

MELBOURNE CONGRESS 05

VALENCES

A lecture given on 8 November 1959

[Start of Lecture]

Well, I hope you survived the last lecture.

I was told there were some people -- some people that had their buttons pushed.

Look, you can tell me. Of course, in most cases I know already.

Well, you still got a congress?

Audience: Yes.

Glad you came?

Audience: Yes.

All right. Oh, say that louder. You glad you came?

Audience: Yes!

That's better. That's better. Got to wind me up here just a little bit, you know.

Now, was that last lecture much too technical for you?

Audience: No.

It wasn't, huh?

Audience: No.

Just pushed a few buttons. All right.

Tell you why. I'd like to release for the first time at this congress the solution to a problem which you will find as far back as Book One and which is probably the main thing that keeps a profile or your graph on tests and so forth right where it is. Keeps your personality pegged there whether you like it or not.

I'd like to tell you about that because it's brand-new material, brand-new discoveries. It's not very complicated and I would like to release it right here in Australia.

Well, the subject is valences. Valences.

This is not a very esoteric subject. It's an awfully common one. There is no such thing as „*your own valence*.“

Every once in a while we fall into the liability of using the phrase. There's just you. And you don't become a valence until you're picked up and worn by somebody else.

Now, let's say we had a mama who was very, very critical and every time we tried to create something she destroyed it. Or let's say that every time we tried to originate something she said, „*No, no!*“ And every time that we tried to be ourselves, why, we get „*overwhumped*.“ (That's a Scientology technical term.) Every time we tried to be ourselves somebody else says, „*No, no, no! Be somebody else*.“

Well, I've just been talking to you about social values. And when you at last became convinced that your values or your ways of looking at things were totally wrong, then you had a choice. You either just ceased to exist or you grabbed a valence that was apparently acceptable. And that's what kept you from being you when you ceased to be you.

And most of the profiles which you answer up and most of the tests which you answer up is a valence or a composite of valences which you borrowed at some time or another that you thought were acceptable, and those you mark on the scoreboard.

Until you change a preclear's valence, you don't change the pc.

If auditing could shed valences easily, you could change a graph, the responses of a pc to life, his ability to handle his environment, with great ease. If you could change his valences!

If you could keep pulling valences off of him until you dug him up -- and when you got him dug up you'd find you had quite a person. And that's the person that'll register high on a graph and stay there.

There are many ways of defining or looking at Clear. But technically, the best way of looking at Clear is not in terms of a bunch of mechanics. It'd just be whether or not the person had become himself. Then you'd say he'd be Clear.

Now, if hi -- that self which was uncovered, unblended, straightened out, was then improved to a point where he could, you know, relax and say, „*Well, I dare reach as myself to a considerable distance and I dare actually progress*,“ and so forth, you'd have an OT.

That's a very simple way of looking at Clear. Just sweep away these mechanical ideas and say, „Well, we've gotten the fellow to be himself, unimpeded by superimpressed personalities.“

Now, you ever hear of the „*old school tie*“?

Audience: Yeah.

That's a valence.

There are even fellows who have been sent to Oxford (it's not „*Oxford*“ you know, it's „*Oxford*“) -- there have been fellows sent to „*Oxford*“...

It's very amusing. My little kids are now going to school in England, and all the words they knew from America, they still pronounce with an American accent. And all of the words they have learned, the brand-new ones in England -- darnedest mishmash you ever heard!

These Oxfordian graduates have very often simply gone to Oxford to get a valence. Factually, they have that. That's part of the curriculum. They're supposed to -- they're supposed to pick up a tone and behavior. Now, it's nothing really against Oxford. It's just the fact that that's part of the business.

Well, it already means they must have had some kind of a lousy valence to want the next one superimposed on it.

And that's the fate of somebody who loses himself. He gets a valence over the top of that and he doesn't like that one, so he gets another valence over the top of that one because he doesn't like that one, and he gets a valence over the top of the next one because he doesn't like -- and he doesn't like that one, so he gets another valence. And you've got some sort of a mysterious series of concentric spheres here -- just valence after valence after valence -- package personalities, each one of these. Each one is a package personality. Its reactions are so-and-so and such-and-such.

