

## **REST POINTS AND CONFUSION**

A lecture given on 31 October 1956

[Start of Lecture]

Well, I want to talk to you a little bit more about education as she is educated. I want to call to your attention at once the various Axioms of Dianetics. The Axioms of Dianetics, of course, cover the Logics. The Logics, then, actually apply to the whole alignment of education. And you should read those. They can be found in AP&A (Advanced Procedures and Axioms). They can be found in several other places. But those first Logics should be examined by you this week and used as stable data to feed to the preclear in your learning lessons. Got that? Got that?

Those first Axioms which we call Logics: There are a few of them there. Then there's the last one, that nobody has ever been able in my experience to completely grasp, about mathematics and the servomechanism role of the mind. Now, nobody ever gets that one, so you can have a picnic with that one. That will become a very unstable datum before it becomes a stable one.

But these you should use in these learning processes. Those Axioms plus the definitions of education itself consist, then, of the whole field of education in its entirety. And these Axioms and the definitions of education are the backbone of what we are calling right this moment Creative Education -- just to make a specialized field.

Now, this area of knowledge had to exist before Scientology itself could be advanced, and much earlier we knew it as Dianetics. And before this could be -- anything could be done in Dianetics, a great many of these Axioms had to exist, and you will find a whole bunch more of, if anything, an even simpler level of operation in Dianetics: Evolution of a Science.

Now, because they're not underscored and there's no italicized lines in that to amount to anything, you would have to pick them out rather carefully. And so I also recommend to you a look-over of Dianetics: Evolution of a Science, picking up some of the

fundamental principles of what one had to assume in order to go about an investigation of the magnitude of Dianetics and Scientology. And they will give you more stable data to feed to preclears.

Now, I have another list, which are the component parts of auditing, and these you can use as stable data, and I will have that in your hands by tomorrow morning.

But in the main I wish to place this before you: We have had, riding along ahead of the subject itself, all of these data concerning education. In other words, we had those before we had much subject and then, because we were interested in the subject, we neglected the fact that we had all those. It's quite interesting. And so here we have education as a fait accompli, and we have ourselves a very, very nice science, all there, sitting there nicely, smoothly, plus the operating principles of the human mind. You see that? I mean, we accumulated all that afterwards.

Now, having these two things, how can you fail? It doesn't mean that we have a science of education only, but it means we also have a science of education. And it is a neatly packaged science which has been neatly packaged now for approximately five years. So it's one of our oldest possessions. And it is a possession; you should look on it as such.

You could really wobble somebody who is up in the upper strata of education if you just tossed out, in a calm tone of voice, one of those Logics, you see? I mean, it'd probably stop him in his tracks. He'd probably be completely discombobulated.

He couldn't help but agree with it because he must have known this somehow, somewhere -- in an unaccented way -- in order to get anywhere. But he has never evaluated the datum in such a way as to give it the proper accent or importance in use. And he doesn't then have the relative value of the data. He doesn't then know how many things this datum clarified. He has no idea of this. And having no idea, he of course is adrift with it. So you'll get an agreement which is a false understanding.

Now look at this: The agreement would be a false understanding. Why would it be a false understanding? He would agree with the datum as a sort of an „*everybody feels that*“ or „*everybody knows that*“ or „*I knew that all the time except I had never expressed it that way,*“ you see? Got that?

And our next remark on his part is that there are lots of other data just like it. Oh, no, they're not! That is the curious thing. Life went from a simplicity to a complexity, and those postulates which stand in the echelon of simplicity interwove themselves into complexities. And in order to reexamine a complex situation, it is necessary to examine it from the standpoint of simplicity. And when we say a simplicity, then we mean a datum which reevaluates all this class of data. Why does it reevaluate it? Because it -- this large class of data -- stemmed from that datum. And so we have the idea of classes of data clarified or simplified because we have the datum from which they came.

So the evaluation of data is very important. Is this datum important or isn't it? Well, if you have this datum in an important state -- classification -- if you have this datum as

an important datum, it would only be true if that datum clarified an enormous number of related data.

Now, the word clarification here is very necessary. The datum must clarify a class of data. In that way it becomes a stable datum. All right.

Now, right away here let's talk a little bit about the rest point and the confusion. I told you I'd talk to you about this, and here we're heading right into it on the educational front. This shows you how important a concept this is, because it is evidently a pattern which is very native to a thetan's method of going about things. And it is so native to it that I don't know any case that this doesn't apply to. I have not yet found a case that did not proceed to resolve itself on these two things -- the rest point and the confusion.

