

# MECHANICS OF COMMUNICATION

A lecture given on  
14 December 1954

I'm going to give you in a very fast rundown now the mechanics of communication – the cycle of communication.

Get an idea of a horseshoe, turn it on its side. All right, one tip of the horseshoe we have Joe. Now, up at the curve of the horseshoe we have – but the same side – the same arm that Joe's on – we have Bill. Now we go a little bit further around the curve and we have Bill' and we come all the way around the curve to the other tip and we have Joe'. Got that graph in mind? Got that graph in mind?

All right. Let's take another horseshoe. Face it the opposite direction. Now, one of the tips we will name Bill. We go up around to the start of the curve on it and we have Joe. And we go around to Joe' and then we go back to Bill'. If I've described this correctly you have two horseshoes. Course of the communication is: communication origin – communication origin, let us say in this case is Joe. All right. It is received by Bill. Bill having received it answers it, this is Bill'. Bill' having answered it, it is acknowledged by Joe'. So the sequence is: origin, receipt, answer origin, acknowledgment. Or very briefly: origin, receipt, answer, acknowledge. [See diagram in Appendix, this volume.]

Now, we understand that one of those horseshoes is – just one of them – is a cycle of communication. That's a cycle. Now, both horseshoes make a two-way cycle of communication. That's a two-way cycle, a little bit different than what we understood this before. We've been understanding it too simply. All right, we have a two-way cycle of communication, and it works this way; Joe says, “Uh – hiya, Bill?” Bill hears this. Bill says, “I'm okay.” And by some sign, simply by his attention, by a gesture or by a spoken word, Joe acknowledges Bill's answer. The total communication cycle is from Joe to Joe', for one cycle.

Now, to complete this and make it a two-way cycle, we've got to take the other horseshoe, and we have to have our good friend Bill originate a communication. And he says, “Well, how are you, Joe?” And Joe hears this and Joe says, “I'm fine.” And then Bill' now acknowledges by some gesture or merely having received it you see. Now, there is a complete two-way cycle of communication. There are really no further parts to communication. There is really not an other to others section, since this is a significance which could never come into being unless Joe or Bill were part of that communication system. And in the case where you have others to others, you merely find our people at the receipt-point. They're no place

else. They are spectator, get the idea? They are spectators. But we haven't altered our two-way cycle of communication in any fashion. We still have these boys at the receipt-point. Now on one of these horseshoes, at the tip, there, we had Joe, and Bill was the receipt-point, you see. He didn't originate an answer yet, he was just right there at receipt-point. Silent. You got that?

But we find the acknowledgment or the gesture or whatever it is; normally Bill, in the position we have just mentioned, would simply be silent but he'd make – he'd probably – some little response there that isn't a complete answer and then he answers, you see. Well, similarly you have another receipt-point back there at Joe', at the other tong of origin. See, we've got this boy at a receipt-point, so in one cycle of communication we have two receipt-points. And in a two-way cycle of communication we have four receipt-points, don't we? There are four receipt-points, two on each cycle are relatively silent. And there's the position of the other to others. This fellow is observing, he is an observer.

Now, the one thing this universe or any other universe tries to convince you of is the fact that you should be silent, that the truth is actually silence; that there is silence and one must not communicate.

A wise old owl sat in a holk. The more he saw the less he spoke. The less he spoke the more he heard. Why can't we all?

*[Ed note: A holk is a hollow or cavity.]*

Poppycock and patter dash of this character is the woof and the warp of this universe. The only thing you can do to be punished in this universe is to communicate. That's the only crime there is in the whole universe; communicating. And that is the only way a thetan can go to his death; stop communicating. You'll find your preclear hung up everywhere he stopped communicating. Because when he stopped communicating he stopped making time, he stopped making a shift-motion of particles, the consideration that time is going forward. He put time into an other-determined characteristic. And of course we find the psychologists involved in a spectator science. "If I just sit here long enough, maybe I'll see something." That is the way they go. So of course we find these people not originating anything because that's the biggest scarcity of all.

Now, how does a person get into a point where he hits just these receipt-points? Which is to say the primary receipt-point; you know Joe over here at the edge of the horseshoe says, "How are you, Bill?" Now, Bill is the primary receipt-point. Then Bill answers and we come back here to the acknowledgment-point which is friend Joe'.

All right. These people as they converse, get into a myriad of complexities of significances, all kinds of aberrations on the line. But what is the first and foremost aberration on this line? It is not, in the graph I just mentioned to you, Bill' back to Joe'. That is not. That is practically unanimously believed to be the only possible way that you could aberrate a communication line, and that is – it's not true. The primary aberration on the communication line is a failure of origin. Failure to originate a communication, failure to originate, that is the point.