You can always expect somebody who has attended Oxford -- just to get the tone -- to, in the face of emergencies, say „*There is none*.“ Immediate response. That's what that valence says. It says, „*There are no emergencies*,“ see?

Roof falls in. The floor goes out from under him and he's supposed to say something like, „*Bit of a disturbance, what?*“

He's supposed to have responsibilities in certain directions and be irresponsible in other directions. He's supposed to be made happy by certain things and unhappy by other things. And he gets a whole carload lot of „*now-I'm-supposed-to's*.“ And at any given stimuli or any given stimulus he has a pat response. And you can play on him like a player piano, you know. Put the roller in and start pumping the pedals. And you'll play the same tune every time!

Now, to a slave master, that person is very safe to have around because he's totally predictable and will never step over the edge at all of the demarked lines.

Therefore, you can do almost anything with him or get him to agree to almost anything. You can put anything across on him just playing it on the right buttons.

And I wouldn't say that a society that is trying to be free, a society that is trying to be independent, a society where each individual is worth something, and particularly in Australia where there aren't too many people, that such a mechanism is totally necessary. I think it'd be safe to have people be themselves.

Of course, I sometimes feel very lonely in this opinion. But it is -- it's safe to have people be themselves.

Of course, it takes a certain amount of nerve to actually get in and unbalance the valences to see what's there. And you nearly always, even in taking a couple of valences off, find a better guy.

And when you take them all off, you find a powerhouse. When we say, „*Man is basically good*“ -- we also mean women -- we mean that when you get him dug up, or her dug up, that she'll try to follow or he'll try to follow the optimum solution in given circumstances.

Only valences keep people pinned down to one dynamic or two dynamics. Because a valence can't be expansive. A valence is a narrowing and a blunting.

What's an optimum private to an army? The perfect private? Well, that's a valence that the sergeants dearly work on. And did you ever hear the sergeants work on it. Any slightest deviation from the perfect private, any direction to be a decent guy, any initiative, any idea of advancing along certain lines practically or getting something done obviously, boy, they're in there with brickbats. „*Get back into line. Get those anchor points back. Be a private. Be a private,*“ you know.

And after many, many, many years of that sort of thing, a fellow comes out of the army, goes into civilian life and it takes him a long, long time to stop being a private. And he finds himself saluting or treating everybody like he'd like to treat sergeants.

There's nothing wrong with armies. Armies are a good thing -- in history books! Armies today, of course, are so deadly outmoded that I wonder that any politician has the cheek to appropriate any appropriation for them, to tell you the truth.

Of course, it's typically political, you see, that after armies have ceased to be any value whatsoever, why, then they have to have big standing armies, you know?

Appropriations for shotguns and rifles and machine guns these days are something like appropriations for bows and arrows. They just might as well make appropriations for bows and arrows.

By the way, they dug out the War Department in the United States the other day. They were getting rid of some of the supersecret files and they found one of the supersecret war devices of World War II was the bow and arrow. Actually -- they'd been developing bows and arrows for use by commandos and they had labeled it „*supersecret*.“ And from that day to this, bows and arrows had been supersecret to the US Army.

But you take a fellow who is made to be a general and he's worked over usually in some democratic body to be the perfect general. And you always know what a general will do. The parliament or the senators or whoever it is, they know what a general will do. He's a safe general. That's because he's in the valence of a general.

And then they rail at him in wartime because he retreats at the wrong places and goes the wrong directions and never adapts the army to the situation and loses things left

and right and gets his equipment chopped up and so forth and somehow or another muddles through at Lord knows how many casualties.

And then they say, oh, they are very upset about this. Ah yeah, well, they -- they've got to have a person there before he can lead anything. And when they have a valence called a general there who has the exact responses that you're supposed to get from a general, of course, they don't get any leadership.

And in a time of emergency there's nobody there. But that's true of valences -- there's nobody there. In this society at this time you have more unhaunted bodies! But a valence, you might say, is a packaged series of responses. A valence likes spinach, dislikes beefsteak; likes green hats, dislikes white hats; thinks plump women are too plump, thin women are too thin -- whatever the valence thinks, that is what is thought. And there can be no flexibility on the subject.