Any engram is an area of confusion with enough rest point -- good, bad or indifferent -- in it to keep the preclear parked in the confusion. The confusion is there, so he seeks a rest point in the confusion. The rest point must be there so that he can seize it. This is very idiotic of him, and yet every time you try to budge him on this rest point, he gets the confusion. Do you see? You move him on the rest point, he's hit by the confusion. So he tries to go back onto the rest point.

Well, you're good enough these days that you can knock these rest points out of existence. In other words, you can unstick him on the track. Every time you really try to unstick him on a thoroughly stuck point on the track, there he goes into an area of confusion, and he ducks back on to another rest point so as to protect himself against the confusion.

Now, what's all this idiocy about? How'd it ever get started? Well, in the first place, no confusion was ever objectionable until it could impinge itself upon something. In other words, a confusion is not objectionable until it can hit something. You should see this clearly. It can hit something, therefore it's experienced. Now, a confusion just as such is nothing unless it is experienced. The only actual method of experiencing a confusion is to have it impinged against something and experience that something. You see this with clarity? Hm?

Now, you take noise. The noise in this area at this moment would be nothing unless it were impinging against a lecture. You get the idea? But because we have a rest point called a lecture, then the noise can impinge against something and it's objectionable. Then why do we say to somebody, *„You can start pounding scraping screaming and leaping up and down all you want after the hour of lecture?“* Why do we say this? That's because the confusion can impinge upon a rest point. In other words, we get a distracted attention then to some degree, and we get a lot of other factors. But if no rest point were here at all, the pounding and hammering would not really be a confusion.

Please learn this, because it's the whole swindle of *„protect it.“* It's the whole swindle of a thetan is nothing but is something and so on. A thetan got into a confusion one day because he wanted to, but the only way he could experience the confusion he'd gotten into was really to experience one point or something the confusion was hitting. So he chooses this thing to experience and after that the confusion becomes experience. He

could sit in the middle of the confusion without touching a single thing in the confusion and have no confusion because he wouldn't experience it. Do you see that? Huh?

Well, it tells you where this principle cuts in and cuts out. It cuts in all the way south. There's no „*southier*“ thing than this principle of rest point and the confusion. And it cuts out just below the level of postulates as such -- he does things by postulate only. Wherever you have the mechanics of space and particles, then, Axiom 2, you've got the whole problem of the rest point and the confusion. Your preclear is in the confusion looking at a rest point (to which he objects), or he's in the rest point looking at the confusion (to which he objects). That's his lot.

When you start to run him on something like Stop-C-S, you shake him off some of these rest points, the confusion comes in, swush! But how come it could hit him? That's because he's hanging on to a body. If he wasn't hanging on to a body, he wouldn't be hit by the confusion.

I mean, it gets idiotic when you really look this over. When you've got this well digested, you'll laugh like hell, because it's one of these basic swindles of you're damned if you are and you're damned if you're not. Now, you're damned if you don't have any rest points or confusions at all, because you have no experience. See, there's no experience, then you're not doing any living. And you're damned if you do have them, because you've got too confounded much.

And this search for the optimum randomness is simply the search for an optimum series of rest points versus an optimum number of confusions. And you could work that out mathematically. You could just draw it just as nice, but it'd be different as a formula for every person.

Now, the common denominator of it is that there are rest points and confusions, and the common denominator of conditions of experience resulting from these is that the preclear is in a confusion objecting to a rest point, or is in a rest point objecting to a confusion. Now, that's the common denominator of the experience obtainable.

Here we have, by the way, the definition of fuel. Fuel is a confusion impinging upon a rest point. The burning of fuel is the action resulting from this. Now, we look into the chemistry of fuel itself and we find things going whizzing around something that isn't going whizzing. Now, when we alter this we get a bigger whizzingness. When we alter it, then we have pistons going up and down in cylinders which are relatively stationary to the piston. So the cylinder is the rest point and the piston and the burning gases and so forth are the confusion. So we have motion and no-motion.

But it isn't as simple as motion and no-motion. Motion and no-motion doesn't quite describe it, because no-motion does not have to include experience, but the word „*rest point*“ does include experience.