All right. Let's take a look at this real fast. You're a little kid, you've been moved all over the world, you've been moved all over the country, you've been shoved from this house to that house and so forth. Every time you walk into a new group you said, "My name is Jack.

How are you? My name is Jack.” What are you doing when you do that? You are originating a communication, aren't you, huh? Perforce, you were the one who was originating the communication. And then you went to another town or another school or another grade or something of the sort and you said, “My name is Jean.” And then you went around to another sorority and so forth. “My name is John.” And then you were shoved to another class and in view of the fact you couldn't take that class you walked in and you said, “My name is Mary.” In other words, here we go time after time after time after time, we're physically originating. We can see this. It isn't as important to physically originate as it is to mentally originate. The physical side of it is simply something that gets – the mental communication balks – becomes solid and we have the physical side of the universe.

All right. Walk in, introduce, see? Originate the communication particle, originate the communication particle, originate the communication particle, originate the communication arragh, arragh. Nobody comes up to you and says, “My name is Jack, my name is John, my name is Jean, my name is Mary.” Nobody says this to you, see. The – you don't have strangers coming up all the time saying – you're not the best of interest sitting there, you see you with these strange people who wander around walking in the front door all the time. Get the idea? Just out of that alone what would you do eventually? You would begin to compulsively originate communications. You would be compelled to originate communication because you are the only one that originates the communications. Get the idea? In other words you keep playing this one horseshoe – one horseshoe – one horseshoe one horseshoe one horseshoe. And you'll say, “My God, obviously there's no other horseshoe.” Obviously no other cycles of communication can possibly exist.

All right. Now, most of humanity is involved in an exterior – oh, this is a very, very neat one, this is real, this is real clever. Most of humanity is involved in an other-determined causation or communication.

Now, let's get the idea. An accident happens, so they gab – gab – gab – walla – walla walla. The newspaper comes out, so they gab – gab – gab – walla – walla – walla. So, Marilyn Monroe comes out and you get gab – gab – gab – walla – walla – walla. And they see a movie and they come home and they tell each other the plot to this damn movie and I – I used to say when I was a little boy – I still had something of the writer in me when I was – when I was young and I've said that people used to come in and tell me about the plot of this movie and I almost used to blow mine or their brains out. I've heard more people come in and tell you the plot of the movie just as though this is what they've been looking at, they've been looking at acting, colored technology, bright lines and so forth and they come home and tell you the plot. The one thing that you could certainly do without.

Anyhow – anyhow we have an exterior origin of communication which then swings them into communication lines. You follow this? They see an accident. That is what we know – what we know as the boot in the pants necessity level. These people can't act until they get an other-determined necessity level. They get down to a point after a while where they only act in terms of emergency. That is necessity level. It is necessity. It is an other origin of sufficient magnitude to put them on a communication line. Now, what is imagination and how does imagination go by the boards? It goes by the boards in a very, very simple fashion.

The individual stops originating communications. And that is the failure of his imagination. And we could say it works either way but the truth of the matter is that he stops originating communications, he stops being an origin-point on this line and his imagination fails. And that's the way it goes about it. He can get back on the origin-point and have his imagination revive it. Just start originating communications on a two-way cycle of communication – now we're talking about processing of it. If he were just to originate to people walking up and out of the blue sky saying “Hello” you know, “How are you? My name's Joe. How are you? Hello.” You'd all of a sudden find his imagination starting to wind up.

Follow me? His imagination would start to revive. All right. These boys who can only act on emergency, these people whose imaginations have gone by the boards... Let's take for instance a painter or a writer who was once a painter, a writer or a musician, something like that and he isn't doing so well these days. All you'd have to do is supply the scarcity of exterior origins. This boy who has been chasing all around the world, walking into new groups all the time, you know, announcing himself. We don't mock up masses announcing themselves to him, we simply mock up people approaching. Just the idea, see, of people approaching and saying “Hello, how are you? My name's Iskowitz.” Anything like this you see? And we have this as communication origin.

All right. Let's look at pan-determinism. You know about pan-determinism. You'd better had. Pan-determinism is the willingness to start, stop and change, along the dynamics. The degree of pan-determinism which the person has is his willingness to start, stop and change along the dynamics. In other words to monitor other dynamics, that is pan-determinism.

Self-determinism leads down to control of self and control of self is actually a last ditch. Of course, that's more upstairs than where man is right now. But this is still – even self-determinism would be a last ditch. Now in view of the fact that the universe operates simply because two things must not occupy the same space – let's go over this real rapidly – two things must not occupy the same space. If two things must not, cannot occupy the same space, you'll have a universe in space and everything different and detached and you have high individuality and all that sort of thing. But if two things start occupying the same space, completely violating the laws of Count Alfred Korzybski and general semantics – if they start occupying the same space, gahh, they do it compulsively and obsessively, you have aberration and identification. If it is done in complete knowingness, awareness and alertness, you just go into communication with everything in the universe, that's all, on a knowingness basis. If you do it on an unknowingness basis, an unconscious basis, you wouldn't communicate with everything in the universe anyhow, but you do it on an unknowingness basis. It's alarming.