And the way you change a pc's reactions around, actually, is to give him enough wins that he begins to believe that he might amount to something and doesn't need all these packaged responses. He believes, at last, that he himself is capable of making up his mind to the various situations which he confronts in life. And you've got a real, live person. You haven't got a wound-up doll.

Now, of course, in this machine age, the country is almost totally populated with people who are hard up against machines. And they get so used to running machines, you know. You press the right buttons and hoods go up and boots open and motors start and -- maybe.

And they get so used to machinery that they think people ought to be all machinery, too. And they get very upset when somebody goes off the line.

As a matter of fact, a friend of mine one time (old science fiction writer, Paul Ernst) wrote a story one time called „*He Didn't Like Soup*.“ Possibly you've heard of me mentioning this before. But „*He Didn't Like Soup*“ was the name of the story.

This fellow goes way ahead into a supermachine age society, you see, that's all assembly line and the belts run and supersocialism -- nobody ever gets paid, you know. They're supposed to appear here and do this and their jobs are that and they're supposed to respond this way and that way and, you know, it's just all mechanical doll sort of thing. And this guy gets shot ahead in time and gets into this society. Must have been an Australian -- he still had some individuality left.

And they get hold of him and they put him in this mess hall and -- to feed him, you see -- and the great big conveyer belts are coming along with huge plates of soup on them, you know. And of course, everybody when his plate of soup comes by, he goes... and puts the soup down in front of him, you know.

Well, this guy is standing there and his plate of soup comes up on the conveyor belt and he says, „*Sniff-sniff*“ He didn't take it off the conveyor belt!

And of course, it goes to the end of the conveyor belt and it goes down with a clank, grinds to bits and stops the whole conveyor-belt system.

Well, nothing like this -- nothing as individual as this had happened in that society for so long, they didn't even have fuses left, you see. And of course, this shorts out all the fuses in all the power plants in the city. Eventually it's all traced back -- the total ruination of that whole machine society is traced back to the fact that he didn't like soup!

Well, thinking in these terms, a machine age has a tendency to devalue the individual likes and dislikes of people. And they want them all the same, and they want them all squared up. And the only way you can do that is to package up valences and say, *„This is the optimum person and you must be this person and you mustn't be any other person and you must have no other opinion but this person's opinion and this is the person you are!“* And then they use various mechanisms to do this.

Well, families start working on this. And after a person has lost too many times, he can be convinced that he himself can't win, but that some other packaged identity can win. Therefore, he buys the packaged identity that's being offered to him.

And the way you get a thetan to do this is just overtly give him loses, loses, loses. Make him guilty of this and guilty of that and guilty of other breaches and guilty of something else, and invent more things for him to be guilty of.

By the way, I almost brought down to you today -- and then I thought, *„Well, I won't give her that much swelled head“* -- the goddess of destruction, Kali, that was being worshiped at a mad rate in India when I was there just a few days ago. The festival of the goddess Kali. So I picked up one of them. And -- worship of destruction. And they explain to you lots of ways why you have to worship destruction, but all it adds up to is the fact that their tremendous impulse toward creation that we were talking about yesterday gives automatic impulse toward destruction. And probably today this is one of the most powerful gods of India -- the goddess Kali, the destroyer.

She, by the way, although I tagged a couple of people there in India with this fact -- I said, *„That used to be the goddess of the thuggee, didn't it? You know, the killer, the fellow who went down the highway and killed off all the pedestrians.“*

„Oh, well, yes, but actually she is the Divine Mother.“ And, you know, *„He's a westerner, he doesn't know his business, so we'll give him a bunch of business.“* And they worship -- they worship Kali.

Now, Kali, of course, is a sort of a tailor-made valence itself. And it's the goddess of a criminal. And most gods -- made-up gods of this character -- are simply tailor-made valences of some kind or another.

Very often they try to trap thetans. They put up images and so forth that should be worshiped, you know, and they say, *„A thetan ought to pick up one of these images,“* and so on. And after a while you've got a body. So, that's one of the trickiest methods of interiorization: to make a thetan have overt acts against bodies until he himself becomes one. It gives him a package of things to be and do.

Now, to free somebody along the line and restore to him his own judgment is not really as adventurous as you think because it's only when he is totally degraded that he

does the wrong things, the bad things, and reacts with destruction and evil, and worships, you might say, the goddess Kali.

