

5412C06

1st of 35 talks bound into 3 volumes entitled „*THE SOLUTION TO ENTRAPMENT*“

given in Phoenix, Arizona to the students of the 9th Advanced Clinical Course between 6 December 1954 and 21 January, 1955

INTRODUCTION TO 9TH ACC - HAVINGNESS

A lecture given on 6 December 1954

So, we have the second book of Dianetics is actually Dianetics 1955! and all it does, actually, is expand Chapter Two of Dianetics: The Modern Science of Mental Health. And the name of that chapter is - that's Chapter Two of Book One - is „*The Clear*.“ And Dianetics 1955! is forthrightly dedicated to the creation of Clear with no further nonsense. And that's what this book is all about. And before you finish with this Unit you will have a copy of this book in your hands.

It will be a great shock to Dianeticists to discover that although we have the second book on Dianetics that it is totally dedicated to exteriorization. This will be a great shock. But that would be mostly because they never read the first book.

The second chapter of that book describes somebody who is without immediate contact with the reactive mind, doesn't it? That's who it describes; that's what it describes - the Clear.

Now, the first book went about a negative gain process. That is, the best way to go about this was to strip away the barricades and you'd find your boy. All right. That's the way that book went about it. It went about it in terms of erasure.

Now, we know today what an erasure is - very, very precisely know what an erasure is, know when it takes place and when it doesn't. And we can produce an erasure with the process known as Perfect Duplication. That is the darnedest erasure you ever

heard of. It erases both the space, the time, the energy and all the percepts and contents of an engram, pshewt!

How does it do this? By making a perfect duplicate - as-is - of the engram. The definition of a perfect duplicate, if you wanted to understand this, would be the first thing you had to learn. And this is: a duplicate of the thing in its own time, in its own location with its own energy. And that is a perfect duplication.

I can give you an example of what that is. We look up here at this microphone and we recognize that you could take a facsimile of this microphone very easily, and then go out in the street with this facsimile of the microphone still sitting in front of your face, and you would look at this facsimile and you'd be able to chew on it for a while and at least reduce any semblance to a microphone that that facsimile had. You recognize that this could happen?

In order to erase it completely and not have to pass it over time after time after time, it would only be necessary for you to recognize where the facsimile was taken. And then without putting new energy into it, without putting new locations into it or anything of the sort, just look at it and put your duplicate in with it using its time, space and energy. There's two objects sitting there, then, aren't there? There's your duplicate and the original. Only they're both using the same time, space and energy. Perfect duplication gives you a perfect affinity which gives you poof!

Now, this is of course, wouldn't be true at all unless we could test it. And it's testable. It very definitely is. Just have the preclear sometime - tell him to start making a perfect duplicate of a chair. Well, of course he can't make a perfect duplicate of a MEST chair unless he goes back to the point where each one of these facsimiles was generated. Where was it generated? What was it generated? and so forth.

It's only the fact that this chair, the contents thereof, the molecules and atoms thereof are so far removed from their point of origin - it's only the fact that it's so far removed from the point of origin that it's solid and here. Unarguably solid. It becomes completely unsolid if it were to arrive at the point of its Origin again - if someone were to duplicate that chair. But you can take an exercise like this, the chair won't disappear simply because you haven't gotten up to the point of origin.

But you just ask somebody to make a perfect duplicate of the chair with its own time and energy in the space in which it is sitting. And he'll start out at first by trying to put a copy in here, you see. And he'll try to do all sorts of things with this chair until he realizes finally that it is simply a matter of saying he has duplicated the chair, you see.

Well now, he will do this, and that's an easy thing for him to say, you see. He can say that. He can say it in English or Portuguese or something of the sort and be a very easy thing for him to say, but here would be the chair. And he would say, „*Well, all right. Ah - I'll see that.*“ He doesn't expect anything to happen. So let's try it.

Take a look at that chair. Now, let's make a duplicate of the chair in its own time, space with its own energy.

Let's do it again. Make a duplicate of the chair with its own time, space and energy.

Now, are you trying to put another chair here? You understand you shouldn't add energy to it if you're trying to use its energy to make the duplicate.

Now, let's do it again. Let's look at that chair and let's make a perfect duplicate of the chair. Let's make another perfect duplicate of the chair. Dick's really been chewed around on this subject, huh. Remember? Okay. Chair try to go any place or do anything strange or peculiar when you do that? Or does it just sit there kind of inertly? Listen, if that chair is still sitting there as far as you're concerned, let's go over this definition very carefully again. A perfect duplicate is one made in the space of in the time of with the energy of the object - and also, of course, the intention of the object.

But let's - let's take a look at it again and make a perfect duplicate of the chair, right where it sits.

Doing that real easily now? Hm? Is it better? All right. Once more make a perfect duplicate of it. And let's make sure we've got this absolutely straight. We're making a duplicate of this chair using its own energy, its own mass. We're not putting any new energy in it. It's sitting here and then a duplicate is sitting here, with the same mass. Let's try it again.

Let's try it again. Oh, we're getting there now, huh?

Getting there easily now? Hm? Can you do this with no strain?

Let's make a perfect duplicate of this chair again.

Anybody noticed yet that there's a continuing time about this chair? Hm? That there's a continuing time about this chair? You can pick a specific moment of its time or you can pick consecutive moments of its time.

Now, is anybody getting - now, is anybody getting, now, an image above the chair or below the chair, or - hm? We're not trying to put more energy in this chair; we're just trying to use its energy to make a duplicate of it.

Got that now? Let's make a - use its energy to make a duplicate of it now.

Has that chair started to fade out to anyone? Interesting isn't it.

All right. Now let's put it back there and make a perfect duplicate of it. All right. Again, let's put it back there and then make a perfect duplicate of it. Again, put it back there and make a perfect duplicate of it.

What's occurring now? Hm? Now, let's put it back there and make a perfect duplicate of it again. And then put it back there again.

All right. Of course - of course you recognize this business about source. If it were totally to disappear for everybody you could make a duplicate of your agreement that it is there and it disappears for you. But remember that this is an agreed-upon situation. And its source, if suddenly knocked apart - that is, if you really duplicate it at its source - where it is, where it was, whatever you want to say - this chair actually would come to pieces.

Bobby was out at the house one day and I showed him how to do this. I had him working away on it, and he was doing just fine. And I said then, „*All right now, Bobby, take a - take a remote viewpoint and put it on one electron in the wall. Now, have that remote viewpoint trace that electron back to its source of creation, and make a perfect duplicate of it.*“

He said, „*That's kind of interesting. Yes, I can do that.*“

And I said, „*All right. Now put up about a hundred thousand remote viewpoints on about a hundred thousand electrons in a very tiny area, and have those remote viewpoints trace them all these electrons back to their original point.*“ Bobby did, he jumped about half a foot, he started to go over to the wall to hold it, and he turned around and he looked at me real silly, and he says, „*Can I go look at it?*“ And he went over and looked at it. There was a tiny, tiny chip gone from where he was working.

Now, this was a great shock to him. He thought this universe had a law called conservation of energy, that nothing could destroy this energy. That's not true. We have violated the basic laws of physics at last. We knew someplace along the line that we would violate the basic laws of physics. Well, this perfect duplication violates the basic laws of physics.