All right. This is the difference between other-determinism and pan-determinism would be the difference between knowing you're doing it and others doing it to you or through you, see. You know you're doing it or you don't know you're doing it.

All right. Pan-determinism happens to be the highest key point which we have in theory and practice today. A very precise definition of it, the operating definition of it is: The willingness to control two or more identities whether or not opposed. Now that is the action definition. Willingness to control two or more identities whether or not opposed. You

disentangle that and you find out that the robber walks up to the guy and says, “Uh – you're, uh – anything you – anything you say will be used against you,” or “Stop in the king's name” or – let's see, what do robbers say? And we have these – this boy does this and the other boy puts up his hands and says “Oh no, don't – don't shoot – don't shoot – don't shoot,” and so forth. He's not being pan-determined at all. The proper thing to do is to be back of the robber's head and go away. That's the proper thing to do.

Well, now an individual if he were pan-determined would not particularly cavil – at which side of this individuality he was on or both. If an individual is pan-determined he would just as soon monitor the robber as monitor the other party and it isn't really a definition which grows out in addition to himself. You know. He would be willing to monitor other things in addition to himself No, no, you see that's an incorrect interpretation. Because if he's willing to monitor other things, himself is anything he cares to make himself you see. There isn't then a vested interest called himself. See, total pan-determinism.

All right. Now, however desirable or undesirable this would be from a standpoint of a mores of the society, it does happen that – here is a flagrant example, that on the second dynamic a person who is insisting on being the male partner and nobody but the male partner and being very, very insistent upon the fact that his sexual partner is a female and an other-determinism, you see? And if the lady in this case or the girl in this case would be also insistent that she was a self you see. And the other party, you see, was a male. They've got this big insistence you see on each one being an individuality, do you know that no – if we reduce this to the complete state of insistence on the other individuality, there is no sexual sensation interchanged. This is a curious thing. The nymphomaniac, the satyr are in this state. They are being so totally themselves and insisting so thoroughly on everybody else being somebody else, you see, than themselves, that they have broken down existence to an impossible form. And they get no communication. Now, anytime you sit down and you say, “I am here, and it's all over there and I am me and it is it and they are them” you go immediately out of communication, pew! Just as neat as you please. Because communication doesn't happen to depend upon space. Communication depends upon the ability to be. Space is a mechanic, energy is a mechanic, even a formula is a mechanic.

Now, I have just described to you, just described to you here, the highest possible, it is the highest possible echelon of aberration, at least in this universe, with this set of agreements, and that is this two-way communication and where people get stuck on these two horseshoes. They get stuck in that so thoroughly they can see only the mechanics. But in order for communication to exist, pan-determinism has to exist.

Now we had Joe, Bill; Bill, Frank; Joe, Frank; and on the other horseshoe we had Bill, Joe; Joe', Bill', didn't we? Does this worry the fellow who could be at any one of these points with perfect confidence? No it doesn't. It does not worry him a bit. So all we have to say to a preclear of course is “Just be willing to be at all these points there are on the graph.” And show him what the points are and just be willing to be at all these points and the fellow is immediately Clear. Unfortunately this is not the case. He's sufficiently bogged down into this; he has agreed to it so long, this two-way cycle of communication is intensely aberrative to him so he is not able to escape from this trap, unless he's assisted. So he has to assist him up along the lines of furnishing answers and so forth and it just works like a breeze because this

is the highest echelon of aberration. The stops, stuck flows, resistances, compulsions, compulsive flows and so forth on these two horseshoes.

All right. What then monitors it out? Now you see if pan-determinism – we're very lucky that the universe is rigged so that the closer you approach pan-determinism and the more you are willing to be anything in the universe the more you're willing to start, stop and change and control anything in the universe, actually the more universe you can have and the more space you can have and it just works out gorgeously. Now supposing pan-determinism didn't exist, supposing we were all – we had to be set on Korzybski's one thing must occupy its space and this is different from that because two things can't occupy the same space. This by the way is a total confirmation of the physical universe and tells you why your general semanticist goes gradually out of communication; is his insistence on this basic law and his continuous agreement on this basic law that two things mustn't occupy the same space. That's right there – Korzybski writes practically about nothing else. He goes on book after book or page after page, book after book confirming this fact that these things are different, because so on. Of course he gradually goes, book after book, and goes compulsively out of communication.