A person has to be in pretty good shape to be pretty good. That's always true.

Now, a valence is not the formless thing that you would think it was. It actually has form and mass. It has series of pictures that belong to it. It has whole series of tailor-made postulates, „*now-I'm-supposed-to*,“ that belong to it and so forth. It's a personality more or less complete. And preclears buy these things. They buy them off of Papa and they buy the valence off of Mama, and they buy it with the old school tie, and they buy it with how to be a good second lieutenant, although I never met one.

The valence is the profile response that most people react up to. And it's a truism that you are not really auditing the pc, you are auditing a valence. And if you just audit the valence and never, never, never address the problem of separating the pc out of these valences, of course, all you do is improve the valence.

You just take a few „*now-I'm-supposed-to's*“ off the valence. And the pc says, „*Well, I feel better.*“

Very often you get somebody who's very obsessed on the subject of a valence -- boy, he really is the valence! -- and just as he starts to get audited out of the valence you will notice that you're auditing him and he's auditing something else. You ever notice that? What you're saying really doesn't address itself to him. You're addressing it to him, and he's addressing it to that. And as he's -- you'll ask him what he's got there and he'll say, „*Well, I don't know. There's some sort of a mass or something that's kind of coming off here. And it's doing very well with the process.*“

He's actually improving or auditing a valence. So that it is a tremendous advantage to have a process that strips valences.

Well, one of the first processes that abruptly stripped valences was, of course, a process which knocked out individuation.

Now, what's „*individuation*“? Well, individuation means „*I'm different from everybody*“ -- the differences between self and others. And when these differences are tremendous, the person, of course, cannot associate with or communicate with other people, no matter how important they are.

In other words, individuation, when it occurs, usually occurs because of valences, if you can understand that.

The pc already has lost himself into another valence, and this valence he knew was very different than all other valences. So he's individuated himself around. Where as a matter of fact, a pc in perfectly good shape can go and sit down alongside the railroad track and talk to the tramps -- he'd go down and talk to them, talk about tramping and so forth, and he doesn't get all soiled. It's not degrading. Then he can go up and talk to the bank presidents, you see. It doesn't make any difference. He can communicate - - communicate with most anybody without terrific liabilities. It's only a valence that has terrific liabilities.

Now, a person wearing an old school tie talking to a person who has no old school tie is, of course, being degraded. A valence can lose out, you see, but the pc has a hard time losing out. It actually takes a long time to aberrate a pc. Took a long, long time to get somebody aberrated. Don't ever think they got aberrated in this life -- they didn't. They've been working on it for a while.

Now, separation and identification are, of course, things of more or less comparable magnitude. What's identification? Well, if I think I'm this microphone or if I think I'm that table, I have identified myself with the microphone or table. Okay?

Now, you can do this sometime on a postulate. You can say, „*Well, I am that automobile. What's wrong with me? Ah! Now I am myself,*“ back off, and you can say, „*You know, that thing's got a busted crankshaft.*“

„*Now, you don't have to do it that stupidly mechanically to find out and pervade an automobile. You don't have to go into the valence of the automobile. It is just a method of finding out about it.*“

You know, you -- a good mechanic can kind of be an automobile. That's right -- it's right, you ask them. Yeah, they wouldn't really consider it a funny question if you said, „*How does a motor with bad valves feel?*“ Before they'd think about it, „*Well, it feels kind of gappy and gritty.*“

But your ability to pervade your environment is, of course, a greater ability than your ability to communicate with your environment. Your ability to experience is greater than your ability to confront.

If you merely go around confronting the environment and say, „*Well, I'll be brave and look at that wall,*“ why, that's pretty brave.

But for you to say, „*Well, I can be that wall,*“ boy, that's adventurous. Because if we're busily in a valence, we know Mama could never be a wall. We know that.

But how did we get a valence in the first place? We tried to keep separate from somebody else. And we said, „*Under no circumstances or conditions will I ever, ever, ever be that other person. Never! Never! Never!*“

And you work on that hard enough, you know -- separate! separate! „*Over there, Satan,*“ you know. And next thing you know you run out of separateness. You do! And you're the same thing.