If you have an engram, actually the engram has mass. This is demonstrable. It is demonstrable that an engram, as talked about in Dianetics: The Modern Science of Mental Health, has mass. It does have mass. You can ask an individual to mock up with quote - „*mental energy*“ what everybody was used to - they used to be very fond, you know, of saying this mental energy was entirely different, you know, than this. And we used to take cognizance of this and agree with it once in a while just to get a point across. But this mental energy will register on meters, as demonstrated on an E-Meter. There isn't any necromancy or spiritualism going on with an E-Meter. If you put a guy on an E-Meter and you call an engram into view that E-Meter reacts. Well, what do you suppose makes it react? Somebody's telepathic control? No, it's all that E-Meter can do. Its total limit of action is the measurement of energy. That's its total limit of action. And if you can ask a guy something and it registers on an E-Meter, obviously you're dealing with energy. You're dealing with energy that can be measured by the same stuff as runs through this electric light. So there's no reason to make a separation point between mental energy and physical energy.

All right. Worse than this, there's a better test - better test than this. You ask an individual to mock up and pull in and mock up and pull in these mental image pictures, any facsimiles or anything of the sort. Just mock up something, pull it in, mock it up and pull it in, mock it up and pull it in. Mock up heavy planets, mock up dense things and pull them in. You shoot a person's weight up - if he's working pretty well, and you do this very insistently, and you insist on density and mass - you can put a person on a set of very accurate Toledo scales, have him do this process for a few hours, put him back on the scales and find out his weight has gone up about thirty pounds.

Now you can have him turn around and throw this stuff away - if he's in pretty good shape - and you have him throw it away and throw it away and throw it away, and his weight will come down to what it was before. And if you have him keep on throwing masses away that he already had he may get sick but he'll certainly weigh less. Now,

what kind of mental energy is this that can weigh on a pair of Toledo scales? Mass, the ideas of mass are mass. All right. That's a cute little mechanism isn't it? That's in the process Remedy of Havingness. You can remedy somebody's havingness and increase his weight.

Actually, individuals have a tendency to pick up a weight one way or the other at which they're comfortable. The body likes to have spare energy to run on, likes to do various things, and a guy will get an energy level he's comfortable in. You ask somebody who has picked up a little weight where he is right that moment - you ask him, „Now, do you remember a time when you were very thin?“

And possibly he may. And he says, „Yes, I remember a time when I was very thin.“ „How did you feel?“ „Come to think about it I was sick and - I was kind of sickly you know. I was tired all the time. Yeah, yeah! I was tired.“

You can ask yourself that. That's usually a response when one was very slender and thin, and they have now put on a little weight and you say, „Well, do you feel tired all the time now?“ And the person says, „No.“

Now, you're going to cut this person's weight down. Not unless - not unless you remedy a few other things, believe me. Person feels better with a little bit of weight. Another thing, mass counts for something in this society. All that seems to mean anything to the current society is mass. If you get into a fight always pick a very slender person with not much weight because they can't put any beef behind the blow. Always do that. And not necessarily shorter. Preferably pick some very tall, very, very thin fellow and he'll be real tired.

These people are voracious eaters but they never put on any weight through eating. I seriously doubt that anybody ever puts on any weight through eating. I think they put on weight through making a facsimile of the food which they are stuffing in their mouths and digesting the facsimile. And if they're unwilling to make a facsimile of the food, they can't eat. They can get no good out of food at all. This is also demonstrable in processing. All right. Now, let's take this proposition of this stuff called energy. And we discover in the Encyclopaedia Britannica of a long time ago, back in the nineties, that time and space are actually energy manifestations born of the mind. And that a solution of the problems of the physical sciences lay actually in an examination of these mental attitudes.

The fellow who wrote that was actually not writing anything very, very original. But he was certainly punching something home that's been along for a long time but was never demonstrated. Nobody ever demonstrated this. They had a suspicion that this was the case, that you wouldn't have any space unless there was life to make and hold that space, that you wouldn't have any energy unless there was life to duplicate it there and keep putting it - putting back these energy masses. In other words, they had an idea that all was illusion but the physical sciences went back to this early assumption: the conservation of energy. All right. They assume the conservation of energy and they took off from there. As I was saying in a lecture the other night, I asked my professor in atomic molecular phenomena back in school, „Conservation of energy? Why do you limit it to that. Why don't you take conservation of space also?“ And, gee, that was a hot

idea. He was about to write a paper for the - you know, without giving anybody else any credit - was about to write a paper for the „*Mathematics Society*“ or the „*Physicists of the Universe*“ or something of the sort and he was all set.

I let him cook for two days and then I asked him, „*But we really haven't covered this. We really are in a triangle of operation here. We have space, energy and time. Have you thought of the subject of the conservation of time?*“ And he got rather foggy on this and I said, „*Well, now look, you have conservation of energy and conservation of space. Time is totally dependent upon the energy and the space so there must then be conservation of time.*“ He almost spun till he got rid of the idea entirely by simply refusing to talk to me whenever I showed up thereafter.

Obviously, you see if there's conservation of energy and conservation of space there'd have to be conservation of time. There isn't any such thing. So, that just becomes nonsense. And it's true of any operation in the whole field of the physical sciences. There is also always the process which can be applied there - the *reductio ad absurdum*. You can always reduce a mathematical or a scientific axiom down to an absurdity one way or the other.

This activity of reducing all these laws and axioms to an absurdity was the entire concentration of logic and argumentation as taught, for instance, in the University of Padua in 1490, 14 - 1504. That was one of their favorite subjects. A man couldn't get out of there as a Master of Arts or anything else unless he had thoroughly mastered logic and argumentation and had learned by trial, error, careful instruction, enough authorities, enough data, enough laws so that he could reduce anybody else's argument to an absurdity. And they never considered him worthy of the school or worthy of anything unless he could make nothing out of anybody's arguments.

And science today has gotten to be, to some degree - as a book came out some years ago called *Science Is a Sacred Cow*. You're not supposed to reduce scientific axioms to an absurdity and yet they will all reduce that way. And similarly with this one - conservation of energy, conservation of space: „*Yes, yes. It goes up to that point, you see? Of course. Of course. Why haven't we ever thought of that?*“ „*Well, how about conservation of time?*“ Poof! That's all there is to that argument. That's all we have to do, you see?

Now, let's look this over and let's recognize without destroying our own sense of reality or agreement on everything that it might be possible that in the absence of life that there might not be a universe sitting here at all. This is a philosophic argument from time immemorial. But today, remember, we can make a perfect duplicate.

When you take this mental energy, so called, in an engram bank and you run a pre-clear in a way - Oh, this is a savage and brutal process, by the way. It just tears a pre-clear to pieces; it ruins him. I mean, his whole body is operating on a stimulus-response mechanism and if it didn't have all these stimulus-response mechanisms and experiences to fall back on, it simply wouldn't operate at all, that's all. I mean, you'd just have no body.

So I say this is not an advised procedure. But you'll find many of the boys will - because this is given in *Dianetics 1955!* - saying „*Well, Hubbard might be right over there but he's wrong here. Of course, to erase these engrams is the main thing*“ So, therefore, they will

track people back, way back in time to the moment of origin. Now, we were doing that and we were going over it several times and what we were doing before was erasing the content.