Now, it's a funny thing, but an automobile, no matter how well it's engineered, will go no place unless the automobile itself is impinged against the rest point called Earth. This is something that engineers run into every now and then, and don't articulate well. It's awfully simple. We ran into it when we were making some experiments on flying saucers, wondering if you couldn't drive something in space -- optimum space

drives and so forth. We were having a good time, and the boys were doing a real good job. The only trouble is they found that when something was suspended in air without having any rest point at all, no matter what you did to it, it didn't move. You had to get an interaction between a confusion and a rest point in order to get motion of an object. There had to be a rest point. In other words, you have to take off against something, you see? You have to move in relationship to something.

Well, I'm just showing you here -- I'm actually warning you -- that you can fly off here into the whole of mechanics, aerodynamics, internal combustion engines -- you can just go off at a mad rate and find some optimum level of randomness for you. But... But all we're talking about is the exact common denominator or the central datum of motion, and that is that motion is accomplished by action against a no-action. But this is only experienced when we have a commotion or action impinged upon something that is not in action -- which we call a rest point.

In other words, if you could get the idea of a steel ball suspended in the middle of this room with a tremendous number of particles whamming around the room and occasionally caroming into the steel ball, you have a picture of rest point (the steel ball) and the confusion (the particles which are going around).

Now, the particles do not have to be seen, but they must be experienced. So therefore, you can have a confusion consisting of invisible particles impinging against an invisible rest point -- and we have very adequately described an engram.

Now, compulsive exteriorization is the action taken by the thetan in getting out of the whole thing. He abandons any particle against which the confusion can impinge. He abandons the rest point to get out of the confusion. He does a bunk. So that when an individual has scrambled out of this melee, you audit him back on to a questionable rest point which is sitting in the middle of a confusion. This makes, then, a very interestingly difficult problem for the preclear. The more you audit him, the more he tends to swing back in on this untenable position. Now, he left it because he discovered it was untenable, but something kept a complete picture of it -- the dope! He exteriorized in 1933 out of a moment of pain and unconsciousness -- intolerable motion impinging upon an untenable point -- so he left. He came back in a little later, and he's never again been able to occupy that point. So there he is, sitting out in the cold and damp -- in that engram.

Now, to forward himself back up the track and run the rest of it he has to come back into his head and come up the track. It's a fact that he does. He can't stand off at a vast distance, noncommunicating with the rest point and the motion area, and expect ever to resolve it. So somehow or another he has to face it. He has to confront it because he has to communicate with it, and only by his communication with it will it become null and void.

So that's the mechanic involved. So we have what is called an engram in Scientology. An engram in Dianetics was a mental image picture of a moment of pain and unconsciousness. That's a Dianetic definition. Scientology adds this one: It's a mental image picture of a moment of pain and unconsciousness and compulsive exteriorization.

And we have singled out the most aberrative engrams on the track when we have described them in that fashion.

Now, some preclears are nervous. I can think of several colloquial words to use there, but -- well, let's just say they're nervous. Somebody snaps his fingers and they run out of their heads. It's quite interesting. They redramatize the compulsive exteriorization in a basic engram. They look in a bookstore window and see a particularly delectable, aesthetic picture done by Goya, which is some man in the Spanish War or something who has had a sharp stake driven upward through his body just to show him he shouldn't be a Spaniard or something. And he sees this picture, and the next thing you know he's passing the Empire State Building.

Now, he actually doesn't have a recall of what happened, but the body took some pictures of what happened. So he looks at the pictures to find out what happened, and his fate is sealed. If you feel you have to recover moments of unknownness, then the body already provides a system by which this can be done: You look at the pictures. You've had it! Get the idea?

So there's many a preclear hasn't been there half the time, but he's got pictures of the whole business. I imagine back in the eighties, seventies, when it was so fashionable to faint...

No wonder they fainted, by the way; I've looked over some of their clothes. And some enterprising scientist, using this as an excuse for digging up graves, has exposed to view several skeletons of certain periods down the ages and so on. It's really not possible to contract anybody's rib cage down to a point of where a man can place thumb and forefinger around it, but they did so -- not two hands, one hand. I've seen them. It's just a fabulous thing -- fabulous! How could anybody distort the anatomy that much? Well, they managed it. Now, there are quite a few of them around that have two hands... These were little people too, by the way. You can put your hands around them easily this way, but to put your hands around them easily that way is not possible. Well, let's say the skeleton distorted after it was buried. But anyhow, they exist in museums.

