you ever get anybody who has a habit of taking artistic considerations secondhand, you've got a boy, you've got a boy. Man, when they will do that they're dead. They smell dead, too, quite often.

When this fellow will give you the - a predigested yackity-yack straight out of the guidebook about the cathedral. This is gorgeous. You are looking at somebody there who is practically an automaton. Because when an individual's ability to consider art form on his own is gone, practically the last thing that he has any reason to live for is gone. There is hardly anything else. So when they tell you - when they give you at long length a dissertation on Sibelius and you find out that this is inaccurately duplicated from a textbook on Sibelius. Heh! And they will do it.

Now, here we have a new word: copy. It's a technical word. It means another one just like the first one, occupying a different space. And it would be a perfectly correct definition for copy. It says here a duplicate distinguished from a perfect duplicate in that it does not necessarily occupy the same space, same time or use the same energies as the original.

But if we drew another package alongside of this one or if we mocked up another package alongside of this one, the second one is a copy. And what do you know, we have almost the same word as facsimile, don't we? But in view of the fact that a facsimile is made of the real universe as part of its definition, we have to have this special word, copy, which is a broader word than facsimile, much broader word. Because you can have a copy of a facsimile but the facsimile has to be a copy of the real universe.

All right. Creative Processing is a nice old-time process which had as its keynote having the preclear make out of energy of his own creation various forms, objects, distances, spaces and the basis of its modus operandi has to be very clearly understood before it is workable and that is gradient scale. Creative Processing has to be done by gradient scale. All right. Let's take somebody and we'll say, „*All right, mock up something*“ And this individual is liable to fumble for a long time. „*You mean by 'mock up' make this copy? All right - of something*“ And he'll fumble and fumble and he will finally make a copy of something or he'll make something and he'll make something else and something else and something else.

Now, if you were to search around and find the things he couldn't make, you would clear him up in many points of thinking.

Let's take a nurse. Here was an - here is an actual case. A girl had had a nurse during a period of illness and this nurse had been rather brutal to her. And she could make copies of Mama, she could mock up Mama, she could mock up Papa, she could mock up George and Bill. She could mock up London and Paris and Rome and New York. Mock up anything apparently, but couldn't mock up this nurse. And this was an intensely aberrative situation. Here was a facsimile, a series of facsimiles sitting there which were - could be resolved by the mock-up the moment the preclear found out he could create this form. All right.

The solution to this - this actually worked, just schoolbook, strictly - one: had the preclear mock up a footprint of the nurse. That was an unsuccessful attempt. Just to give you an idea how far she was from this nurse - couldn't mock up a footprint of the nurse. So, we had her mock up a number of footprints of women until she could mock up a footprint of the nurse. And having mocked up a footprint of the nurse we got finally a discarded shoe of the nurse and from a discarded shoe, we got a current shoe of the nurse at some distance from the nurse, of course. And then finally got two shoes of the nurse and then got a whole pile of the nurse's clothes. And having gotten a pile of the nurse's clothes we were then able to get one lock of the nurse's hair - total mock-up. And gradually we built this nurse on a gradient scale and the next thing you know, this nurse was there, was operating under perfect control of the preclear, had the preclear move the nurse around a few times and copy the nurse many, many times, and remedy havingness with the nurse and so forth.

And the very next time this nurse, who had produced actually a terror syndrome on the preclear thereafter - this was why I'd been yanked in on the case. There was one person in the world who was producing a terror syndrome and just nobody could solve this; just the idea of nurses, you see how it spanned out and associated. And the next time this nurse showed up, this girl put her to work very, very forcefully and chased her tail all over the place. It was the most remarkable thing, her family said, they had ever witnessed. They could not credit that anything had happened there, you see, which actually would cause this reaction toward the nurse. Actually, plenty had happened.

You get how the gradient scale is used in Creative Processing? Now, if you know this, that I have told you just now, you know actually anything you want to know about

Creative Processing and it's a very workable process even if it's a very old one. Gradient scale, make them mock it up.

Now, we get a preclear who can't mock up a damned thing; solid black in all directions and this you say is not a subject for Creative Processing. Let me assure you that this preclear can mock up something. He can mock up something and if you'll just stay with him for a little while till he can finally mock up something you will return visio to him. If you can get him to mock up sounds on a gradient scale long enough you will return sonic to him. And actually gradient scale applied there in Creative Processing will return sonic and visio. But it requires a very, very smart, cagey auditor. But all he has to do is just what I've told you. He has to bear with it. And this is a curious thing that we would have passed on along the line past Creative Processing. Because it looks like a real stopper. You know, it looks like a wonderful place to stop. But auditors couldn't learn how to do this. Isn't this strange?