We were keeping the person's mass intact to a marked degree, you see. And we were having him go over it several times which erased the content. It gave him a mass of meaningless, nonsignificant energy, you see. The erasure of an engram delivered into the preclear's hands a mass of usable energy. It now didn't have debarring significances in it. Energy is just energy, actually. So he was perfectly willing to acquire energy by erasing the bad content of the energy as he considered it.

You see, we erased birth and yet we did not destroy the mass of birth. We didn't make a perfect duplicate of birth, you see; we merely erased it, we went through it, we knocked its content out of it. And this at once gave the preclear a mass of usable energy, just like we'd fed him a spoonful of high-power gelatin or something of the sort, see.

And I suspected this and set up some experiments which were conducted in New York at the New York Foundation under very good control. We had two Otis tests, and people without being processed at all were demonstrating no increase of intelligence between Test 1 and Test 2. No increase of intelligence. Otis 1 and Otis 2, short forms. Then I had these people audited on the spot while they were sitting right there at the desk, and shoved back into as heavy an engram as the auditor could quickly find. Stuck in the engram and given the second test, see. First test, shoved into an engram, second test. Their intelligence went up. That's a curious thing isn't it? That's a very curious thing. Shouldn't have, you see? Should have gone more stupid.

In other words, we gave them this first intelligence test and then stuck them very heavily in an engram, and then their intelligence increased. Weirdest thing in the world. Until I experimented a little further - I found out that any contact with the engram bank delivered into a person's hands more energy. If it delivered into his hands more energy, he therefore was happier and so smarter, even though he could moan and writhe.

The other thing was - which you'll learn and which we know about problems and solutions-the other thing was it gave him a new problem. Remedied to some degree his scarcity of problems and therefore let him solve something on the examination paper. You see that? He was permitted to solve something because he had a new problem. So we'd say that a person should therefore function better if he's restimulated than if he's not restimulated.

Yet this isn't true at all, you see. This is a complete upset. This is not true. A person does not function better when he's restimulated. So the bug in there was simply energy. An individual functions better when he has his hands on any kind of energy than no energy.

And the eventual process that came out of that - rather belatedly I must confess; almost two and a half years later - was the Remedy of Havingness. You simply have an individual mock up masses. The less significant these masses are the better. Just have

him mock up masses and pull them in, and mock them up and pull them in and mock them up and pull them in and mock them up. Have him create an energy mass. If he can only get blackness, have him mock up black masses and pull them in. And then have him - get him into a state where he could mock up masses and throw them away and mock up masses and pull them in, and mock them up and throw them away. Very odd manifestation such as an avalanche of masses from Lord knows where sometimes materialize and practically swamp the preclear. There's lots of interesting things occur in the Remedy of Havingness. But the main point is that it makes the individual aware of the fact that he can create and have energy. And if he can have, why, his engram problems are to a marked degree solved.

Now, I don't know how many hours you would have to remedy havingness in order to make an individual let go of every engram in the bank. I don't know how long you would have to do this. It's quite a long time. It's probably a very long time in modern auditing. It's probably in the neighborhood maybe of fifty hours, maybe more than that. But that's a very short length of time, isn't it, compared to Book One techniques. You'd have this individual remedy any kind of havingness he could remedy.

I got on to this technique, by the way, some years ago over in London. I had a black, caved-in V simply mock up his body and mock up his body and mock up his body and mock up his body until he exteriorized. I finally asked him what was happening to these mock-ups, and he said at first, „*They're disappearing*“ And then he said that after a while they were snapping in. People who won't have - can't have mock-ups snap in and who never run into this, and so forth, are simply lower on the Tone Scale than a snap-in. You just have to work at it longer.

But look at this in an - look at this as a contrary fact to this perfect duplication I was talking to you about. All right. So we take the guy back on the track, you see, and we ask him to take a look at the engram and make a perfect duplicate of it, see, and it's gone, pshew!

We've had people around here who were good old Book One auditors who just never would let go of any part of Book One you see - wouldn't advance to any degree. And they actually worked for some days doing this perfect duplication on the engram bank on each other. That was the sorriest crew at the end of that time you ever saw in your life.

One fellow was standing on my front porch when I came up to my office one day. He was standing there on my front porch and he could not see a car that was across the street. He did not quite know where he was or what he was doing. He knew I was there and he was very grateful for that fact. I had this individual alter, change the environment around until finally the environment straightened out. I asked him what that was across the street and he finally got a dim inkling there might be a car over there, so he said, „*A car.*“ And that wasn't the answer I wanted, and I said, „*What is it across the street?*“ And he finally woke up to the fact that I was demanding some other kind of an answer, so he said, „*It's a hayrick,*“ and he said, „*It's a this and it's a that, and so forth.*“ And the car got brighter and brighter and brighter and brighter, and all of a sudden

straightened out and stopped being a Model T Ford and became the new Oldsmobile which it was.

I mean, the fellow was completely over into the hallucinatory band, you see? By what? By changing, of course, and altering the condition of his immediate environment we of course restored an enormous amount of energy to this man. How do you do that? Well, the only way you can actually get anything going and surviving and continuing is by altering it. When you stop altering it, it just coasts on a sort of an as-is basis, but it just coasts. Two things - the altered condition, the surviving condition, and the other.

But I don't want to give you too much data. All I'm trying to give you here is just this kickoff here on this basis of Dianetics 1955!

Now, in Book One-in Book One we conceived the energy of the individual to be erasable by going over it several times. That was not the case. Actually, all we were doing was washing the content out of the piece of energy and he got better because he'd now got some energy. That's why he got better - evidently. Also, he also got better because he took antipathetic, nonsurvival significances out of this energy mass. But the first book did not reduce anybody's energy masses. If it had, you would have found while running en-grams the same manifestation, the very same manifestation as would now occur in the Remedy of Havingness.

You ask the individual to look at space and to fool around with getting rid of energy and in a very short space of time he's liable to be very sick at his stomach. And we didn't discover all the preclears we were auditing with Book One getting sick at their stomachs did we? We discovered one occasionally, but this was a momentary manifestation. You can - by tearing up a person's havingness you can make him good and sick. He'll get good and sick.

Now, tearing up his havingness and erasing an engram are, then, not the same things. By erasing an engram, by going over this engram, we're simply removing perceptics out of the mass of energy, and the preclear then - slurp, slurp - can have this energy without any significance in it and he's real cheerful about this. And this is a fine thing as far as he's concerned.

And the perfect duplication or the complete eradication of energy and time, and so forth, in the bank is antipathetic to his good health and well being, very antipathetic. Now, therefore there is a theoretical process which on theory should just work out beautifully. That is to say we return him to the moment when it occurred, we have him make a perfect duplicate of the mass. He's at the moment and the position where it occurred, he makes a perfect duplicate of it, the mass, space, significance - everything vanishes pshew! And it vanishes very fast. And we take him to another incident, you see - this is theoretical, and that erases you see - pardon me that - that vanishes by perfect duplication. You take him to another, a big ridge of some kind or another and we have him make a perfect duplicate of this ridge and it goes.

By the way, it's very easy to take the significance out by perfect duplication. You merely say its significances, too, you see. And there goes that ridge and that mass and that engram and that birth and that chain of murders and that chain of past deaths, or

any darn thing you want to run, by returning him to the moment and doing this. Theoretically it's a wonderful process. But in practice it does not work, and in modern theory it doesn't work either. You are simply reducing the havingness of this individual down to a point which is unbearable to him. And the more you make perfect duplicates of the bank the hotter and faster he will work in order to find new, strange and peculiar facsimiles to cave in on himself And you get more facsimiles caved in by perfect duplication than you could easily count.

