

## COMPLEXITY

A lecture given on 17 October 1956

[Start of Lecture]

All right.

It's all very well to talk about auditing somebody, but what you doing?

Now, I know that's a dirty trick to ask anybody. There's a fellow by the name of... Oh, I don't -- I never mention names. Anyway, Lyle one time in an early course was asked by an auditor, I think -- asked him something on the order of how he went about acting and how he did it. And he got back he couldn't even took a microphone or a television camera in the face. He just couldn't act all of a sudden. He had an awful time getting back on.

Well, you, in any action -- even auditing -- tend to set up an enormous number of automatic responses. And you set these up, evidently, from a postulate which is the basic postulate of automatic responses -- is „*I can't do all these things at once,*“ or „*There are too many things to do at once,*“ or „*There is too much going on here; I must do less.*“ Do you get the idea? And so you set something up on automatic.

Now, for instance, Scientology organizations have a very hard time with me because I never set up any line in the organization on automatic. It's just something that I seldom do. I can do all these various functions, and every once in a while somebody finds me on his comm line doing them, which is a very disconcerting thing to have happen.

I'm supposed to be off someplace teaching an ACC or minding my own business or inventing a new book or something, you see? But all of a sudden, why, memberships are not on automatic, see? They never went on automatic. I always got my eye over here on memberships, see? I can do those too.

And membership all of a sudden gets a shot in the arm or a query or there is a new proposal or something that goes out. Is there something we ought to be doing that -- or we shouldn't be doing or something of this sort.

Everybody was horrified about a year ago to hear about this thing called associate membership which never expired and it only cost the price of the pin and so forth. It was a horrible thing.

And as a result, it just took months and months and months and months to finally get the pins made and get it into action and get it out, because it was too simple a membership.

Now, this thing was really grooved. An associate membership consists of a card with a pin attached to it, and it's handed to a professional auditor who hands it to somebody and says, „*One dollar, please.*“ And they pay him a dollar and then he doesn't do anything else; the auditor doesn't do another thing.

But the card says, „*Mail me at once.*“ So the person who bought the membership has the responsibility now of mailing in that card to the HASI. And they get back at once (and sometimes a little later) -- probably be much later now that Marilyn is here; she's off the post at the moment -- mails back this and puts him in the files. Now, no track has to be kept of these files beyond keeping track of a roll book on them, because the membership doesn't expire. This is too simple a membership. See?

The power of an organization to a large degree depends upon the size of its rank and file. And unless you can develop rank and file, and particularly file, in very large numbers, when you sneeze you've simply sneezed. But if you've developed a large rank and file, when you sneeze, why, the seismographs operate ecstatically all over southern California. Well, that's the associate membership, and that's all there is to that.

Now, the funny part of it is that a person ought to be an associate membership anyway. He ought to be an associate member anyway. Regardless of whether he is a general member or a special member or any other kind of a member, why, if he's an associate member he can really never be kicked out -- never. Which takes a lot of temptation away from officers and executives in the organization, you see? They could cancel all of his memberships except his associate memberships and he's still a member. So then they have to find some other prey. They have to go out and chop up senators or something, you know?

Well, anyway, there's a simple operation. There's a simple -- very, very basically simple operation. There's nothing much to it. Its simplicity was too much simpler for a long time. It took a long, long time to get it into operation. It actually is going slowly even now, but it's picking up a little speed; picking up a little speed. It's actually a profitable activity to some slight degree. If a fellow has a group of twenty-five people, actually he puts twelve dollars and a half in his pocket if he sells each one of them an associate membership. It's slight, but encourages him to go out and get more groups -- it's just that little bit that pays for his postage. That's all that it does; it doesn't do any more than that, but at least does that.

Now, it permits the group to belong. A fellow now belongs so that he can think and talk as part of the group, and so the group becomes alive. A group which is not composed of members is not a live group.

All right. Let's follow the course of the Constitution of the United States. It was written up -- same thing, intended to be a very simple thing. They had a closed congress so that nobody could possibly -- the Constitutional Convention -- nobody could possibly have known what was going on in that convention because it was a secret convention. They tore up all the notes every night. I think it was fifty years or forty years later that somebody published a diary on it. Monroe finally published his daily diary on the thing -- that much later -- which was a mistake.

The moment he published the mistake -- which was the fact that it was created and wasn't a thing -- some other people started to go to town on interpreting the Constitution. Up to that time it hadn't really occurred to anybody that it needed a lot of interpreting. It was a constitution, everybody could read it and understand it, and that was that; that was what you did.