Have you ever read *Science and Sanity*? He starts out in midflight on the first page; it says it's the first page of the book, but you sure wouldn't believe it. They obviously – refers to about four other pages that are missing or a couple of chapters or something. It's a dislocated area immediately.

All right. This law, this basic – oh, by the way, this guy is tremendous, I'm not running him down, I mean I'm just giving you the one single point that this guy was hepped on that made it fail. We know there's been a failure in general semantics. We're quite aware of that. But where was that failure? It wasn't in personalities and it wasn't in theory. His theory is gorgeous. His mathematics beautiful. It's just that one point that insistence on two things cannot occupy the same space and therefore they're different. These two cigarettes are different cigarettes because they're not occupying the same space. Or if they were occupying the same space they'd be the same cigarette. Would they? No. No, they can both occupy the same space and be different cigarettes. It's a matter of consideration. There you have a dependency on space to make everything different for you. The second you get into that rat race you're really in a rat race. Dependency on anything to make anything different for you or change anything for you is real wild unless you're dealing – and you have to be real careful with this – you have to deal with actual elements themselves. And if you start dealing with the actual elements themselves, boy can you communicate because you're knocking out communication barriers. It gets rather rough going communicating because you're racking up against communication barriers and going through communication barriers and so forth, when you're communicating on this subject. It's utterly fantastic to be sitting and talking about communication. I mean this is real wild to do so with any degree of success at all this hasn't happened before. I mean we're really doing something.

All right. Look, if it were true that the physical universe was all true and that this communication formula got this way and the communication formula was unalterable except in terms of the physical universe, you know how you'd have to process somebody? You'd have to have people keep walking in the door and saying “How are you, Joe?” you see and

then saying goodbye and going away. And walking in the door. You'd have to set it up in physical mock-up everywhere. You know if you did that it wouldn't work? That's why processing is – this is the old gag you know, you say processing in the MEST universe – by MEST universe – doesn't work. But processing in a fellow's own universe does work. It's because processing in his own universe raises his pan-determined character. And processing the physical universe simply keeps pandering along to an other-determined situation.

So, what do we do to cure this communication formula? Well, the first leg up on it is to adequately get it out of the road for the fellow so that he recognizes that in the terms of the physical universe there is an answer. But all the time we're doing this we're drilling him on pan-determinism. All the time, you see. 'Cause we have him mock up answers, mock up answers, mock up answers. When was the last time he made somebody else facing him really answer? Do you get the idea? When was the last time when somebody was talking to him he didn't want to have talk to him, that he was three feet behind their head and sent them home? When did this happen? It must be way back on the track someplace. I don't know, that's beside the point.

But we run it on a pan-determined basis. We get him putting these ideas around, these communication ideas around. And cancelling out these silences by filling them full of ideas. By the way, the fellow doesn't even have to have sonic in order to make this work. He's – just basically the idea is – he spotted these ideas around. And he is taking over all the times when he met silences which he couldn't control. And you will find them in space opera and everything else if you keep on running this sort of thing. Sitting up there alone in space, you see, with everything black around him and all of a sudden a rocket hitting him in the guts, you know, from some unknown area. Nobody to talk to at that moment, awfully silent.

All kinds of incidents of this character to run out where he was being the only one, the only identity, where he was surrounded by silences. And so we have this situation where with the processing we rehabilitate the pan-determinism of the individual over all points of this curve. But the points of the curve we are not interested in are the silent points of the curve. We want him to pan-determine that they're going to talk. You understand? That they're going to move, that they're going to circulate. That we're going to have action, motion, in other words life and time. Where there's been an absence of life, an absence of talk and an absence of motion. Where there has been silence – no time. And that's the end of it.

Now, actually with those processes we recognize with great clarity that it would be very difficult to run such processes on a person whose power of decision was shot to hell. So, we have such a thing as 8-C. Let's take a preclear; he can't follow your orders, he doesn't know what you're saying, he's sitting there processing something else actually. You see, he's not processing – you're not processing a preclear, you're processing something – just processing some mass. The various problems which we get mixed up with. If you told him an order he would do something else and tell you he had followed your orders. He goes dead silent when he should be talking and he talks when he should be silent. And he has lost contact to a very marked degree with present time and if you ask him real quick he'd probably tell you he was just getting ready to route some of the dead at Saratoga. Whatever this was that this boy is doing it certainly must be bettered and so we have those processes which are immediately addressed to this betterment which is forming a two-way communication with

the preclear, getting him into some communication with something and then getting him around and running some 8-C on him and getting him under orders and discharging some of his feelings about orders and so on.