Now, the individual who is in this universe has been habituated to be caved in on. This is the regular response. This energy universe is flowing in on him, you might say. He's agreed to it, it's flowing in on him at a very vast rate from a 360 degree sphere. In other words, he's being hit from all sides. So therefore inflow is a habitual - evidently, according to him - needful thing. And that is his trained response you might say. That is his total experience - that energy must flow in. Thus we get eating and we get all sorts of things.

Sex is a puzzle to men. It's not a puzzle to women. It is an inflow. You get an inflow of sensation, energy, mass, so forth - a feminine reaction towards sex, you see? It's an inflow reaction. Therefore that's just exactly what it ought to be, you see, according to this universe. That is a total agreement with this universe.

A man gets into a bad shape, is liable to get into a worse shape than women and actually his death rate is earlier and so forth than women. There are many other things. It's because this fellow is being forced to outflow on a physical basis. You see, there's a sexual outflow. And he then gets impatient with women and is liable to be very upset because he'll learn sooner or later that he's getting no inflow.

Now, actually there is an energy sensation inflow which is possible in the sexual act and which a man can receive. All right. This is fine. Let's take some woman who isn't putting out any of this at all, you see. Just no put out at all but just a total pull in. Man gets very dissatisfied with her. Assigns all sorts of dirty words to it, such as nymphomania. And he'll find that she's frigid, that she's this, she's that. There's nothing wrong there except that she isn't doing any output. You see, no output of energy.

Now, women compensate for this by feeding men food, by doing the cooking, by bringing the man things and so forth. You see, they do outflow after all. And a man expects this. And a man - a man who won't permit himself to be waited on or a woman who will not bring a man things and so forth; we can expect in that some sort of a bad upset in the man.

You see, he's doing - outflowing and then there's no compensating inflow, and the darnedest things are liable to happen to him.

So we get this business of outflow, inflow as just the two basic manifestations of havingness. So we're up against this thing called havingness. There's a matter of space, there's a matter of energy. We find a preclear who gets very anxious about having things and so forth runs out of space. Space is something to him that's antipathetic. It hasn't got any particles packed together in it. And he gets to detest space, so if you ask

him to spot a few spots in the air and just locations, he'll get violently sick, sometimes. He'll get quite ill. You see, there's no solid matter there.

So solid matter becomes the final goal, form, mass, and so on. Now, is it curable? Is it - is it natural? That's a very definite question we face in this. Is it a natural thing for an individual to have to have? No, it's not. There's a higher level than this where he doesn't have to have. But only when he has ceased to create does he have to have. If an individual ceases to create, then he's got to have an exterior inflow from another determinism that's entirely dependent upon that other source than himself. Up to that time he can create something and so he can have something and so he can take it or leave it alone. Creation goes to pieces, in other words.

When he gets into havingness entirely, why, he just gets so he's just eating, you might say. He's not putting out anything. He's having a rough time in this. Some creative impulse must remain in the individual for the individual to be healthy.

Well, we find out, then, the Remedy of Havingness is too often interpreted by the auditor as meaning an inflow. And it's not totally an inflow. Remedy of Havingness means remedy of the condition of having to have. That's what Remedy of Havingness means, very precisely. It's a remedy of the condition of having to have. That means, there - that therefore, that a Remedy of Havingness should be run in such a way as to have the individual pull things in - mock them up and pull them in - and mock them up and throw them away. And he's got to be able to accept or reject any of this havingness.

An individual who is badly restimulated, an individual who is restimulateable, an individual who has a great many Fac Ones and all kinds of weird engrams of the darnedest description packed, up and stacked around him and so forth, would be very happily - erase the significance from them and so have them as energy, you see, or have more energy. But there is his point of view. He's got to have a mass of energy. And even though it has a bunch of significance in it he's very, very happy to pull in this mass of energy. So we get the motto of the individual, which is *"Anything is better than nothing"*

I put that in Latin one day. I've forgotten what it is, but it's called a motto. *"Anything is better than nothing"* *"Anything is better than nothing"* And they'll pull in engrams and everything else on themselves.

So we get this first book. Let's take a look at this first book again in view of what I've been saying here. And we recognize that we're in contest with the significance in havingness in the first book - see, that was our contest. This havingness had significance in it and we could erase the significance from it, but we were not remedying the basic havingness of the individual. Therefore, we would have difficulty in bringing about the state of Clear, because an individual could not be entirely clear of his engram bank unless his ideas on having to have had markedly altered and changed. See? So we have to remedy his havingness, remedy the necessity of his having to have in order to have a Book One Clear.

Now, the second book is totally devoted to the creation of, with rapidity, a Clear. Now, people will argue with terms. Thetan Exterior stable, Operating Thetan - these are Scientological terms, perfectly valid terms. But Clear can be defined as an absolute today. That was never possible before. We had to have a relative Clear. Whether or not it can be obtained as an absolute, you see, is quite another thing, but it can be defined as an absolute. It would be, an awareness in Book One terminology, an awareness of awareness unit - that thing which acts upon and is aware of being aware in the body. Call it a thetan in Scientology - awareness of awareness unit in Dianetics.

All right. This awareness of awareness unit would have to be able to have or not have at will in order to remain in a totally stable condition. But one which had the ability to have or not have at will as appertains to anything in any universe would be an absolute Clear. Therefore, you get a new definition of Clear which is simply a person who can have or not have at will anything in any universe. That's a real simple definition, isn't it?

Now, when we say to somebody, „*Be three feet back of your head*,“ the odd part of it is, is that we disconnect him from his reactive mind, boom! The body is what you might call a reactive mind. We disconnect him; he's disconnected. And as such, then, the reactive mind has actually no bearing on the personality of the individual. And so we've solved it there and we have, in the second book, the „*One-shot Clear*.“ The „*One-shot Clear*“ which was searched for, speculated about and so forth is „*Be three feet back of your head*.“

Of course, this takes the guy out of his reactive bank, boom! To some degree it works upon about 50 percent of the human race. So this is a pretty good „*One-shot Clear*,“ isn't it? Remember the human race contains lots of children, contains lots of people in pretty good condition. About 50 percent of the human race in general can be cleared or, pardon me, they can be approached up toward Clear about that fast. But you have to get their attention, get into communication with them a little bit. They know you're there, you know they're there, and they have to be in a condition where they will at least do something you said. And you get them up to that point, which is merely the approach to the thing, and then you would say, „*Be three feet back of your head*“ and 50 percent of the race would do this.

Now, if you went on and concentrated on the body - which Dianetics does, very markedly concentrate upon the body - the way to go about finishing this fellow off and straightening him out has nothing to do with engrams. You just covertly put him in shape so that he can see the electronic structure of the body. There is a structure senior to the flesh and blood structure of the body called the electronic structure. The electronic structure of the body is actually a piece of space made by actual anchor points. And where these anchor points are disarranged or misaligned the body will twist and turn.

Now, it will pull in facsimiles and do other things and mess up its anchor points with engrams and all that sort of thing. But we're not interested in that it does that. All we want is our boy, this awareness of awareness unit, be three feet back of his head, get him in good shape so he has good perception. Just check him to make sure, then have

him check the electronic structure of the body and wherever he finds an anchor point out of position to go through the steps necessary to put that anchor point back in position; and where he finds one shattered to glue it back together again one way or the other and put them all back in position.