Here was a rather simple document -- rather simple -- and it got more and more complicated, and more and more complicated, and the government went along in further complications. And now to read the Constitution, you have to read a book of many hundreds of pages, because you have to read all the Supreme Court decisions with regard to every paragraph and sentence in the Constitution. And, believe me, they abound -- these decisions, these Supreme Court decisions. They're practically endless.

If you started to read the lower-court decisions which were referred to the Supreme Court, and the number of things that were reversed and turned this way and that, well, you're in for a full law course. And that's what it's become. Somebody goes to school for six years to find out what the Constitution says.

I can do better than that. When I was about eight years old, somebody left a copy of it lying around and I read it. I said, „*That's fine*.“ Never had any trouble with it, actually, until one day in studying civics and law, legal procedures, somebody presented me with a book on the Constitution which was the textbook, and the thing was about a thousand pages; I never saw such a tome. And I started to read it, and every comma had been taken apart in the Constitution. And it's so complicated now nobody can follow it. See, it couldn't possibly be followed now. See, it's just too complicated. You have to know too much about it.

Well, this isn't just a mechanism to disenfranchise the private citizen; it's another thing that is going on. It has approached a level of complexity to a point where it itself is destroyed. That's the whole thing. You get the idea? So anything approaches a level of complexity at which it itself is destroyed.

Now, let's take up the human body. And let's just look at it -- not because the word Hobson-Jobson over into „*constitution*,“ but let's just take up the human body.

I'm going to let you in on something. It's horrible if you haven't already established this fact. The human body at one time or another was mocked up to persist through

an evolutionary cycle. And it did that. But what did it consist of? Of what did the human body consist at the moment of its mock-up? It wasn't necessarily small; it wasn't necessarily big. It was mocked up to do a cycle and it's still doing it.

Well, I'll let you in on something: It had no lungs. It had no stomach. It had no intestine. It had no bones. Didn't have any cells. It just worked. And then helpful little thetans coming along, started to invent things for it.

As an example of this, we read in the Vedic (many of the four Vedic Books), we read along there, and we find there's a rather uniform agreement that at a certain stage people all went to the devil. Everybody went to the devil, and they've been there ever since and going further to the devil. And they got so bad, it says in these ancient books, that they began to eat! It got so bad that they began to eat. Now, that's pretty bad, see? They evidently considered that was horrible.

Now, how do you get all this genetic blueprint? What is the genetic blueprint actually? It is an additive history of various types of forms which didn't succeed, which had to go someplace, so they got installed by Fac Ones.

The evolutionary track is apparently a swindle, because the mechanism of it can be run out, and the fellow suddenly winds up with no evolutionary track. But you didn't erase the evolutionary track; you erased the machinery which created one.

That's a different look at physiology, isn't it?

Now, I don't state these things to you as absolute, Aristotelian- yea/nay, clear-cut facts. They're simply the result of a great deal of investigation and the likeliest explanation of the data overhauled. This is the likeliest explanation.

We find on the course of auditing this genetic blueprint, that we diverge from the genetic blueprint and we move over into the actual body cycle as such. And we don't find hardly any of the early body cycle on record. It wasn't making records. Additive! The facsimiles became an additive factor. The machinery to make facsimiles then began to add factors to the body. The thetans running these bodies, now convinced that they needed all these extra gadgets, would put them in. And we had additive machinery. And we had machinery that adds machinery. And we find people are sick.

The body was evidently originally a very simple thing. One of these days we might get up to a point where you can mock up a visible body. We have techniques that go there right away, by the way. Quite fascinating.

The experimental evidence back of this, however -- I've only mocked up a shimmer; I've only had a preclear up to mocking up a shimmer in the middle of the room that somebody else then entering the room saw this shimmer in the center of the room. That's as far as we've gone.

The creation of a mock-up does not involve complexities; it involves a simplicity. And the person who cannot mock things up is doing so -- failing to mock them up -- because he has to have too many methods of mocking them up. There's too much methodology in his mock-ups and so he gets no mock-up. Follow this carefully.

You can say, offhand, other people have noticed this one way or the other, but they certainly haven't made it very clear. One of them is in the Bible -- something about „*Little children shall lead thee*,“ or something of the sort. Forgotten what that's all about.