People tend to become what they resist. Why?

Well, I gave you the answer yesterday. They won't create the other person, ever! Because it's a bad person. Never create the other person; we don't want that kind of person in the world. So, they make that person persist. And they make that personality persist and they make the most objectionable characteristics of that personality persist. And then they said, „*I will never be them,*“ and they get totally fixated on it. And the trick is, there's no space anyway, really -- space is a mechanism that thee and me dream up. And you can run out of it awful fast.

Because when you say, „*I'll never be it. I'll never be it,*“ you say, „*There's no space between me and it. No space between me and it. No space. No sp-----.*“ And you see how that would work?

You can sometimes get down and say, „*There's space between me and it. There's space between me and it. There's space between me and it! Space! Oh, damn.*“ Because your space depends on your ability to have anchor points out there. And when you keep on saying, „*There are no anchor points out there,*“ you're saying there's no space out there. So you're saying, when -- „*I won't be that person,*“ you're disowning an anchor point. And you're not going to have any space between you and that person. That's the way it winds up and you get a valence. It's very tricky the way this thing works out and very complicated, but actually very simple.

A person says, „*I'm incapable and unable of being that person. I will not be that person. I'm incapable of it. I'm unable.*“ And it all shortens down to the fact „*I'm incapable; I'm unable.*“ And faced with (quote) „*evil characteristics*“ and so forth, a person tends to exclude those out of his own area of understanding and therefore they very often persist much better than good characteristics to him. And he goes into valences.

Well, let it be enough that you have seen boys going around being girls. Well, what's that but a snap between a guy and a girl?

And you've all occasionally seen girls going around being boys. Well now, what's that? That's a twist-up somehow or another on valences.

A much more obvious and humorous one: It is very often remarked that „*Englishmen resemble their dogs.*“ I don't believe that's true, by the way. I believe the dogs resemble the Englishmen.

It's remarkable. You can go down to Hyde Park and watch it if you don't believe it.

Valences -- valence characteristics have snapped back and forth one way or the other. And trying to maintain an obsessive difference puts identification or similarity totally on automatic.

In other words, one never takes any responsibility for the similarities and runs out all the differences.

Says, „*I'm different. I'm a good boy; he's a bad boy.*“ Yeah, well one never says, „*I'm a bad boy, too,*“ you know? Never says, „*He's a good boy, too,*“ you see? And this thing gets unbalanced -- very unbalanced.

One says, „*I'm different, different, different, different, different. Check over the number of ways I am different than Joe. One, two, three, four, five, six, seven, eight.*“ And one forgets that basically one has trem -- as many similarities to Joe as he has differences from Joe and never runs out, as-ises or does anything to those identifications, those similarities. And lets those sit there and so valences can snap. And those are the exact mechanics back of the thing.

It's very wrong for one to make an absolute villain out of anybody. There are no absolute villains.

You go around and talk to the villains and they all say, well, they did it out of the best possible intentions. It's amazing! Your jaw would drop to go and talk to a confirmed killer and find out, well, he just had to do it and the reasons why were all totally justified and nobody seems to understand him. Well, that's his corrupted, twisted, valenced version of „*why he did it*.“ And that's very, very confusing to us.

We say, „*Well then, a person's good intentions lead him into criminality*,“ and so forth. No, they weren't his own intentions at all -- they were criminal intentions. He was a valence. He no longer had control of the situation or he would have done quite differently than he did.

But the final analysis is ... Some people don't like to hear me run down psychiatrists -- they've never been to them. They don't. And one of the things they're trying to do is protect me, really,

kind of, from doing some kind of a snap into that much grogginess. Of course, I don't mind being a psychiatrist. I'm certainly not one.

And as a matter of fact, it's very amusing to go around and talk to psychiatrists and feel what it'd be like to be guilty of that many overt acts. It's kind of weird.

But I don't have to be different, you see? And I don't have to be like them, and this problem doesn't come up. But every person as a little child is asked to make up his mind -- asked to make up his mind whether he's going to be like Papa or like Mama or dislike Papa or unlike Mama.