Now, the odd part of this particular activity - auditors are apt to forget this - the odd part of it is that it is a concentration upon the body and it's not particularly a healthy procedure unless the Remedy of Havingness of the thetan has been very well taken care of. See?

The body itself eats up its own anchor points. These are gold balls originally, little golden spheres, sometimes in terrific number in the vicinity of the body. And the body will eat up its own anchor points. Snake eating its own tail. You have to fix the fellow up so that he won't do this. Actually, the only reason it starts eating its own tail is an electronic flow starts up because of the misposition of one of these anchor points. You shove one of these anchor points out of the road, that is the electronic structure, and you get an enormous and immediate flow of energy from some quarter to something else and then this fellow is swamped to some degree. And if he can't handle flows of energy - in other words, can't handle energy - why, he's liable to bog right at that spot. This is where the people come back inside, see. They disturb one of these anchor points, or some old flow suddenly activates and swoosh! And then they go back inside and they get stuck; they decide they can't handle energy.

Well, all of this in a breath, so to speak - we're trying to cover this rather rapidly, what we are going to study - and we discover that another factor is involved here and that is that 50 percent of the human race can't do this.

You walk up to them and you say, *„Be three feet back of your head.“*

And they say, *„What head?“*

And you say, *„Well, right there. The one you got leaning up against the wall.“*

And they say, *„What wall?“* And we're off to the races. The other 50 percent of the human race.

Well, we could say right here at this point, *„Look, psychoanalysis, witch-doctoring the Goldi medicine man - these people produced uniformly 22 percent of cure. Only 22 percent of cure. And this 22 percent, didn't much matter what you did. These people would get well whether you shook a gourd rattle or you jumped up and down and screamed or you gave him some pills or you told him his mother loved him again or he received a letter from his girl or anything. It didn't much matter what you did, 22 percent of the human race will recover from almost any malady known to man. See. Twenty-two percent.“*

Naturally this gives medicine and witch doctors, and other witch doctors - excuse me - a very strange opinion about healing. They see these fluke cases, you see? So they conclude, then, that almost anything will work on some case or another. So they make it very imprecise, and then they never go further and study it to make it precise, you see? They say, *„Well, this uh - I don't know. People all of a sudden - they - I - no telling what'll make 'em well because all of a sudden they'll get a letter or something“*

Actually, they're only talking about 22 percent of the human race. But they see in the - they see this 22 percent and then they have never found out that there was a remaining - remaining 78 percent. And they never looked at those.

And we find out when we look at those that we begin to find the constants, not this variable 22. Well, this variable 22 evidently is simply in kind of a state of hypnosis of some kind or another, or is in very good shape. See, they could be in several states. They could be very well off or very badly off and all somebody would have to say to them, „*You're well*,“ and they'd go around and say, „*Look, I'm well*.“ And whatever interesting condition this would be, remember that this was an upsetting thing to the entire field of research and development. Twenty-two percent of people would simply get well.

Well, we had to pay attention to the other 78. Well, we've raised that figure on a very easy process of auditing, if we take into account children and so forth, to 50 percent. See, we've raised that 22 to 50 percent. Only it isn't almost anything will make these people well, it's „*Be three feet back of your head*“ - that's what makes them well. „*Be three feet back of your head. Okay. Let's look around. What do you see? You see something? All right. Make a copy of it.*“ By the way, you make a copy simply by putting an exact replica of the thing alongside of it. It's not a perfect duplicate.

You'll find the word duplicate carelessly used in earlier publications. It says, „*Duplicate it, duplicate it, duplicate it.*“ That means make a copy. „*Perfect - make a perfect duplicate of it*“ would be to make it with its own time, space and its own energy, in its own locale.

All right. How about this? We've shot it up to 50 percent. Hadn't we better quit? Huh? What's the matter? Well, look-a-there. That's a higher level of cure.

Do you realize - do you realize that there was only one specific prior to about 1912? There was only one thing that you could absolutely count on to cure something - thing called aspirin. The one specific. It was a specific remedy for a specific ill. And you think I mean the headache. No, that was not the specific ill that aspirin takes care of; it's rheumatic fever. Aspirin takes care of rheumatic fever. Somebody comes up with rheumatic fever you give him aspirin he gets well.

All right. That was along pretty near a 100 percent proposition. So you could call this thing a specific, it means a 100 percent proposition. Are there any others? I read a list from the AMA. The AMA is an organization which is allied with the „*Liars of America*,“ and they have a great time interchanging their jokes. They listed the fact that medicine had made great progress, enormous progress, because they now had about twenty specifics.

In other words, all you do is just throw away the definition of specific, you see. Just throw it away. Actually, you don't have twenty specifics. Penicillin is not a specific. Damn near is. You call for a lot of remedies and you say, „*Well, that calls for penicillin.*“ But then you find out that Dr. Jones and Dr. Hoopgala and so forth have been giving this patient penicillin lozenges and he's had several other courses of penicillin, and we shoot him for this infection which he has and, by golly, that infection thrives.

Well then, we have to change him off to aureomycin. That's a specific, too. And then chloromycetin - that's a specific, but that didn't work either. Well, the patient dies, so we say there must have been something else wrong. But penicillin is still a specific, only it's not a specific.

They speak very widely and rather wildly that cinchona bark, known to us better as quinine, is a specific for malaria, and is a specific in the prevention of malaria; that atabrine is a - is a specific in the prevention of malaria. And I've had malaria while full of both of those. I mean, it's wonderful how unspecific they were.

So - but nevertheless, if we've gotten up to 50 percent we could say - in the same company with the American Medical Association - we could say, well, Dianetics and Scientology are specifics for human illness and aberration. That's that. Wouldn't have to go any further.

But an unfortunate thing - I was early indoctrinated in a certain attitude of thoroughness about this sort of thing. So I didn't really consider 50 percent good enough. And it's taken about two and a half years to put the finishing touches on the remaining 50 percent. Always we could find a case who was tougher. Always we could find a case who was more snowed in. Could always find somebody who was a little bit blacker than we'd ever noticed before. Very, very curious. Very, very curious thing.

I've been cracking these cases pretty regularly. Only trouble is I've had a tendency as years went on to put on the back grill and let simmer awhile, processes; put them out into the hands of auditors, tell them that this is the very hot process and so forth, and find out, whether or not, one, they could do the process, and two, whether or not the process continued to work in their hands. I had a tendency to do that.

The program has paid off very well because you've got a very interested and enthusiastic piece of auditing when somebody tests the process with the idea that „*this is it*“ sort of a thing. But the main thing about auditing is teaching the auditor. If the auditor does the process he'll get results with it - if he does the process. It's been a big question. We find there's a lot of the boys who couldn't get results with rather elementary and basic processes. We find a lot of the boys have had a tendency to shift over and skip Dianetics because it didn't get results.

I beg to differ with them. They didn't work Dianetics and it didn't get results. Now, there's nothing simpler than that is there?

It's just like you give this kid a lemon when you're supposed to give him some cough syrup and he doesn't start - just doesn't stop coughing so you immediately say, „*Well, that cough syrup doesn't stop coughs.*“ You get the idea? I mean, this is a real silly situation that we have had in this particular science.