When you have a simplicity, however, you do not necessarily have any power or direction or purpose or knowledge or experience. So don't confuse these issues. When you have complexity, you do not necessarily have any power or any knowledge or any experience. Have you got this? They're just disrelated.

When you have a complexity, you do not necessarily have difficulty. But if you have a complexity which contains unknowing, or unknown complexities, you've got trouble. You see what it takes?

It isn't just a complexity; it's a complexity which contains a number of unknowns. A communication system of great complexity would simply be one with an enormous number of terminals and an enormous number of lines. And we'd have no trouble with this huge system.

And let me go back to one of the oldest things we have, one of the oldest things we have in Dianetics: the calculating machine with the drop of solder on the digit 5 so that we have an additive 5. And nobody knows the drop of solder is there, and there's an unknown message goes into the machine every time they try to add something up, and so they never get a right answer. It takes, then, an unknown or unknowing bit to confuse the complexity.

Now, if we have a complexity with a great many unknowing bits in it through which messages are and should be traveling -- it requires all that -- which contains these various points which are unknown, we have a confusion. And that is the difference between a complexity and a confusion.

Now, wherever we see a great deal of difficulty on some complicated operation, we are apt to believe that the people involved in it are not capable of handling that many details, and that is an error of the first magnitude. And you who are studying ability should know that. It is an error of the first magnitude. There is no reason why one man couldn't run the U.S. government; there's no reason at all. He'd have to simplify his own handling of lines, perhaps. But he'd have a terribly complex operation going forward, and it would be (theoretically) handleable right up to the moment when unknown terminals and lines were introduced into the same complexity, which traffic then goes over and through and is shunted by. See that? The introduction of this series of unknowns would then make it impossible for one man to handle the entirety of the operation.

It is not necessarily true that when a thing evolves it develops unknown terminals and lines also. That's not necessarily true. But when a thing becomes complex and also develops unknown terminals and lines, it then becomes a confusion and then does follow the cycle of action to destroy, and destroy is arrived at.

There is nothing wrong with any preclear you have or will audit if the data is known to the preclear. This is a rule of thumb in auditing. If the preclear knows about it, it isn't hurting him. Now, that's an awfully hard thing for an auditor to swallow. You

can no more teach an HCA that, complete, than the man in the moon. You could teach [it to] him; he'd accept it intellectually. He'd sit down and he'd start auditing the preclear and preclear would say, „*Its my mother. Mother. Yup. Oh, she was terrible to me! Beat me! Starved me! Threw me down stairs!*“

So, „*Oh, poor boy. All these horrible things happened to him because of his mother. Ali! Nothing we can do about that except audit out Mother.*“ Now, listen, we are trying to make top auditors here. There's nothing wrong with auditing out Mother, about whom he is very upset. It makes the preclear far more comfortable, I am sure. There's nothing wrong with this. But it is the slow train through Arkansas. And if you expect him to go anywhere further on the road to OT by auditing out something he knows about, skip it.

I don't know how many thousand hours you could audit out things the preclear knows about. By auditing things he knows about, you are discrediting him. You're invalidating him really. You're saying, „*Look, there's parts of life that you know about that we know you can't handle.*“ The only thing he can't handle is what he doesn't know about.

Well now, this becomes a mystery indeed. Here sits Mr. Preclear and there you sit as an auditor and you're supposed to gab-gab, walla-walla with the preclear and he's supposed to tell you what's wrong with him, and then you are supposed to do something about it. Is that the way it goes?

Well, if it goes that way, it goes nowhere, don't you see? The complexity doesn't hurt him. The unknowns which have entered in to an already complex communication and terminal pattern are capable of killing him dead.

Now, I'll give you an example of this. Up in front of my face I will give you an auditing command here which you should be able to follow very easily. Now, got it? You could follow that as an auditing command couldn't you?

Go ahead and do so. All right, that's good. Fine. Fine.

All right, you all set? All right, now raise the same number of fingers that have raised. He can see. You got it?

The reason you didn't do that's because you're dependent on sight to tell you how many fingers I was holding up behind my back. You don't have to do that either. You're also dependent on light to tell you Tsk! You're also dependent on space to be told through. You got it?

There's a lot of factors involved which make that an unknowingness and each one of them is led by a dependency. Every unknown factor there ever will be was preceded by a dependency upon it.