And I've seen girls around -- poor things -- they couldn't cook, couldn't sew, couldn't do anything around the house and couldn't work outside and couldn't hold down a job, merely because they „*wouldn't be like Mother!*“ And Mother unfortunately could cook, sew, work outside, hold down a job. Now, the poor kid's had it! Maybe Mother had lots of ability in a very nasty sort of way. And the little kid had to make up their mind, „*I don't want to be like that. I don't want to be this mean to people. And therefore I must discard all those abilities that's Mama.*“

And you very often find that Mama did have some nasty characteristics and the child, in trying to avoid those nasty characteristics, has decided not to have any of the good characteristics at all.

All right, this poor little kid grows up, the years go on, gets married and all of a sudden snapped! Still can't cook, sew or anything, but has picked up some kind of semi-package of all the nasty characteristics, and can't work either. And then all of a sudden reforms totally and can cook and sew and work outside and do everything and is nasty to everybody.

And the pathetic part of it is, is this person knows this is wrong. This person doesn't feel right. And you ask most people who are having a hard time, „*What would you like to be?*“ And the usual response is, „*I'd like to be myself.*“ It's sort of on the order, „*If anybody ever dug me up... If I could ever dig me up... The things I'm doing aren't me -- who are they?*“

Well, that's very easy to find out on an E-Meter. You can find out who they're being.

And what you do is assess them for this -- lifetime valences they've adopted by finding the greatest needle reaction on broad classes, like men, women, go up the dynamics, sort out all the possibles by broad classes and find some class that reacts on the needle more than others. And then that class which reacts more than others, narrow that class down and you'll find the valence which is the most difficult valence of the case to do anything with.

You just narrow it right on down. You could actually exploit the thing I'll give you a better example of how you do it: eight dynamics. And you just take -- run the dynamics describing what each dynamic is, not necessarily calling them first dynamic, second dynamic and so forth. Describe each dynamic in turn and find out which one of these seems to fall differently than the rest. And maybe you find suddenly that it's the fifth dynamic „*living things*.“ „*Man*“ doesn't fall, nothing else falls, but „*living things*.“

And you'll find out somebody's being a tree. And you just narrow the thing down. You've got living things out of eight possible choices, now you narrow down that one choice by dividing it up into classes: birds, beasts, fish, you know -- vegetable matter, animals, whatever it is. And you'll get one of these drop better and if you're real clever on the E-Meter you'll come down and find out the person's being a juniper tree! That's factually, factually -- I'm giving you an actual case.

Another actual case that fell on the fifth dynamic one time was a dog The only companion of this little girl had been a dog and the dog hated all dogs. And if you don't think that wasn't a puzzle! She couldn't possibly be a dog because she hated dogs. Yeah, but she was being a dog hating dogs. Got the idea? Yet she was being herself somewhat, but being a dog, but she hated dogs. She couldn't explain this. But some processing knocked out the valence.

And there are numerous ways to get rid of a valence once you've got the thing nailed down.

Some of the older ways is „*How could you help a dog?*“ you see -- whatever the valence you found. „*How could you help a dog? How could the dog help you?*“ That would be one of the very old ways of doing this.

You could go around a five-way bracket, numerous questions. And the person, in finding out how he could help something and how it could help him and so forth, would tend to individuate from this thing and you'd get a separation of valences.

That's one of the oldest very good „*valence splitters*,“ we've called them.

There are many others earlier than that, but that one was so good and is so good today that it's the first one actually that you'd consider a very effective valence splitter.

You locate this valence, you find out what it is, you find out who this person is being. It doesn't matter what you find out -- he's being a traffic cop, she's being a -- she's being a waitress in a hotel, or -- we don't care what it is. Then we run this valence on Help: „*How could you help a waitress in a hotel? How could a waitress in a hotel help you? How could other people help a waitress in a hotel? How could a waitress in a hotel help other people?*“ and so forth. You do get a valence change. That does change a valence and that was the

first very, very effective one. And that was sufficiently effective that it led in -- well, it's less than 50 percent of the cases -- to what you might call a MEST Clear. It was that good -- that good. It did clear off these valences and all the auditor had to do was get in and slug, slug, slug and pick up the next valence and run it and pick up the next valence and run it and finally they'd come down to the first time the person ducked his own identity and assumed another identity, and we call that the Rock.