Of course they fainted. What were they using to breathe with? So that every time that you said Boo! she swooned. Well, I don't care how fashionable it was or how unfashionable it was -- don't care at all. The point is that it must have dramatized into existence a lot of these compulsive exteriorizations, and of course resulted in such things as tuberculosis, other things -- such restrictions. The restriction itself would have been bad enough, but they must have kept cutting engrams in with all of this swooning, see, which just says, „*I'm gone!*“

Well, they aren't doing that these days. I don't know why. They're generally picking the man up and taking him swooning off the scene. Oh, that's an exaggeration. There are a lot of women around who don't always have to face the situation in spite of what the man does. There are a lot of them -- but not many. It's becoming stylish now for the woman to become more Herculean.

Maybe that period, though, is kind of over. Come to think about it, probably is. Maybe they're both becoming sort of collapsed. Now, maybe that's the newest variation.

But you get the idea. This whole thing: „*It's too much for me.*“ Get the idea? Well, that is the postulate level. The mechanical level below that means that „*I am sitting on this rest point which is surrounded by a confusion, and I am not now going to further continue my residence upon this rest point because even that is too much for me, and I'm going to abandon all.*“ Does a bunk. Out they go. Swish!

Well, what do you do about it? Well, you put them back in their heads and run them through the incident.

So the bug in all exteriorization was that when you exteriorized somebody, he probably didn't exteriorize in present time. He exteriorized as a dramatization. And doing so, he went out and this disenfranchised him from life, and he behaved not in an improved but in a peculiar fashion. You see? He's disassociated from life.

All right. Confronting is the common denominator of all this. The way out is through; this we know. He has to be able to resume the rest point and the area of confusion somehow or another, so that he will communicate with it. But if he would straightly communicate with it he wouldn't have to resume it. You got this? But if he is unwilling to reassume it he won't communicate with it. So you pays your money and you takes your chance, and that's the way it is.

You got to get him into communication with the thing; that's about the end of it. And that is done by two different processes, completely aside from the learning processes. Two different processes operate in that field: One is the whole series of Confrontingness Processes, and the other is the whole series of substitute processes -- Substitution Processes. These are two classes of processes, both of which an auditor would find extremely interesting if he could look at the pc's own bank action while he was running the process on the pc. So the best way to do is to get it run on you.

Confrontingness: Now, there, on the postulate level and on the mechanical level, is something pretty close to as important as the rest point and the confusion. You're talking about two classes of thing now. Confrontingness adds intention to the condition of the rest point and the confusion. Now we've got a whole intention -- confront -- added to a condition which is simply experience. Now, you see where these two data fit. You see, actually, the mechanical aspect of the rest point and the confusion is one thing, and the intention of confronting or getting something done is another thing; and an auditor, to obtain success on the preclear, has to put them both together.

Now, the truth of the matter is, all valence closure -- now, I say that very advisedly. Below the level of just clean postulate, „*I am Papa. Do something about it*“ -- below that level all valence closure comes from confrontingness. The exact mechanism of valence closure has now been isolated -- isolated it, nailed it down, described it, fixed up some processes to run on it, got it all set, and it's the very neatest package you've got in Scientology today.

Valence: The whole idea of assuming the personality of another. Now, when one simply does this and says, „*I'm Papa*,“ and so forth and that's that, he does it; that's all. But when he says, „*I do not want to be Papa*,“ and then becomes Papa, we find him in an amazingly second-rate condition.

At some time or another he had to want to be something before anything could force him to be anything. So the DEI cycle is in operation here, and a lot of other things are in operation here, but let's just look at it just as a clean look: confrontingness -- valence closure.

When the individual discovers it is impossible to make something confront another thing, he discovers then that he cannot maintain his distance between it and him, and he becomes it; and that's all there is to it. I'm sorry it's that simple but that is valence closure. When an individual cannot maintain the distance between himself and something else and cannot make that thing -- other thing -- continue to maintain that distance, he becomes it.

You might say the whole game of the universe is established -- as far as wins are concerned -- just with this one thing: Which maintained the distance? The one that maintained the distance won.

Now, that's quite amazing. But that isn't any great truth. This is a great truth: That the individual who fails to make something confront others by his own intention, and keeps at it, discovers he cannot maintain the distance and becomes the other object.