So nobody could come in and louse up this one man running the whole government by simply introducing some unknown terminals and some unknown comm lines. You know, they just extraneously introduce these unknown terminals and unknown comm lines, and he walks along one day, and he sees something going on and he's not quite sure what it is and so on. This wouldn't upset him; he could take care of it unless it was done this way: He's depending on a certain number of police as terminals in various parts. That's what he's using for terminals; he's using these cops. One of these

cops on whom he is depending ain't dependable, isn't even on the force, wears a uniform and is totally in the enemy's pay, who has a charming personality, and who individually has invited the greatest confidence on the part of the fellow ho is running the whole government. Wow! Now we've got something that can wreck the works. Do you follow that?

But an unknown must be preceded by a dependency to be aberrative. A person was dependent on something, and now he doesn't know that he's still depending on it, and he doesn't know that it's still there. You got it? It's just gone out of view. And yet he's still depending on it, and it's still unknown. But it was known once when he was depending on it, wasn't it?

So we get our next little rule: That it must once have been known to become unknown in an aberrative sense. It must once have been known to become unknown in an aberrative sense.

We're driving through a park. We see only the road and the flowers on either side of the road. Only those flowers are in our view. It is very true that the flowers one hundred yards deep into the park are unknown to us. That's quite true. We are not looking at them. We do not know what flowers are there. This is unknown to us. But we never depended on them for our pleasure or scenery, nor have we known them. They don't worry us then.

Now, we're passing down the same road, but when we were children we played a hundred yards deep there into the woods, and there was a little glade and it had very pretty flowers. And we decide that these are very nice woods, and we start to go looking for the glade. We can't find it. It bothers us.

Why does it bother us? Because we're sure it's turned up somewhere else. We're sure that it's now haunting us. If we can't find it, we are very prone to assume it still exists, oddly enough. We don't say necessarily that it has been eclipsed and changed and doesn't exist anymore. We are more prone to say, *„It's still there but I can't find it.“*

Why is this? Because that's the safe thing to do according to a thetan. It's very unsafe to merely assume that that glade is no longer there and has disappeared and that's that. If he's in a very calm frame of mind he can assume that. But if he's in a little upset about life, and he's lived for a while, you know, and -- know what I mean? -- best thing to do is to assume that it still exists. He doesn't see it; he doesn't find it; it's not there.

And we get this queer, odd, little phenomenon of Straightwire. Now, Straightwire is a very limited process which is very workable for a very brief space of time. It works for a few commands. It's pretty good, pretty good.

Something general like *„Remember something that is really real to you“* or something like that: That's not bad. It can be run, however, on a specific personality with disaster: *„Remember a time when your mother was there.“* Now, *„remember a time when you saw your mother“* becomes one of the most aberrative processes that could be run. You strip the visio of Mother off the track, and what do you leave in its place? You leave the *„there-ness“* of Mother.

How many times were you walking down the street and Mother was alongside of you and you never looked at Mother? You knew Mother was there though, didn't you? So to run out Mother by knocking out all the times that you were looking at Mother becomes a near fatality, because it leaves Mother omnipresent for the preclear.

This works better: „*Can you recall a time when you knew Mother was there?*“ „*Recall a time when you knew Mother was there.*“ You'd have a better chance. This is still not good because it's a fourth-postulate process. But you'd still have a better chance because that is the trouble.

A valence is an omnipresence; it too often is accompanied with a thereness. „*I know Mother is there.*“ One is riding down the road, Mother is in the back seat. He knows Mother is there, but he is not looking at Mother. He's asleep in the house; he knows Mother's in another room asleep in bed. He's not looking at Mother, but he's aware of her thereness. So there is her thereness, don't you see?

Now, looking at Mother is a complicated thereness. Just knowing Mother is around is a simple thereness.

Now, let's invert it and make it the most complicated phenomenon. We know Mother is there but we cannot locate her at once. We have this feeling she is there, but we do not locate her. Brrrr! It's not so good. People will even believe in ghosts after a while.

Now what does this lead to? The complexity of life adopted by a person proceeding into complexities is very much upset by this additional factor that the people that were there are not there, but he knows they're there. And that is what's wrong with a valence; that's what a valence is.

If you described a valence as „*He's having valence trouble. We all know what that is. He's closed terminals with, and he thinks he is, and he's in the valence of some near relation or somebody close to him.*“

Well, let's not describe it that way. Let's describe it another way entirely: He is aware of the thereness which is a not- thereness. He knows there's some kind of a comm line going into some kind of a terminal that isn't present, and he has restimulated one of these „*I know Mother is there.*“ He's restimulated „*I know Mother is there.*“

It could be no more serious than the fact that he fell down as a little boy, and Mother is in the other room, and he's feeling mighty sad because he's all bunged up, and he's lying in bed. And he knows Mother is in the other room; Mother is there, you see? That's quite all right then; everything is fine. It becomes part of the engram, the thereness of Mother.