In other words, we eventually found the first time on the track that this happened. But it wasn't for everybody, this series of processes -- it still left a lot of people cold.

Help worked on them, but the accompanying process to get rid of the rest of the bank, called Step 6, made the bank more solid and more uncomfortable. And so it wasn't for everybody.

And from that time -- that was 1957, late fall when I first broke this out -- and from that time on forward, why there have been many advances on this particular lineup and we've been ... We found out something about MEST Clears, by the way, that a MEST Clear still has it in his power to postulate himself into an aberrated condition. That's what happens to MEST Clears.

Person gets cleared up to a certain point -- they can postulate, but they haven't learned yet that they can postulate. You get the idea? And before they learn that they can make postulates or make statements, make thoughts, make goals, make dreams, so forth and make these things stick, before they really find this out, they sometimes -- this is not in all cases, but in some cases, why, they'll make invalidative postulates.

And they'll say, „*Well, I'm not so good. I still have a bank,*“ -- they got one!

Those that are just on the brink, they can postulate themselves right downhill again rapidly. They never get as bad off as they were, but they can dump themselves over the edge from Clear.

Now, Theta Clear, of course, is more what we're angling for. This is a much more important thing because a Theta Clear is himself and doesn't even have to depend on a body to be himself. And that you'd kind of define without any further mechanical ramifications, you'd say, „*Well, this person has a body, is living, is identified by a body and is known as a body but doesn't actually have to depend totally upon the characteristic of a body to himself have a personality, ideas or thoughts.*“

Got the idea? He knows he is doing the living. He isn't a servant of the lamp or the body, you know. Whether he can go in and out of his head like a dog in and out of a doghouse or something, that's -- that's beside the point!

Now, that state is again achieved by the separation of valences and I have found this basic thing about valences: Valences occur because of obsessive separation from -- on all dynamics. Obsessive separation.

Person says, „*Mustn't-mustn't-mustn't.*“ And leave the identification on automatic.

Now, it can go reversewise. A person says, „*I am this valence. I am this valence. I am a good boy. Every night before I go to bed I will say, 'I am a good boy'*“ or „*I am a good girl. Every night*

before I go to sleep, I'll say, 'I am a good girl' twenty times and I'll eventually be a good girl, and I'll be the girl that Mama wants me to be,“ and so forth. And the next thing you know, why, they're out robbing banks. How did that happen?

Well, they went on an obsessive identification. So separation and identification are the two opposites. One is either separate from or identified with or on the verge of becoming either one about the whole universe.

Identification. You look in Book One, Dianetics: Modern Science of Mental Health you'll see A=A=A=A. Well, that is the story of valences. Anything equals anything.

In other words, *„I equal a body.*“ See? That's an identification.

„I am Mother.“ See? That's identification.

It's not a correct statement. I don't care if a thetan has a body that has babies, that thetan is not a mother! Look it over for a minute. That thetan is being a mother. Slight difference.

Many a man gets very upset about being a family man because he has to say all the time, *„I am a father. I am a father. I am a father. I am a father,*“ you know. It's borne down on him completely and continually, *„I am a father.*“ He's not a father, he's being a father. His role is that of father and he is trying to say he is totally identified with this thing called a father.

Now, if he didn't like his own father, you see, he'll say, *„I don't want to be a father,*“ and oh, oh, well, here we go, you know. Confusion, confusion, confusion.

But there's those two opposites: separateness and identification. There's a simple process that takes care of that state.

You do the assessment -- this is brand -- new, never been released, there's not even an HCOB out on it. You find the thing the person is obsessively identifying himself with -- the person or thing he is obsessively being -- and you will find the thing that he really doesn't want to be, which he is being. Therefore he hates himself or he dislikes himself or he feels degraded. And you find this thing, whatever it is, and then you run a very simple process on it and, of course, a very obvious process on it. You knock out this obsessive *„got to be different from it“* that is keeping him in it.

And it runs like this: You say any wording which adds up to, *„Tell me something different from this object. Tell me something the same as this object.*“ -- *„Tell me something you do differently from your father“* or *„Tell me something you are different in -- any difference.*“ Any way you want to phrase it. And I'm not giving you any pat command because I want you to understand it.