Now, you can see this mechanism. This is the easiest mechanism to observe we have anywhere. It's hard for some people to observe an engram, but it's not hard for people to observe this, because if they make the ghostiest shadow of a mock-up, they can make a mock-up confront a wall; and the next thing you know, they're the mock-up. It's wild.

How did you become Mother? Well, maybe you made a postulate to become Mother; that's beside the point. But it's a cinch you couldn't make Mother confront something.

Now, just skip whether or not Mother could make you confront things; that's a no-game condition and doesn't come into auditing at all. It's something that an auditor just completely ignores. That's cause-distance-effect with effect at pc, and we couldn't get less interested. What we're interested in is cause-distance-effect by the pc upon other things, with the pc at cause.

So it's those things which he couldn't make confront things which he became. So the dwindling spiral is always the dwindling spiral of weakness.

This is confirmed by a much earlier observation. We observed... Much earlier I found out that closures with weak universes usually establish the pattern of the case -- the weak universe. That was an isolated datum and I just parked it there, just let it sit there for a long time before new observations accumulated with it.

Then all of a sudden one day, why, I up and dreamed up this process „*Fight the Wall*.“ That's a cruel and bloody process. If you just told a preclear to go over and fight the wall, and you gave him no mattress, he would continue to do so, oddly enough, usu-



ally. Knuckles bloody and the wall full of holes and everything else; and he'd go on fighting the wall, feeling fine -- recover at once. But it's certainly a bloody process, You want to put a big mattress up there, or something, and let him fight the wall with his body and...

This uncorks more cases than you can shake a stick at. Why? Well, because it's confrontingness, rest point (wall), confusion. You're letting the preclear fight something motionless. An amazing process, but a little bit violent, not very well recommended; it's a last-resort sort of process. When Stop-C-S didn't resolve his case, go find a mattress.

Now, the whole idea of confrontingness means that the individual has some particle, object or body which he is trying to make confront some other entity, activity, space, condition -- anything, see? See, the individual is trying to make something confront something else.

Now, tally this in with what I told you about rest point and confusion. The individual cannot possibly be a victim of the rest point and confusion unless he is experiencing via at least one particle. Got it?

You get all sorts of things. You get the individuation of the individual. Once he was the whole confusion, now he's come down to being only one part of the confusion, so forth. He's decided he can't run the whole population, so he decides to be one body. Any way you want to analyze this rest point and confusion sort of thing, we get this condition of must have contact with one or more particles or rest points or confusions in order to have an experience. And now in order to have a game he has to make this thing act! Well, he doesn't want it to act against him, he wants it to act against something else. And so we get confrontingness; we get cause-distance-effect, and that thing we can sum up as confrontingness. Fantastically important principle in modern auditing.

Now, you want to split a valence, you have -- you want to split Mama's valence or something like this, it might be a mistake to have him mock up Mother and make her confront the wall, for the excellent reason that he may use facsimiles, and the next thing you know he's blown out all of the rest-point facsimiles he has for Mother, leaving him nothing but a confusion about Mother.

If you chew up the confusions you get a rest point. If you chew up the rest points you get a confusion. Auditing can do either. You pays your money and you takes your chance. You can change his randomness ratio now for the first time. You can give him a lot more confusions than he had before, and he'll find a whole bunch of new rest points, and he'll change his taste; his appetite will alter. Fellow thinks he has to have tremendous numbers of confusions, why, you can change this balance one way or the other and he'll change his mind. It's quite interesting.

So the rest point-confusion concept here shouldn't confuse you as an auditor. Preclear goes into violent agitation: You blew him off a rest point and put him in a confusion. That simple enough?

Now, the confusion is actual particles in motion. Don't think we're talking about something esoteric. You get the idea? We blow him off the rest point, he'll go into the confusion. So agitation, motion, franticness, leaping up, rushing away from the session, all of these various activities -- activities -- are, of course, the activities of confusion. So we've moved him into a confusion. Answer: Give him some rest points. The individual is sitting stock-still. We can't get him to move, act, enter a game or do anything. The answer: Give him some confusions. You give him some confusions by taking away some rest points, or you just give him some confusions directly, or you take away from him the valence that sat stock-still. You got it? It's a simple mechanism. It's sufficiently simple that I can guarantee it will evade you. I can guarantee it.