So we run this engram very cheerfully, and we skip all of the fascinating and pertinent data in the engram, which was the preclear knowing that Mother was there. So we run the engram and we don't solve the valence: We never ran out his knowledge that Mother was there.

Now, you see, knowing Mother was there at first was simple, but now it's gotten complex. We know Mother is there, but Mother is not there. Now you see how complex that is? And that can be quite aberrative.



And that is why a valence is aberrative, and that's the only reason it's aberrative: It's gotten to be a complicated thereness. And it's also a complicated not-thereness which leaves us with the wonder if it is there, and one deals with this by submerging it entirely out of view. It goes entirely out of sight, and he doesn't even know who isn't there! That's the worst; that's the worst thing. He does not even know who isn't there.

We had an early SOP that has a technique that says some of the darnedest things happen. „*Tell me somebody who isn't there. Who isn't present?*“

„*Well, so-and-so isn't present, and so-and-so isn't present.*“ And there's somebody right in the room that all of a sudden had a cousin show up that had been there all the time -- been there all the time and he didn't know that this fellow was there. This is what we call a spook. That's a technical word, „*spook.*“ It's a person who is there who isn't there.

Now, this spook is one step forward on to being the thing that isn't there. The next thing you know, we become so worried about the spook that the best thing to do to solve the whole thing is to settle the whole question and be the spook, but the spook isn't there and neither is the preclear. You got it?

So when you say „*Look at that wall*“ and the fellow can't look at the wall and see any clear wall, the only thing that's really wrong with him is he is somebody who isn't there.

And this popular song, „*The Little Man Who Wasn't There,*“ was oddly enough terribly popular. One of the most popular songs; it sold more copies! It was wrong with everybody. Terrific general agreement -- „*The Little Man Who Wasn't There*“ or „*Who Isn't There.*“

Now, where do we enter this kind of a situation? The fellow doesn't know... He's probably in this kind of a state: He has a dozen spooks and he's being at least one thing that has previously been a spook. See, let's say he's a case of thirteen spooks, one of whom he's being.

This is a case of the preclear is haunted. And that's basically, in terms of personality, what is wrong with him. Basically, that's what is wrong with him. It is the not-thereness of the people he knew was there.

He likes the assurance of havingness, he likes the assurance of mass, he likes to touch things. And we get most of our phenomena of thought out of this crazy not-there, there, so forth. We get this hair-trigger, slap-happy this and that. And he -- understand, he doesn't need any of these spooks, but he dreams up uses for them now that he's got them. He uses them. There are specific patterns of use of these spooks. Does all sorts of weird things here.

Well, we look over all of this, and we see that a complexity has proceeded from the simple fact of somebody was there. Somebody was there and he knew that somebody was there. He didn't even have to look at that person. Now, after a while he gets anxious, and he has to look at the person to make sure the person is there.

You never saw anybody in a state of anxiety until you've seen a little child who has become already very anxious about the presence of his mother. Mother just starts to walk away from him and he cries and he gets very, very upset. Mother has to be always in view.

It's quite an amazing thing. For instance, my kids have a fantastic tolerance level on this particular fact. They're very fond of their mother. Boy, she is a hit! She is five-star as far as they're concerned. See, she's the queen, just swell. They love her most to pieces, so forth.

She says goodbye to them and they go back to playing. Calm, cool, comfortable -- doesn't worry them a bit. They have this level of trust; they know she'll turn up again. They don't have to keep their eye on her!

So we get another factor associated with valences. We must already have achieved a situation where one had to keep his eye on something to know it was there. So we have abandoned already knowing something by just knowing it, and we know it now by seeing it, and then when we can't see it anymore we know it's still there. That's the dub-in. So we get a spook.

Now, there's the complexity of a mind. A man actually starts thinking through these comm terminals.

Now, back of all of this, of course, are the elements of existence, and they are more aberrative than people. By and large, they're more aberrative than people. Light, darkness, walls, sound vibrations, other things of this character are really more aberrative than people. They become more thoroughly unknown.

One tries to do all sorts of things with these. Why? Because there is a thing called time. Single aberration is time -- Dianetics. Very true. This thing called time is eternally associated in anybody's mind with anything. It is the common denominator of incident.