„Now, tell me something the same as _____. Tell me something different from _____. Tell me something the same as _____. Tell me something different from _____.“ Got the idea?

You could say, *„Tell me something that you are different from your father in,*“ you see? *„Tell me something that you are the same as your father.*“

Get the idea? Difference-similarity; difference-similarity; difference-similarity.

Identification is composed of difference and sameness, and by getting both of these plowed out on alternate commands, you can make valences go zzzuppp. And they separate out and all of a sudden the fellow says, „*Oh, do I feel degraded.*“

You say, „*What's the matter?*“

„*Well, I don't feel like I'm my father anymore.*“

⁽¹⁾ You say, „*Oh, you feel very, very degraded, do you? Now, why do you feel degraded?*“

„*Well, I just feel degraded, that's all. I feel like a little kid.*“

You've found the point where he lost himself and became the other fellow. You just run the process a while longer and he will at least get back the same morale he had when he was a little kid.

Now, we've got to go a little further than this and find out somebody else he's busily being and chase it down on a new assessment and then run „*same*“ and „*different*.“

„*Tell me something that's the same as _____.* *Tell me something different from _____,*“ until we get this next valence straightened out. Now we do another assessment and „*same*“ and „*difference*“ and we get that, so on.

Now, this particular type of process to an old-time auditor would seem to violate havingness. The individual is losing something, isn't he? He's losing valences; he's losing package responses. And that would seem to be an actual loss.

No, the only valences you'll want and the only valences you'll take off are the things where he's so different from everything else that he can't have anything. And every time you take off a valence or improve the condition of the pc, you improve his havingness because the only way you can have anything is to kind of be able to be it.

For instance, if you're obsessively different from a wall, you certainly can't have the wall. And if you're a valence that can't have walls, you can never have walls. And the thing to do is to take off the valence that can't have walls and even though you've lost the valence, you've got walls now.

It's quite remarkable to find that valences do separate on something as easy as this. There's a great oddity about this: This is specially forbidden in old-time Buddhism. A Buddhist must never think of similarities and identities or separatenesses. He's not supposed to think separatenesses.

Boy, don't tell me some of these religions got into a trap, because that one was certainly a trap. If a person never thinks of separatenesses and never thinks of identities, he certainly can never get out of a valence, can he? And yet that was forbidden in this ancient religion.

But here we have ways and means, then, of finding the person. And the person became somebody else because he himself could no longer be himself because he con-

¹ [Editor's Note: This small section of the original recording was damaged. Fortunately, another recording of this section of the lecture was located and has been restored to preserve the full text of the lecture.]

ceived that he had to be separate from or he had to be the same as. And if you run out both sides of that, of course, you run out the valence.

This is rather terrific -- this is rather terrific processing and you'll want to try it out. It takes an E-Meter. It takes something that you run down. It's something that can be done in the HGC. The HGC will be doing that here in Melbourne very shortly -- this week.

You have to trace it out and find exactly what the thing is and then get all the reasons why, you might say, the fellow couldn't be it and had to be it. And the second that's all off, he breathes a sigh of relief and becomes that much more himself

Of course, it takes some nerve to do this because somebody sitting there well provided for with a fairly successful valence sometimes feels like he's taking his valence in his hands! And here we go.

One of the more difficult factors in running this just comes up against that. Whenever a person moves out of a valence, he moves into a feeling of degradation for the first few little times that he's tentatively being more himself

All the degradation there is on a case is on self. And it starts coming off the second they start getting rid of valences.

That's one of the reasons you hate to see people go away, because you see somebody go away and you instantly feel that you're kind of degraded. Did you ever notice that? Well, that same sensation of loss will overtake a person for a few commands after he starts to lose Papa.

You know, he hated Papa's guts. If he'd -- and yet, there goes Papa, you know, and -- not too sure that's a good thing, you know. Because a little boy needs Papa! And then there goes the valence.

Well, I hope that information is of some use to you. And I wanted to have some new material to give you here at this congress so I carefully kept that one suppressed from the time I have learned it and handed it over to you.

You won't think it's very good until you watch a pc's face start changing -- „*Well! Came in Papa in one session and went out Mama.*“

Well, thank you very much, and I'll be talking to you shortly.

[End of Lecture]