We ought to have some method, by the way, of taking a whole bunch of marbles and having a stick in the middle of the pan and making you shake the marbles for a while and say, *„Now, you see those marbles running around that stick? Well, which is moving the marbles or the stick?“*

And you'd think it over for a while and you'd say, *„Well, the marbles.“*

You'd say, *„Fine. That's the confusion. All right, which isn't moving?“*

*„Well, that stick.“*

*„All right. That's the rest point.“*

Now, what would happen if you juggled the stick so it started to run around with the marbles? You wouldn't have any rest point, would you? Well, in the bank, how do you keep the marbles from running around, and the stick, too? Oddly enough, people are perfectly happy if you simply give them another stick erected in the middle of the whole thing. Simple.

Now, Substitution doesn't require an intention, and Confrontingness does, so which is the simpler process? Substitution is the simpler process. It requires no intention to substitute at all, and you will find people substituting some of the wildest things. Now, you can substitute anything you want to for the confusion. You can ask them to substitute anything you want to for the rest point. Either way. You can substitute for the rest point; you can substitute for the confusion. There are direct processes which do this.

Somebody who's too motionless, you could give him an awful lot of confusion. But that, of course, was why he became motionless. So if we take away a few of his motionlessnesses and get him into action and get him moving around and so forth, why, he will have enough confusion since he didn't have so much rest point to absorb it. You just play these things one against the other. You can substitute for the confusion; you can substitute for the rest point. Process: *„Look around the room and find a substitute for the confusion of the last few days.“* Perfectly good process. That's a honey.

Another process: *„Look around the room and find a substitute for (anything you know he has as a stable datum).“*

*„Look around the room and find a stable datum for the confusion caused by Mother.“*

Wording? I couldn't care less. Just the devil with it. It's a mechanical picture: You want him to substitute things for the rest point; you want him to substitute things for the confusion. Either way, we don't care what. You don't even have to use your judgment on the matter; you just know what you're doing. It'll work out some how. Just as silly as that; it will. You give him enough confusions (substitutes for), enough rest points (substitutes for), and he's liable to get over the whole idea of confusions and rest points, and get so that he can move whether he is moved or not. It's a fascinating picture.

Now, you can just pull somebody's bank to pieces with some of these processes. Stop-C-S. Wow! Fight a Wall. Wow! Just pull the bank to ribbons, that's all. Keep good, solid control of your preclear all the way and the next thing you know, the bank is in shreds.

It doesn't much matter if you overdo it or not. What's a bank! If he runs short of banks, take him out and let him spot people whose banks he could have -- which, by the way, is a terrific process. It's a walk-about process: *„Look around here and find somebody whose bank you could have.“* Scientologists would understand this, but so would everybody else if you'd said what the word *„bank“* was -- *„...whose mental pictures you could have“* would probably be the communicating one. It's a killer! That's a killer as a process. That's one of the best processes I know -- next to Substitution. That's a better process. And Confrontingness just takes the whole of the game of life and lays it out in front of your preclear's lap. Bang! There it is.

Now, I'm not exaggerating the workability of these processes. I used to be prone to do this, as you know. Although today some of you guys, really knowing auditing, could take a pc, knock him through a couple of engrams and put him back to battery in an awful rush. But man, does it require control. Look at the amount of rest point and the amount of stable data and the amount of confusion which you're chewing up running somebody straight on through an engram, headlong. Brrrrrrr! It's murder, apparently.

And if you didn't chow him all the way through it, if you didn't shove him all the way through it, if you didn't make the grade, if you let him change his mind, if you let him change to another engram, if you for a moment let up, if you for a moment believed that those pale screams had any effect on you or the neighbors, if you for a moment believed that his onrushing temperature and those dark purple blotches which suddenly appeared upon his cheeks had anything whatsoever to do with your mercy, you were finished. That's a brutal business, running engrams -- still works.

But I don't exaggerate these -- the workability of these processes. The workability is sufficiently good that the results obtained by an auditor using these depends exclusively upon his skill of rendition. It's a hell of a thing. I mean, here are processes which directly require of the auditor his delivery and handling of the preclear. You see, they require that directly. So we have just this variable to work with, is how you do it, how smoothly you handle it and so forth.

We don't care what valences you get rid of in the bank. We don't care how many new valences we have to dream up and substitute for. We don't care anything about any-

thing here -- just to hell with it -- beyond this: Get him to change so that he is in better self-mastery, better control of his surroundings so that he starts handling a bit of life rather than life handles him.