In other words we pull him up the line. We might even run some Opening Procedure by Duplication on him. We might remedy a little havingness, we – and so on. We get this guy right up out of any danger of being in the psychotic or neurotic band in other words. Get him up into normal band, move him up to the upper end of the normal band, with the six basic processes of which we know – that is if he was not exteriorized at the moment. We wouldn't care whether he exteriorized or not, just skip that. We could then start remedying various sections and sectors of these communication formulas he's at fault with. See?

Now we started processing a psychologist – one of the unluckiest things that a Scientologist or Dianeticist ever undertook was the processing of a psychologist. This is horrible. That is because the boy is fixed over there on an observer point. We even find Einstein, great guy, but we even find Einstein completely stuck on the observer. The only thing which a scientist has any right to do whatsoever is observe. He should – he even describes this, he should stand at the hole in the wall and look through a hole at the needle of the meter and all he should ever report is how much the meter wiggles. This is a direct quote; I'm not giving you a bum steer.

Well, now if this is – if this is – the observer is in a bad way – if the observer is in a terribly bad way, we have to get him out of this: sit back and look at what is happening in the bank attitude towards processing, see? We have to snap him out of that. We would snap him out of that with a two-way communication with some 8-C, you know, a little Straightwire or something like this. We'd get him up there to a point of where he was able to observe and execute orders. Something he's not been doing. He could move around, he'd be feeling lots better. He'd think this was – must be the end of processing. You know, I mean the processing must be about all over because he's never felt this good before. We've got him up into the upper band of Homo sap in other words. Somewhere around there. We don't have his sonic on or visio or anything like that. Boy, we better charge in there and remedy all that damn silence that has got him parked at the receipt-point of the horseshoe. He's parked there. We never process into silences. Let's remember that. The guy we are processing is parked at the silent spots. Now, the silent spots, the chief silence spot of course is the receipt-point of the original, the originative communication. We've got this horseshoe up here and at the open top end we have Joe. Then we swing into the other end of the horseshoe here and we have Bill. He's a preclear. See. He's over here like this. Silent. See, he doesn't do a Bill'. At least for God sakes let's get him to be Bill'. What a terrific difference it would make if we could move him off of being so exclusively Bill and get him over here to Bill' so that he would then answer so that Joe' over here could get off of this cycle. See? Now the only thing that happens to these boys; there's only two spots where being stuck is very serious.

Now, we take this one cycle I just had before, Joe here, at the open end tip of the horseshoe, and we come in with this to Bill. Joe says, "How are you?" Bill receives this. All right. That's receipt-point. We call that receipt-point. That is stuck spot for preclear. There is the point where he's going to move into eventually and stick at and study psychology.

Now, let's look at the other point he could be stuck on this curve. Do you know there's another point he could be stuck, and there's hardly an auditor alive that isn't stuck there, at least somewhat. And that's at the acknowledgment-point. At Joe'. You see it's a different kind of a stuck point. It's a different kind of a receipt-point. Bill' emanated an answer and this answer missed to some degree Joe'. There really isn't a Joe' there. The totality of the communication lag is from Joe to Joe' on this curve. Now compulsive or obsessive originator of communication is in far, far better shape than a person stuck over at the receipt-point. This guy's at least fighting moving into the receipt-point. He'll move in there eventually. But he's making a good fight of this. The only trouble with his communication lag, we're speaking of lags, is that his communication line is Joe-Joe. See, Joe, Joe – and he'll begin to talk about Joe, Joe – too. See? He never moves out around the rest of the cycle. He just compulsively originates communications and without it being received, answered or anything else. Right? He states a certain Joe. So, actually what people find the most fault with is Joe to Joe', pardon me Joe, Joe communication or if we take the other curve, the Bill, Bill communication.

They think that is a horrible lag. They get upset about this lag. They get more upset about this lag than the first receipt-point. That receipt-point's the dangerous one.

This fellow out here was on Joe, Joe, you know, compulsive origination of communication consistently is sooner or later going to slide in over there at the receipt-point and get silent. Don't worry about him until he does. But he'll still originate communications, compulsively or obsessively and is in better shape than somebody who is silent.

Now, we start looking around for decayed thetans or upset cells or something like this and we find these boys are protecting, hiding the truth. The truth is silence. See, that's truth. It is an ultimate truth. Only they're protecting and hiding an ultimate truth with energy. That's a different thing, see. They're maintaining that they're truthful, they're truthful. Look you can't talk at all and be truthful. If you talked at all, even vaguely, if you go down the street and say, "How are you Joe?" You're not telling the truth. That's not a truthful utterance. "How are you Joe?" In the first place you've got to pretend you don't know how Joe is. That's the first lie in it. The second lie in it is that you want an answer. You can look at him and tell. And again, you expect him to answer. And so you get into thousands, millions, billions, binary digits of mechanisms by which to keep some communication and motion in action. And when you slide out of this completely and say, "I'll tell the truth, it is all truth, I will agree 100 percent, I will protect the truth" you're dead. Isn't that horrible. The necessity for a problem comes about through a scarcity of answers. But it's still better to have a problem in action or in motion than it is to have silence. Of course silence is the truth and a person should be able to be silent on a self-determined basis or speak on a self-determined basis. But this is an awful quiet universe, so is any universe awfully quiet. And a thetan dreams up all kinds of mechanisms by which to have some communication and then he has some time and then he has some motion and he has some life and in the absence of communication he has none of these things.