There is a phenomenon that comes up in Creative Processing. If you ask the individual to mock up a body, he would probably discharge against this body and lower his havingness. So the one bug that comes up is havingness. So if you did Creative Processing and remedied people's havingness with the mock-ups and had them, you know, get them to throw them away and pull them in and so forth, and ran Remedy of Havingness and Creative Processing you would have an awful terrific process, very, very good process.

By the way, we talk a lot about throwing away or not doing anything about old - we are not doing anything much about matched terminals and double terminals. But you know that's a very effective technique if you remedy havingness. This is one of the fastest ways to deaberrate some individual. Gradient Scale by Creative Processing may be a slower method of doing it. That'd be the extreme.

Let's say he can get a mock-up of Joe and Joe has recently just beaten the tar out of him, but he can get a mock-up of Joe. Let's put two mock-ups up of Joe, huh, facing each other and then two more mock-ups of Joe facing each other and two more mock-ups of Joe facing each other and all of a sudden Joe is no longer aberrative. Fabulous the speed with which this works. That's a fast one. That's really fast.

One particular instance: a wife I processed who's violently jealous of her husband's secretary without any cause by the way. This secretary was strictly dragged in from Dr. Ross' canned food factory. Honest, it was the darnedest thing but evidently there was something on the whole track and some girl like this that really upset things. And I had this girl mock up two of these secretaries facing each other and then replace the mock-up several times and every single bit of jealousy and irrationality with regard to that particular secretary ceased, bang! Five minutes worth of processing.

But this discharges the living daylights out of somebody's havingness. It just knocks havingness to pieces. So matched terminals becomes immediately workable if you remedy havingness immediately afterwards.

Male voice: It spoils the game.

Hm, it spoils a game all right. You got to give him some more mass to play with.

Dianetics. The definition of Dianetics means *dia nous*. It means „*through mind*.“ Another reason why Dianetics became an unworkable word the moment that we were no longer going through such a thing as the analytical mind, the word itself did not mean that much as it had before.

We find here dichotomy, next word. Somebody might throw this one at you sometime or another. Dichotomy is a pair of opposites. Where the hell did this word come from? Actually it comes out of flower growing. It is really a grab at the moon for a word but it means positive-negative. It is an effort to express in the field of language and human behavior the positive and negative quality of poles, and that's what a dichotomy means. It's a positive and negative quality of poles that you would find in electricity expressed in human nature. So we have such a dichotomy as „*I can - I cannot*,“ „*hate - love*,“ so on. „*I can hate - I cannot hate*.“ „*I can control - I cannot control*.“ That's a dichotomy. It means the opposite polar sense of the livingness.

That was really a reach for the moon, dichotomy. But I don't know what the hell you would put in there. I spent, I remember, a couple of days fooling around with words of all kinds or another but they always meant something else.

By the way, with definitions, this is the most terrific contest you ever got into in your life on the subject of life itself is defining. The second that you use some word out of some older science, it already has so much mud hanging to its roots that you can never clean it up. And when you try to teach somebody this way: „*Well, we have now conditioning. Conditioning meant to psychology so and so, and so and so, and so and so. But to us conditioning means the repetitive impact*.“ That's a definition? No, it isn't because it's got a via in it. We have to explain what it doesn't mean anymore every time we use it. And so everybody would go crazy trying to learn such a vocabulary because it tells you first what it doesn't mean and now what it does mean. So we find that a system has been employed throughout here. We've gone into far flung fields for a word or we've taken and made a noun out of an adjective, just to get a clean word, and then said exactly what that word meant and so we had a vocabulary. Tried not to have too many of these.

But a dichotomy is an example of taking a word from flower growing. Di, sort of kind of means two, choto my, it sort of has a run to it. The positive and negative poles expressed in livingness.

Dramatization: May I invite your attention to the chapter called „*Dramatization*“ in The Original Thesis. It's the only dissertation so far that I have written on the subject of dramatization that is really a knockdown, drag out, this is what happens and how it happens. The Original Thesis, not even Book One, I mean, it was before Book One.

Dramatization: The guy has a picture, you know, and the picture says „*Wiggle your ear*“ so he wiggles his ear; that's a dramatization.

Now, if you could figure some raving, duplicating obsessively psychotic who was surrounded by nothing but sane and well-controlled people, you could actually get a dramatization of sanity. Did you ever think of that? I've seen it. It's the damnedest thing you ever want to see in your life: somebody dramatizing sanity. They're not even

vaguely sane, they're wild. You have to track them very carefully to see that what they're saying doesn't fit the real universe, it doesn't fit the environment. It would be what a sane person would have done in another environment.