The only dangerous people there are on Earth are those who can handle nothing. Those people are dangerous. We've got one down at the end of Sixteenth Street here: man can't handle his temper -- nothing. It's quite remarkable. He's dangerous. I really just cognited how dangerous. I thought, gee, we were going to get out from under. But this man evidently will get joggled a little bit on some kind of a rest point that he's nebulously sitting on, and it throws him right into the middle of a fantastic anger confusion, see? And he's mechanically rocking back and forth between these confusions and rest points, just on a totally mechanical basis. He doesn't put himself into the anger, something puts him into the anger. You get the idea? So this is no self-control, we might say.

Now, the funny part of it is, when you raise the ability to handle the environment, you raise the ethical level. That is the fabulous little trigger in life that belies all former efforts at education and says they were for the birds, says they should have been ditched. Hypnotic type of education, a demand level -- you've got to memorize it and quote it directly back and so forth -- why, this was certain to lower the ethical level. So much so that the entire field of education no longer has these two things -- morals and ethics -- separated. You look in the dictionary and you read morals, it says it's ethics; and you look in the dictionary at ethics and it says morals. This is fabulous, because these two things are entirely different items.

All right. Now, the rest point and the confusion, the confusion and the rest point: you play these things back one against the other. Now, if an individual can't confront things, then by golly, how are you going to get him to confront this engram containing confusion and rest points? So you get him to handle it by substitution, and he cannot help but communicate with it if he substitutes for it. It's real cute. It remedies his havingness at the same time, if you do it objectively. You ask him to substitute for it, and he then is communicating with it. And as he's communicating with it, it all of a sudden ceases to have any punch at all. He finds out, in other words, that he's tougher than he thinks.

And now, you going to do this substitution thing and give him a crutch and make him hobble down life's avenue to the end of his days just on the basis that everything really makes the bank quiver, he's got to substitute things for, and he's got to go through some careful process or go find an auditor? No. No, then you have to take up Confrontingness.

What are you trying to do with people? You're trying to make them confront things.

Now, we get into the field of business personnel activity. The only people in the organization who are causing management any trouble are the people who can't and won't confront things. And sooner or later the manager begins to feel sad, tired, and have ulcers. You find out which person he knew he couldn't make confront things had ulcers. He's taken on the valence of those things he can't make confront things. It proves to him that he's an effect. Don't you see that?

How would you do this Confrontingness? Oh, well. „*Mock up Mother and make her fight the wall.*“ That's good enough. That's fair. That's a close approach.

„*Mock her up and make her fight the wall.*“

„*Okay. That's fine. Mock her up and make her fight the wall.*“

„*Good. That's fine. Mock her up and make her fight the wall.*“

„*Mock her up and make her fight the wall.*“

„*Mock her up and make her fight the wall.*“

That's a fairly good entrance, but of course it requires first that one must be able to mock up Mother. Well, you can have her mocked up at least thinly in order to go on this.

Now, this takes some motion out of it, don't you see, and a rest point out of it, all at the same time and is a pretty good process.

A less good but far more spectacular process, as very often happens, is simply: „*Mock up Mother and make her face the wall.*“ „*Mock up Mother and make her confront the wall.*“ Either way.

„*Make her confront the wall.*“

„*Make her confront the wall.*“

„*Make her confront the wall.*“

„*Make her confront the wall.*“

Oh, Mother will do all sorts of wild things. So will Father, so will Grandfather, Grandmother, aunts, uncles; and all of a sudden, as he's checked off all the valences in his life -- all the people he's ever known -- there will be one that he's somehow overlooked to tell you about -- you know, the drunken uncle or something of the sort. You better have some more valences he could make confront the wall before you run into this drunken uncle, because the preclear puts that one up and it goes slap! snap! right back on him. He puts it up, bang! puts it up, bang! puts it up, bang! puts it up, bang! puts it up, bang! You're just at it for a long time. You're in for a long haul.

Then pretty soon, why, by being Uncle at the wall and by straining every fiber (thetans do have an awful lot of trouble with their fibers), he is able to keep the mock-up there confronting the wall. And then eventually he merely uses effort and then eventually simply holds the mock-up in there by postulate and then eventually can do it rather easily. And the odd part of this is at this time you will say, „*Well now, how do you feel about drink?*“ (Maybe this was a drunken uncle, you know?)