But there was some justification for this. Old processes were pretty complicated, pre-clears were quite variable, they were very recalcitrant, they refused very often to get well, and they were not the good, well-mannered, schoolbook solutions by a long way. So obviously there must have been some bugs left in the machinery of auditing. Otherwise nobody could have made a mistake, you see? Nobody could have drifted off the line or failed to follow the book, see? There must have been a mistake somewhere

in there. And of course this mistake couldn't have been theirs because they weren't working on this first investigation, so I have to assume responsibility for it and go on and on and on and on and on.

Well anyhow, two very true - pardon me, oh about - more than that - about five or six very, very terrific things have shown up. One of them is this whole thing about problems. Until I got a perfect solution - that is to say until I knew what a perfect solution was, an ultimate solution. That was big news. I told a couple of the guys who were drifting around my office about this. Didn't spread it much any further. But an ultimate - and then, of course, it's in Creation of Human Ability - but an ultimate solution, the ultimate theoretical solution. What is the definition of an ultimate solution? Well, of course, it would be the perfect duplicate of the problem wouldn't it? So an ultimate solution would have no mass, meaning or mobility. It would have no wavelength, would have no position and - rrrrrrr - it's a static. Ultimate solution - static.

You want to know why people have to have problems? Well, they want mass, don't they? Well, if you had every piece of mass you had around solved, you wouldn't have any mass - not a single scrap of it. That's a horrible fact, isn't it? If you solved every problem in the bank. People start to solve problems feel worse, so they immediately start creating more problems. And they'll create problems, problems, problems, problems, problems, problems, problems, problems. And unless they can create an abundance of problems, unless they know they can have problems, they aren't going to give up any. That was the first bug.

Talked by the way to a patrolman last night. Curious boy. He had a problem. It was his last problem evidently. He was sure fond of it. I offered to take it away from him. He didn't cooperate at all.

All right. There was that, there was this business about Remedy of Havingness, and there was this remaining 50 percent. There must be some auditing solution which exteriorizes these people and so forth, and that is the auditing solution which we will concentrate on in this course. There must be, you see. Completely aside from everything else, there simply must be an auditing solution which does it. And there is.

So, having brought you up to the edge of the springboard, tomorrow we will find out what Uncle Remus did to Br'er Rabbit. How you exteriorize somebody, exactly how you exteriorize them, exactly how you get them over hanging onto these pieces of mass, exactly how you work them out of the frame of mind they're in which makes them interiorize, and exactly how you do this in about two or three hours regardless of what kind of shape the case is in, is of course a rather lengthy thing to teach.

And if I'm going to teach it all today I'd have absolutely nothing to teach you in the next six weeks. Now, the process which I want you to run ... Going to get assigned to some auditing teams. You won't like these assignments. These assignments will be an affront to you. That's a certainty. For the good and ample reason is they're usually misassigned on purpose. That's just a cross-brained attitude. You know why?

We concentrate on auditing in this course; we do not concentrate on one's own case. We concentrate on the ability to audit. You got that? The ability to audit - this is all we

care about. We don't even vaguely care what condition the auditor is in. If he can - if with the help of a couple of mop handles he can be propped up in a chair, if he twitches when kicked, he is in a state whereby he can audit. That's all we require of an auditor - qualifications. If he can quiver he can audit. Do you know why? Because the secret back of all secrets, as far as masses and forms are concerned - you understand that there could be secrets above masses and forms - but as far as masses and forms are concerned the secret of it is pan-determinism or control. That thing which you control you do not have to fear.

Would you be afraid to run a kiddie car down the front walk out here? You might feel that you're being ridiculed. Well, let's take it out in the desert someplace. Would you be afraid to run this kiddie car out there in the desert someplace, huh? No danger involved with this kiddie car.

Well, how about a jet plane, checked over recently by an Army mechanic? You, with no training. They put no helmet and no oxygen mask on you and jam you in the cockpit, shut the cockpit and start the plane. You wouldn't look on that with great calm would you? Hm? And yet the jet plane to a trained pilot is about as hard to run as a kiddie car. He can do what? He can control this jet plane can't he?

Human aberration has only been a bugbear to man because he couldn't control it, he couldn't predict it, he couldn't start, stop and change it. The anatomy of control is start, stop and change. He couldn't start, stop and change aberrations. He couldn't start, stop and change the state of mind of his fellow beings. He couldn't handle aberration.

That's - you don't find many doctors of contagious wards in those wards with that contagious disease, do you? That's because he can control it to a very marked degree, you see? But you sure find an awful lot of psychiatrists in institutions, don't you? That's right. Head nurses and psychiatrists - because they know they can't control this thing called aberration so they get controlled by it.

There's - to that degree in this universe at this time it's a dog-eat-dog sort of universe. I mean, you've got to be able to control something. Have to be willing certainly to control something. You don't have to actually get in there and direct every movement of it, you see. You have to be willing and able to control something in order to sit back and relax as far as it's concerned.

One thing that drives the public frantic about this atom bomb out here is they do not even vaguely have the faintest control even over the personnel that have the most intimate connection with it, see, or even the most distant connection with it. Far from being able to control the explosion of the bomb, they couldn't even vaguely control or determine the use and course of the bomb in any way. In other words, it's just totally removed from control.

There's why people are off on the fourth dynamic: They do not think they can control the fourth dynamic even vaguely, see? It's gotten even fashionable to say „*Conquerors are no good,*“ and that sort of thing. Well, actually, it's a-conquering the human race, just to demonstrate that you can control the human race is kind of a dull thing to do. But -

that's a rather low-scale activity, but they feel they couldn't possibly control the human race or group. It's just their willingness. And so they feel, „*Well, I'm all shot, you know. Fourth dynamic - there's nothing I can do for man. I am myself. I am an individual, I am all alone, I am the only one,*“ they say as far as they're concerned. „*Whatever happens to the rest of the human race, well, that's their lookout.*“ And so of course they get no control over it at all on a dwindling-spiral basis.

Well, let's take a look at auditing and recognize that the control of human aberration is the goal of an auditor. Now, it goes further than this. That is an immediate goal. The increase of human ability is a much higher goal. First you have to learn that you can control human aberration, really, before you realize you can control human ability.

Recently the boys have been getting hot enough with their auditing that a considerable change taking place in a lot of boys - lot of auditors that haven't had any auditing to amount to anything. See, new thing - they can control this thing. This is an oddity. You watch this thing work out. Of course, they have to recognize finally that they can control it, and this takes a while for them to do. But that is the longest trial that we have on auditing.

Now, let's take this as compared to the apt use of a technique. Let's take this „*I can control human aberration through these processes properly applied and so forth. I have control over it. There is a start, stop and change, and this kind of thing. Therefore and thereby and thereafter, I'm in pretty good shape with relationship to them.*“ But that man stops restimulating, is what happens to him. If he knows he can do this he stops restimulating. How does he know he can do this? It's by auditing people, one after the other, see. He audits them, he finds out he can change their behavior pattern and ability, and it ceases to be this huge mystery to him and he becomes very, very certain.