So, we say that any mass or anything we have fun with or any problem that we are playing with and so forth is obviously a set of lies. And you and I as auditors know very well when we're looking at the preclear that there's an awful lot of things wrong with him that he just thinks are wrong with him, that really aren't wrong with him. But do you know there really is something wrong with him? His silence. His silence is wrong with him. And that is

what's wrong with him. He has fought silence and lost. And he will get over into a bracket of talking about the truth when he talks and he will be stuck on this whole thing called truth.

Just as artwork is a consideration bad or good, it's a consideration, you see. A lie or a truth could be a consideration, but there happens to be an actual truth and that actual truth is silence and no light. Anything that's got communication, noise, confusion, flow or anything like that has perforce to be a pretense. So we have to get the preclear up to where he can play a game.

Another one of our factors falling into place. We have to get him up there where he can pretend. And we have to get him up there where he can imagine. Because if he can't imagine he can't communicate with anybody. Are you going to depend on all these lies to do your imagining for you? Huh!

There's nothing sadder than this fellow who goes out and sits down in a car and just because it's nicely shaped, thinks it's going to make some time or furnish some action for him. It's not going to furnish any time or action. He has to have every idea of where he's going to go. Every idea of what he is there. He has to have the idea of what the car is. He has to have the idea of what he's doing with the car. He has to have the idea of who else he's going to pick up and take around in this car before the car has any meaning whatsoever. No mass has any meaning unless it is placed there by the thetan. It has no meaning, it has no use, it has no action and when it gets into a total automaticity the person is depending upon an other-determinism to furnish action for him, he's dead. He goes then himself into silence. And if he does this for seventy-four, seventy-six trillion years, of course he will settle down at last into the silence of knowing it's all being done for him. And he's set. And when the auditor gets hold of him – when the auditor gets hold of him, the auditor has to bring him out into the daylight. And the way to bring him out into the daylight is to raise his pan-determinism. And the way to raise his pan-determinism is by remedying the scarcity at these various points on the communication cycles. And you have to remedy the points on these two cycles. Now that is the road.

And of course raising a person's pan-determinism is also raising his power of decision. You know that a psycho let's you push him around in a room. And this psycho is just doing fine walking over touching the wall, letting go of it and so forth. And you ask him first, you ask him who's doing it and if they're real bad off; oh no you'll say “My god I should never have asked that question.” And so somebody who has – we're just going along fine here and he says, “Well,” he says, “Uh, actually this damn DScn and so forth taught me how to do this and that kind of thing – haven't particularly wanted to do it.” The best thing to do obviously is raise this person's power of decision so we start him on part C of Opening Procedure of 8-C: “Make up your mind to let go and let go.” Ding-ding-ding. Auditor just wishes he'd just never mentioned it.

The person is insufficiently in communication, he's too much into silence. He is too much surrounded by other-determinisms which have to – far too much power on him to ever dare or adventure to make a decision on his own. This would be an utterly incredible thing. Yet a decision on one's own and the primary origin of a communication are cousins, if not brothers. Decide, the biggest decision he can make. Decide to originate a communication. You see, that's about the biggest decision he could make. Decide to originate.

He gets all sorts of things. It's got to be original. It must never have been done before, you know? Of course everything always has been done before and therefore I couldn't of – oh, lots of rationale here. But all it means is simply I'll say “Hello Joe.” This time usually Joe walks up to me, you know and he says – he says “How are you Bill?” but this time I'm going to say “How are you Joe?” before he gets a chance.

As a matter of fact Joe is so unaccustomed to having things originated and communications in his vicinity, he's a rather outgoing sort of a fellow, if a bit obsessive or something like that, that you'll actually give him pain if everybody started to originate communications in his area, you see? People would come up and say, “How are you Joe?” People walk into the shop and talk first you know and they say, “How are you Joe, How are you Joe?” “Well Joe, what can we do for you today?” You know this guy will turn on a somatic. It's that rare maybe in his experience. Maybe if you didn't have artists and newspapers to talk about accidents and morgues and if you didn't have movies, offspring of the artist and so forth, maybe the society wouldn't talk at all anymore. See, if you didn't have TV and so on, well, maybe nobody would talk at all. Huh? I believe so.