„*Drink? What's the matter with drink?*“ It's rather peculiar that he'd change his mind this fast.

Now, there's a whole bunch of valence splitters I put out in a recent HCO Bulletin which are very, very good. Oh, you didn't see them; they were just staff auditor release. And they wind up with the little gem of „*Make (blank) fight the wall.*“ See? „*Mock*

*up (blank) and make him fight the wall.* “ Well, of course, the oddity and the peculiarity is, is this is all the process there is there, really. Got it?

Now, why do you say fight? That's because it's the rest point and the confusion at the same time. Its confrontingness and so forth. It's all up in one. Just confront may occasionally make your pc as-is all of the rest points that he's got in facsimiles for Mother, see, and that throws him into a confusion. You don't get off with it successfully.

But we have this whole picture here, and a rather interesting picture it is, of a preclear sitting stuck on a time track. Why is he stuck on a time track? Well, he is stuck on a time track because he is on a rest point. Why is he on a rest point? Because it's so confusing there, of course! That's logical. Simple Simon- type of logic. It's the  $A=A=A$  computation. He better be on that rest point or it'll be an awful lot more confusing.

Now, what does 8-C do? It simply shows him that there are rest points in present time. That's all it does -- brings him up to present time.

All right. There in that rest point-confusion situation, other engrams have pulled in on this, usually, making a nice confused bundle, in some of which he is the confusion objecting to a rest point. So you get both of each in a preclear. You get the person who is in the confusion objecting to the rest point, and you get the person who is the rest point objecting to the confusion, all in the same preclear. So he runs in a phase. He runs in phases. First he'll be the rest point. Then he'll be the confusion. Then he'll be the rest point. Then he'll be the confusion. Then he'll be the rest point and confusion: So don't be too particular about which one you handle.

But remember that this working rule lies back of everything: The common denominator between any object and a thetan is motionlessness -- stop -- because stop is native to a thetan and motion isn't. You then get further by running stops than by running changes or motions. And he comes out into a better action by running stops. If you try to run change on them, they go half mad sometimes on this kind of a condition.

All right. Now, the next thing: What can you do about it? What you can do about it with any pc is one or more, no matter how you do it, Substitution Processes -- Substitution Processes. And you can wrap up these Substitution Processes rather easily.

*„Look around and find a substitute for your mother's.*” It's simple as that. You don't have to say your mother's anything. You just *„Look around and find a substitute for Mother.*” *„Look around and find a substitute for Mother's confusion.*”

*„Look around and..*” You know, spotting processes. And it amazes you, the  $A=A=A$  computation that you immediately see roll out.

*„A substitute for Mother? Oh, I don't know. That... No connection whatsoever. That uh... uh... Well, it's... yes. That's very good. A substitute for Mother would be that dot over on the wall.*”

Try in vain to get an association between that! Well, that's because she is at the absolute level of identification and so anything substitutes for Mother. So it becomes a very unusually workable process.

Now, the next version of this is less easy for the auditor to control and is less successful but is sometimes quite necessary, and that's Subjective Substitution.

*„Oh, you were in the army, eh? Well, tell me what could have withstood that experience in the army?“*

*„Oh,“ the fellow says, „what could have withstood it?“*

You're asking him, in essence, an individuality that could cope with it, see? What could have withstood it? All right.

*„Oh!“ he says, „Oh, nothin'!“*

*„Oh,“ you say, „come on now. Come on now. Something could have withstood all that. Some object? Some person? Some thing?“*

*„Well, my mother could have withstood it!“*

That's where the boy is sitting right this minute, in his mother's valence. So you ask him at this moment, then, to mock up Mother and mock up Mother and mock up Mother and mock up Mother. In other words, any stable datum he gave you that would have withstood the confusion, you now ask him to mock up -- right out there in the middle of the floor -- and you get him to do it and do it and do it and do it and do it and do it and do it, until he can do it easily and the confusion is no longer kicking him to pieces. But if you do that and reduce the confusion in the vicinity of that stable datum that he was using, you then have to furnish him with some more confusions. So you can have him mock up confusions, mock up confusions -- any way you want to do it, but you have him mock up some confusions, too. You got it?

And after you've got all of those Substitution Processes flat, you then have confrontingnesses, and if that doesn't exteriorize them it's because there's no thetan there!

Thank you.

[End of Lecture]