Now, I ran into the Foundation one day back in Wichita. I was in a hurry. I was going into my office to pick up a couple of papers, but here stood an auditor, a girl, she was white. I said „*What's the matter?*“ Somebody said immediately, „*Why, that psychotic she was assigned this morning*“ (she was a staff auditor) „*has been taken home by her husband.*“ I said, „*What's the matter here?*“ This kid was just shot, see. And I asked people around. Well, then, obviously - auditing session, short auditing session - this auditor had evidently done all the right things. This woman had gone into a violent restimulation, had practically spun in and been taken home back to Oklahoma or someplace by her husband. What about this?

A little Straightwire on this girl demonstrated the fact that this woman was the exact replica... I - we had never known before that this auditor had once worked in a sanitarium as an attendant. And this woman psychotic was the exact replica of a woman who had jumped out of the ward one fine day and practically strangled this auditor. This auditor was much younger. This woman psychotic in this old institution years before had practically strangled this girl, and now we get a duplicate person shows up. This auditor goes into complete restimulation, practically spins in, and although the auditor went right ahead and did the processes, the fear, the inability was so manifest to the preclear that the preclear just went out of mind.

Obviously the techniques couldn't have been well used. It must of just been lip service to the type of process this person was supposed to have. But you get the idea? Person - this girl knew she could not control that preclear even vaguely and as such, naturally was ready to quit, run. And when seen immediately afterwards was in a horribly restimulated state. What was in restimulation, however, was not just this incident of being jumped. What was in restimulation was the whole bank. „*See, I can't control human aberration,*“ it says immediately. Bang! There we go.

So your foremost job is to learn that you can handle human aberration, psychosomatic ills, and then that you can increase somebody's ability. That's the first thing we'll concentrate on. And therefore, let's get into the auditing techniques which we will be using. The first auditing technique we will be using is simply this one technique. I hate to have to tell you this: It's, „*Something you wouldn't mind remembering Something you wouldn't mind forgetting*“ That's the auditing technique we will use. We won't use it for very long, but it's the only one we can use. See, we're totally restricted.

Why that process? Merely want you to get into two-way communication amongst yourselves as a class unit. Get the idea? This is an easy way to do it and there's no significance at all.

Oddly enough, that's a terrifically potent process. But not so potent that it will blow anybody up. It's not that we distrust anybody; we also do that for another reason. We want to see how well you can follow an auditing instruction. Guy who knows an awful lot of auditing techniques finds he has a hell of a time all of a sudden turning around and settling down to this process. He knows what's wrong with this case. He knows he's going to do this he's going to do that. Well, we just put it on a training basis. „*Something you wouldn't mind remembering Something you wouldn't mind forgetting*“ Those are the two processes - two auditing commands.

We're going to do this for another reason. I don't think anybody here knows all he can know about communication lag and we're going to study it. And that one turns up some honeys.

Communication lag: The length of time from the moment the individual is asked something to the moment when he actually replies to that exact question regardless of what comes in between.

Caught somebody on this the other day who was trained in it. Said, „*Well, I really couldn't...*“ This person must have been doped off or something of the sort. This auditor knew this. Said, „*I couldn't tell what the preclear's communication lag was.*“ Auditor was kind of rattled; late in the evening when I caught him on this. „*I couldn't really tell what the person's communication lag was.*“

And I said, „*Well, you couldn't? Why?*“

„*Person kept talking all the time, couldn't get an answer.*“ Of course, that's communication lag. That's that. So, we take a look at this as communication lag and we'll estimate by communication lag the consequences and results thereof.

When we've discovered whether or not we can follow an instruction on auditing, then we will go immediately into a much tougher process which is still a two-way communication - that's a Straightwire process - we'll go into a Two-way Communication process. And that Two-way Communication process is simply involving problems and solutions. And we will simply do that in order to remedy enough problems around here so we don't have to have too many.

All right. Right now, though, your auditing command - the one allowable command for this Unit, and that pertains to anybody in this Unit - is on the preclear involved *„Something you wouldn't mind remembering. Something you wouldn't mind forgetting“* Okay? That's just to find out if you can follow an auditing instruction. It's the most wonderful duplication process known to man. Make a poor auditor duplicate like mad all over the place, the auditing question.

Okay. And the next thing that we will get into here in these lectures - which will take place at 12:30 every day - next place - thing we will get into will be this business of havingness. And we will give that a complete knockout. And I mean we will go over that very thoroughly.

Right along with that, at the same time we'll run in some Opening Procedure 8-C and so forth, but this will be rather fast. Opening Procedure 8-C is still working most gorgeously. We will also get into a subject not - you might think it has been, but it hasn't been - we will get into a subject called *„memory“* in this unit, which has never been covered before in any unit or in any publication. Memory. What is memory? Why is it? How far does this thing called memory go? Very fascinating subject. Fascinating once you know what it is. It's very baffling until you do. More ways to make a person's memory work than you can shake a stick at.

I didn't ever teach one of them but I used one, one night - a gimmick on a group here at the Church. And it worked on them; worked on them gorgeously. It certainly did startle them. Cases that couldn't remember this and couldn't remember that. Actually there's a process that will turn on a person's memory almost at will on any subject. You can handle memory. Memory's nothing to handle.

Now, as far as the first week or so are concerned we will be involved with picking up these various details, and then we will get on to this pan - exteriorization process and we will get hot with it. And we will see how hard it is to teach and we will see how hard it is to follow, and we will see any shortcomings which the process has by working it broadly on a group. This will be the first time it's been worked on a group. It's been worked, of course, by the Department of Writing and Investigation very thoroughly at this time, and all kinds of weird and incredible results can be obtained.

But our auditing goal today, which is something that you should know right here at the beginning, is simply to get them out. As far as the physical goal is concerned, it's adjust their anchor points. See, if we want somebody well physically, we'll adjust his anchor points. But that depends upon our getting him out first. So the emphasis is on exteriorization. Techniques are all emphasized in the direction of exteriorization. This, of course, is being taught straight into the teeth of fast exteriorization - get them out

quick, turn on their perceptions, patch up the physical beingness, jump the person's ability level. Just about that order.

It may be that one auditor has more facility than another in using the processes which I'm giving. That may be. But I'm afraid that that is a far better determining factor than the state of case today.

We can do the damndest things with psychosis. I mean, psychosis is no longer a problem. It is no problem. The answer to psychosis is the Opening Procedure of 8-C, and Two-way Communication, Mimicry and the technique of nonverbal communication - no speak; tossing the object back and forth. These are psychotic - they're not psychotic processes; they just happen to work on psychosis. I mean, the last psychotic that came into my auditing room, I said, „*Oh my, another psychotic. Well, let's see now. I'll have to give about - oh, I'll have to give at least three days for this and about fifteen minutes at a crack.*“ And that's what did it. I mean, it's real fast.

It has a lot to do with how fast the auditor could get into two-way communication with the psycho. Once that is done - sometimes only requires a minute or two. The last psycho that walked in my office walked in gibbering and walked out talking. And the total auditing time was two minutes. And this was very amazing to the two attendants that were with this psycho. This was very, very amazing.

I took the easy route. I simply flooded the psycho with ARC, you know? I just gave him a big bunch pf ARC, did a slight duplication of physical mannerism - brought the - brought the person into immediate communication, snapped him into present time, shook him by the hand and they left. They were considerably improved by this long and lengthy process, about two minutes. I spent a lot longer talking to the two attendants, you see, because they „*Ya, ya, ya, ya, ya. What wall?*“ They weren't disassociating anyhow.