If you want to make a little test of this, just start around into various places, stores, a very bad place to examine the society through the clerks in stores, you know, because they're on a – they're on a trained social basis. They have a social response. The place to do – you see somebody raking up leaves in the backyard. You know, that sort of thing. Just show up and wait for him to originate a communication. You originated one didn't you? You showed up.

By the way this business of originating a communication is so hard on somebody just on a restimulation basis, that the Church auditors over here go up and ring on a doorbell see, and they go and ring on another doorbell and ring on another doorbell and ring on another doorbell. Do you realize that they are originating a communication and originating a communication and originating a communication and originating a communication. Nobody walks up to them and says “Hey, you know we've got something brand-new that we'd certainly like to help you out with.” Nobody does this.

And that's why I tell you with some truth that in view of the fact that we have people who are willing to originate communication they are willing to talk about – to people. They are willing to advance an interpretation of theory, they are willing to advance theory, they're willing to talk, they're willing to outflow. I can tell you very clearly that we must have some of the highest toned people in the United States. You don't know maybe what the community or the society level is. You would only really find out not by ringing doorbells, because that's a trained response too. It would be by walking into ballrooms and dining rooms and around.

How long has it been since you walked into a public dining room, you know a restaurant, or something of the sort and had a couple of the diners look up and smile at you and ask you how you were? Or do they just kind of sit there like complete strangers? You know there's no damn reason under this – it's completely irrational that they would sit there. You can explain it on the basis of privacy. You can explain it on the basis of they're out for a social occasion. You can explain it on a thousand bases. But it's all unreal. They are originating silence. This is what it breaks down to. They're originating silence.

Now when you, in your turn, originate a communication at these people, you're sitting at the dining room, in the public dining room. Somebody comes in, they look around, they want to be kind of unnoticed. They're with a girl who really wants to be noticed. You know, they walk in and you're sitting at the table, you and a friend and you were to look up and say, "How are you people, how are you getting along?" You know they probably in most cases wouldn't answer you. They would probably shy away. Why would they shy away? Because you actually can turn on a somatic with them. If you went on with them, you said, "How are you, how are you doing, how's everything with you, how are you, how are you doing, are you having a good time tonight? Gee you guys really looked dressed up." Never met them before, see. They either send for the cops or collapse and go to the hospital or something weird and wild will happen. Because you're talking into an origin communication scarcity.

All right. This society actually hurts in the teeth of an originated communication, it actually hurts. You go to a party; you've got something exciting and new to talk about, you've just had an adventure of some kind or another. People either sit there like a bunch of hypnotized chickens or they go out and mutter to a particular pal of theirs in the vestibule what a goddamned bore you are. Get the idea? Now, here you have the basic source of the somatic. This is the somatic. It is a line which has been pulled in, pulled in, pulled in or pushed out, pushed out, pushed out until its particles match the pain point of the Tone Scale. In other words condensation of the particles is passing right on down through an intolerable point, see? They will then after that get much solidier. You're talking about unfinished communications, incomplete cycles, incomplete two-way cycles. You're talking about mass, you're talking about engrams, you're talking about facsimiles and so forth.

Why does a person make a facsimile anyhow? Well an individual makes a facsimile by resistance. They resist the environment. They get a picture. But remember there has to be an obsessive duplication in there for that thing to be unconsciously made. For it to be unconsciously made and to stay in existence thereafter, that's really quite a trick, see? Another thing is the dependency on memory, it's an effort to have something, it's an effort to have a communication with the environment which didn't communicate with you. There's half a dozen things that can happen here. But the balled up masses, the black masses, the upsets that people are in, are simply unfinished, untermiated, unacknowledged communication lines.

All right. Let's go immediately into the anatomy of exactly what are these items, what are these items? The items that you remedy. All right, let's look at a single cycle of communication which is Joe, Bill, Bill', Joe', on that curve. And let's discover that there isn't ever going to be any noise at Bill, you see. Now that is a receipt-point, see, that's really no noise. And there is no noise over at Joe', no noise at Bill and no noise at Joe', particularly. Actually there's no noise at Bill, ever, but the noise comes in at Bill at Bill'. So what people notice is an absence of Bill' and an absence of Joe'.