So, we get the second meaning of dramatization which would be that it is not a present time situation. The individual is enacting or making a drama out of some past occurrence by rote, you understand? He's following it by rote, strictly push-button. So therefore he's doing something in 1955 that is copied from exactly 1780. See that? So you've got an out-of-time.

The best example of dramatization is a player piano roll. The roll goes through the piano and the piano plays and there's no player sitting there. Well, that's a dramatization. Only in this case the dramatization is a mock-up or a facsimile of some kind or another and that's the player piano roll and the preclear just goes on and plays the piece. He could no more stop himself or start himself in this piece than anything. What he is doing there, and he is the effect of drama. Curious business.

You will see an awful lot of that. There's the dramatizing psychotic as opposed to the computing psychotic. The computing psychotic is a nutty circuit, he's an insane circuit. It figure-figure-figure-figures and all of its computations are offbeat. Figure-figure-figure-figure-figure.

Now, you will understand something a little more in just a second now. The dramatizing psychotic is running off a player piano roll of a facsimile. In other words, one is running off a facsimile and one is running off of a machine. So you have the nutty body with the dramatizing psychotic and the crazy thetan with the computing psychotic. We spotted the difference between these two things back in the fall, early fall of 1950. There are obviously these two types of psychotics and there are no other types of psychotics.

All right. So there's the reactive psychotic and the machine psychotic and you'll see these two. Now, the machine psychotic thinks; he figure-figures. He'll give you wild, different computations all the time.

The dramatizing psychotic doesn't. They simply play. Well, when I see a dramatizing psychotic I have a problem. Oh, I see - when I see a computing psychotic I know very well a thetan is present. When I see a dramatizing psychotic I am very doubtful because it tells you immediately that the thetan in this case must have at least succumbed to the reactive bank to dramatize this thoroughly. Both of them have no criteria, no consideration, as we were talking about a little while ago, see? The keynote is absent consideration, consideration absent. And so we have the dramatizing psychotic and the computing psychotic.

We have a dramatizing psychotic out here and that's a goofball one. We also have a computing psychotic out here. We are running a type of Communication Processing on the two of them.

And just to complete this particular one, the perfect duplicate has a definition but it also has quite a study.

The perfect duplicate is one which is made in the same time, same place with the same energies as the original; matter, energy, space, time. Not necessarily the same consideration, but as far as the mechanics of the thing are concerned, you have identical. And when you make a perfect duplicate it disappears.

This was what told us what an ultimate truth was. An ultimate truth is nothing. The ultimate truth is the static. It is not any masses, energies, spaces or times

Well, a perfect duplicate then, if you told a preclear to make a duplicate and he made a perfect duplicate, whatever he was looking at would have disappeared. If you told a preclear to make a perfect duplicate and he had something left of what he was looking at, he didn't make a perfect duplicate. Do you get the difference between these two things? There's not only a difference of what he does but a difference of result. If he makes a duplicate he has another one, he has two. If he makes a perfect duplicate he has none. A different result.

Okay. Well, so much we have slogged along that far. It'll take us forever at this rate, won't it?

Did you learn anything from these definitions?

Audience: Yes.

Language is to some slight degree a via, but unfortunately you are dealing with people whose main communication line is language. You are liable to get into the belief that all language is in the band of symbols. No, it isn't. Language is only in the band of symbols when it no longer has a consideration connected with it. As long as language has a consideration connected to it and with it and as long as those people using language are still considering, why, it's not in the band of symbols.

But when a language is only at last in the band of symbols and there's no further consideration connected with it at all, it's no longer anything but MEST; it is not communicating. When anything gets into - really gets into the band of symbols, which is to say there is the symbol and the consideration is absent, we just have a symbol and that's that. When an individual gets into that state he's a gone dog.

When we talk about the Know to Sex Scale and say somebody is stuck in symbols, we simply mean he's using language without further consideration and this is a pretty hard thing to do. Do you know that he couldn't understand anything you said? It wouldn't matter if you used the plainest language in the world, he couldn't understand a thing you are saying. He could utter sounds, you got a parrot. He could write words, you got a philosopher. But there would be no consideration connected with these things. Consideration, the degree of; determines the amount of life present. When you can change a consideration it must mean that you have considerations to spare.

You're liable to get a little bit into the symbol band slightly when you're studying definitions because you are actually having enforced upon you to some slight degree a set of meanings. But as I have been trying to demonstrate to you in these last two lectures, these are just relays of communication which have an understanding of life wrapped up in them and they too are very subject to consideration.

(end of lecture)