Psychosis is no problem as an - actually, is no point for an auditor to concentrate on. I mean, he has to learn, and he should learn that he can do certain things for psychotics, so he can handle psychosis today. He should learn that just as one of the things he should know on controlling, and so forth. Because it is the more frightening, out-of-control mechanism. But actually your psychos are running on a two-watt peanut-whistle transmitter and they're as easy to handle as a small pile of beads. You can push them around, see, and so forth. An auditor has to learn that. Where an auditor should concentrate today is upon ability, because ability is a measurable thing. Person - person is taking a long time to learn how to play the piano, and you suddenly pick him up and make him play the piano in a hurry. Person is unable to drive a car well; you audit him for a while and they're - all of a sudden become tremendously able drivers.

You can never stop working on ability. It is a completely unlimited goal simply because there are entirely unlimited categories of ability.

I was working on ability the other day, myself I mean personally. I was - I do fairly well on a - on a motorbike. It's a great sport. I ride one for sport. You've got a lot of space around you. You don't have to have all this damn mass of windshields and all that sort of thing. You're in contact with your environment like a - like an old dog I

used to have. I - he used to hang his nose out the side of the car and boy he'd just whiff-whiff whiff-whiff whiff and he'd smell that landscape every place. Well, you don't smell anything but a motor or the air-conditioning unit in the car, or the dust. And on a motorbike, you see, you can smell anything. So I ride motorbikes and I have a good time doing this. But I ran into a kid out on the desert not too long ago who was riding a fairly light bike, and he'd shoot out of a gully and take the front wheel off and go ten or fifteen feet on his rear wheel only and then slam his front wheel down again. Get the idea? Spectacular. I couldn't do that.

So I went out about a week ago and took a good heavy bike and started to put it through its paces. And after I'd pulled it over on me a couple of times, I decided that there was something about this that I hadn't noticed. But instead of going around limping - my shins are still all covered up - instead of going around limping badly and bemoaning it and so forth, suddenly recognized what I was doing very ably. Physically, I recognized what I was doing. I was learning how to do it; I wasn't doing it. And because I was learning how to do it I was taking it easy at first.

You mustn't cut the throttle on a bike you are balancing just after it's come out of a gully. And I was instinctively cutting this throttle - see, because I was still learning. I would do it later on. So I put my goal too far up the time track and liked to kill myself as a result thereof, you see.

So the next time I said, „*Well, the hell with it. I've been doing it for two years.*“ In fact, I put it on the backtrack to make sure that I could. I distinctly remembered when the king and queen of Bulgaria were over here and I did this trick, and that was where I got the mocked-up medal that was hanging around my neck. And I slammed that bike down into the gully and slammed it out the other side of the gully and opened up its throttle wide as I went up the other side and didn't cut its throttle an instant as it came out of the other side, and of course it just walked along on its rear wheel just like nothing because there was no gyroscopic imbalance being entered into the situation at all. Its wheels were traveling at the same rate of speed right on along as it came out of the gully. It's very interesting thing. Bikes do that.

Male voice: Now both wheels.

Huh?

Male voice: Next week, both wheels. You've got - you've got yourself the - a similar problem in any point of training. Now, I've had boys in Units that go clear through to the end of the Unit before they know anything. You know, „*I will know this at the end of the Unit.*“ Well, therefore, this is the last day of this Unit, and all the rest of this Unit will be retraining. Just finished the Unit. You all graduated. Now, we'll learn how to audit. Okay?

I'm much more interested in what you're going to do with this blanket exteriorization process as a Unit and learn how to do it. I'm much more interested in that than I am in anything else.

But I am very, very morally, horribly certain that we have to hit some basics and some fundamentals here and there and refresh them up.

The task of auditing is not a very - not a very complicated right now, but funny part of it is you can't leave any pins out of it.

There are six basic processes as we know. Those six basic processes have to be understood as fundamentals of the business. Regardless of what we do with these six basic processes, you see, regardless of what we - how we apply them, there are six basic processes and there are just exactly six ways to do the six processes. And that fundamental can't be overlooked. One of the main reasons why, is because you from the Advanced Clinical Course will be doing a lot of instruction. And you will find out that your people - we have learned this the hard way - you'll find out that your people all too often are apparently very well based in theory, and then they go riding off on their horses in all directions and you get a maximum amount of disturbance in any kind of a small group you are training, just because of the absence of the precision of these processes.

There's a way to do each one of these processes, but of course there are other things that you can do with a preclear besides these processes. And I'm teaching you some better things to do than these basic processes. That doesn't mean these basic processes aren't good. They are the standard processes and they remain so.

Those processes are of course Two-way Communication, Elementary Straightwire, Opening Procedure 8-C, Opening Procedure Duplication, Remedy of Havingness and Spotting Spots. And those are the six processes, pang!

There's a precision way to do each one that's finally been worked on, worked out and agreed upon, and cases have been observed and results have been tabulated on each one of these processes until they're killers. That's right, they're just killers.

The only thing that whips those processes is this unit exteriorization technique when they don't exteriorize on „*Be three feet back of your head,*“ see.

Well, what do you know, then - what do you know. You cannot even vaguely handle a preclear on this type of process. It is not a good control process. You've got to get that preclear under control, you've got to get him squared around before you can work this other process. Otherwise he'll do anything but. And he can really squirrel himself.

Any time you handle dynamite of this caliber and velocity and nitroglycerin content, you are of course, of necessity, having a considerable amount of trouble getting a hold of your preclear and slamming him into the proper position in order to do just this process.

There's a lot of this, a lot of this. Easy way to exteriorize a preclear, of course, would be to be in perfect two-way communication with the preclear and he'd exteriorize. But how do you get into perfect communication with the preclear? Well, that's the remaining five processes.

Now, the number of boo-boos that auditor makes - auditors make today are all involved in exteriorization itself - all of them - really. They really foul up on this like mad. Old Route One - Route One processes - patching up anchor points, this sort of

thing. My God, I have seen more damn mistakes of the most gruesome kind made. Girl one time - fellow said to her, „*Be three feet back of your head.*“ You'd hardly call this boy an auditor. „*Be three feet back of your head.*“ He had no training by the way. And she was. And so then he took a book and he put it over in one corner of the room and he says, now he says, „*Go find the book.*“ So she did. And then he says, „*All right. Now..*“ and he took the book out into the bedroom and he says, „*Now find the book.*“ And she did. And then he took the book into the kitchen and she went and found the book. And then he put the book down some places in the cellar and she found the book about one more time.

And then he says, „*All right. Now, read me the first page out of it through the cover.*“ She couldn't do that, gave her a lose, banged her back in the head and made about fifty-five hours of work out of a perfect preclear for the next auditor that came along. Gave her a big lose her first moment out. Never got her - gave her a moment to stabilize herself, to even find out what she was, get used to the idea that she was different from the body. None of these things were even vaguely entered into this process. Well, a boo-boo like that is a pretty big one, but they can still make them - can still make them.

Well, the process is allowed again, „*Something you wouldn't mind remembering Something you wouldn't mind forgetting*“ Then we're going to take up some Remedy of Havingness.

But our next big jump after this will be a very fast review of these six processes and then we will get into this button process. Now, I hope to do that before the congress so you better make up your mind that you just graduated yesterday. You've graduated; now you want to find what the hell it's all about. Okay? All right.

(end of lecture)