All right, so there's an absence of Joe on this curve, an absence of Joe, an absence of Bill' and an absence of Joe'; really three points on the curve. All right. Bill, the point Bill, which is the receipt-point, is not necessary to remedy, there isn't any point in remedying this. It's always going to be there; it's a necessary point. Your absence that you would notice would be Bill'. It's only when an individual gets obsessively at Bill you begin to notice it. Only what you're still noticing is an absence of Bill'. All right, we've got three points there, haven't we,

which can get deficient. From Bill's standpoint Joe could be deficient, that is originated communication. And from Bill's standpoint still, Joe' could be deficient, right? So Joe and Joe' can be deficient. From Bill's standpoint, the only deficiency is Bill'. That's the real deficiency. Unless you want to consider an existence as Bill, see; just nobody there. So, all right there's two scarcities. Now, we have to look at the other side of the curve and discover that we got the same scarcities over there. And again the big scarcities are – the big scarcities, in this particular case, from Bill, Joe, Joe', Bill'. The scarcity over there is Joe'.

Now, the basic scarcity all along the line in communication would simply be somebody to talk to, see. That's somebody to talk to and somebody to talk at you, somebody to originate communications at you. Well these are scarcities. So all these points, there are eight points there, aren't there? All these points, any one of them could have some significance in processing. But what do you know, they straighten themselves out anyhow, almost anything you do, because you don't have to be too significant about this at all. Now, the main thing an auditor notices in processing preclears – let's say the auditor is Joe, the main thing the auditor notices is a lack of Bill'. The thing that the preclear notices is a lack of Joe'. The preclear notices this lack of Joe'. Now Joe as the auditor, as I say, notices the lack of Bill'. But what do you know! If an auditor is really alert, really alert, what he sees is the lack of the matching curve, the origination of communication by the preclear.

Now, in processing then it is absolutely necessary for you as an auditor to furnish a little motive power there. So the preclear walks up and touches the wall and says, “Huh!” We then consider, and remember all communication is merely a consideration, that he has originated a communication. And we put him into the role of communication origin whether he would or not. And we answer him by saying, “What's the matter?” And now he has to originate a new cycle. He says, “I just – just had my grandfather's face of a coffin show up in a small picture in front of my face.” The auditor says, “Oh, is that so?” He answers, “Yes, sure is.” Acknowledgment.

Now the auditor having done this trick, had made him put in and originate a communication and then just go on with the process, till the next time he notices the right finger starts shaking a little bit, “Hey, what's the matter?” It made him aware of the fact that he originated a communication physically. You make him originate one by consideration. The auditor's always up against the idea of putting in that second cycle in on the preclear. The more he can put it in on the preclear, of course, debarring off a lot of obsessive or compulsive flow of the preclear, an unknowingness machine flow, why the better the preclear gets and the oftener an auditor can acknowledge – just go round Robin Hood's barn to find something to acknowledge. You can put all kinds of significance into this. You can put approval into this. You can put how glad you are into this. You can throw some A into the communication. You can throw some R into the communication, so forth. Completely aside from that, we want to keep throwing those communications in there, see, and make that preclear originate a communication. If we can make him originate a communication often enough his imagination will come way upstairs from where it was, quite fascinating.

So we keep shoving him over onto the other curve, make him originate communications, we keep acknowledging communications and every time we do this we're supplying a scarcity of communications. He'll get better to the degree that he is made to

communicate. Only he doesn't want to be aware of the fact that he's being forced to communicate; it's got to be an originated communication. He originated one unconsciously, we make him originate one consciously. Every time he talks, we acknowledge. We keep the two sides of this curve working.

Now, as far as him running this in mock-ups is concerned, you can pick any part of either two of the curves, fix up the silent part. Don't ever run that silent part 'cause that's what's wrong with your preclear, you'll just run him right straight on downhill into the woods and far away, if you start running silences on him. Beyond this, you can ask him a time when somebody was silent, he'll gradually peel off an awful lot of stopped points on the bank. But this again is negative gain processing. Positive gain processing is just yap – yap – walla – walla on the bank. See. You just make him make things talk. He will fit them into all kinds of significances, he's liable to try to put them into tremendous significance. Significances don't count, it's simply the communication curve itself. And all the time you're making him remedy these in mock-up form you're restoring his pan-determinism. And this is the big trick in today's processing. Okay.

*Male voice:* What about social stuff like uh – people uh – pretending they want you to – well, let's say it this way, people say, “Well, how was your trip to London, I want to hear all about it.” Total silence. “And you know I went down and I processed this preclear down here on forty-fourth street the other day. Yap – yap – yap. And the butcher said, yap – yap – yap – yap – yap. Gee, that was a very interesting trip you told me about...”

That's Joe to Joe. Isn't that great.

*Male voice:* It sure is. This is a very common phenomena.

You'll find this boy stacked by the way. This boy's bank is stacked.

*Female voice:* Would it be therapeutic just for a person to self-determinedly go out and originate communication?

Oh I'm sure it would be, I'm sure it would be.

He's liable to get a lot of backlash, he's liable to get a lot of entheta.

As a matter of fact – as a matter of fact I had talked to people at random and actually have a lot of luck doing this.

(End of lecture)