But more important than that, time alone permits things to proceed into a complexity; time alone. If something is old, it's complex. You almost draw that as a conclusion. If something is old and has been many times changed in the course of existence, its complexity contains unknowns, and you have a person.

Now, what are all these mental image pictures? What are these machines that make them? What's this thing that mocks up a body? How come?

Actually, it's an effort to recover time. A person begins to view time as a continuous parade of loss instead of a continuous parade of gain. He doesn't think the next minute will ever come. As a matter of fact there's a cliché, a social cliché: they say, „*We'll do it tomorrow because tomorrow never comes.*“ There's no havingness in the future; there's some havingness in the past. And as a result, then, we get time producing or enforcing the production of (through the considerations of the thetan) tremendous complexities, one of which is the mental image picture. And thus we have a mind.

The there -- not-there spookness influenced by the parade of time and backgrounded by the elements of the universe itself have required solutions, no matter how poor, and those solutions, no matter how poor, have become the mind.

The mind could be defined as a series of solutions to identity and time, which don't work.

Now, let's take at first this thing called a body, a mock-up. Let's consider it more or less in the light of the walls, space, light. It's of that order of magnitude. It is just a body. That is all that it is. It isn't even something to see with or hear with or handle or control things with. It is an existing thereness which in some cases is ambulatory.

Consider that body, for the purpose of auditing, in the same order of magnitude that you would consider space, walls, light, sound, particles, motion. Just consider it that in the same order of magnitude. It can be moved; it can be made to stay still; it can do this and it can do that. Tremendous number of things then become added to it, and we have already entered the borderline between body and mind -- the additives. They are functional purposes for this body which in its origin has no purpose, any more than light has a purpose. Do you see this?

Now when we start to add functional purposes to this body, and modify its structure and do this and do that with it, we have already begun a complexity.

The next step, of which this complexity of additives is a part, is the mind. We've got the body. Now, we've got all these additives and they are part of the body, but they are the bridge to the mind; so that we find the glandular system, for instance, monitoring various actions in the body when called on from the level of the mind. We have these glands reacting in certain ways when an observation of danger is made on a mental level.

But a mind consists of purposes, games, losses, wins, and „*what I had yesterday*“ in a constant parade. Every time the clock goes tickity-tock you've lost a universe -- pocketa-pocketa-pocketa- pocketa-pocketa, gone universe, gone universe, gone universe. Look around! Gone universe, gone universe, gone universe. I'm going to count: one, two, three, four, five, six, seven, eight, nine, ten. Have you still got nine? See? Fascinating trick, isn't it?

How do you get it back? You got a picture of me saying nine. Now, if you could make that solid enough, you'd have the universe back the way it was.

One of the more interesting puzzles about all this is just this: Is there any time? Horrible question. Is there any time? This is all you've to think about with regard to this. Is there any...?

It isn't the question of how time works, but is it?

Now, you could even think of it this way: A thetan is in motion along a time track. He can appear at different periods of time; but these walls never travel in time, they're always here. There's only one time for a wall, and that's now. And now, the instant of mock-up, is now, the instant of the end of eternity and the thetan is the one traveling along this track.

All right, there's a reverse view: The now of the wall is way back there and its future is way up there. And a thetan is motionless the whole way, and he never moves in time. Now, which of these is correct? Which of them is correct?

Hm? Which is the correct one? Hm?

Audience voices: The last one. Give me two guesses.

The last one. The last one. Boy, he sure makes these walls work hard.

Now, here we have a thetan, who isn't moving in time, recording time in passage. That's a nice trick. So we have a deeper and more significant purpose to a facsimile: that's to tell him, at least, „*it has gone by*.“ When he loses the power to tell himself that it has gone by, he thinks it is, and you have aberration. That's all there is to it. When he loses the power to tell himself that it has gone by, then it is, and that's aberration.

The only person that's ever going to tell him that it's gone by is him -- or maybe an auditor.

But the instant that doesn't go by is the instant he doesn't know about -- on which he has depended. Quite interesting, isn't it?

Well, we get senior processes for the mind which are very good. But it's quite interesting to note, as we took over these processes in general, that we are handling two different items here at once. One of these items is called a body, which has the same complexity as a lump of wood. Maybe that's too complex. It has the same complexity as a pile of putty -- that's it -- to which has been added enough bric-a-brac, functions, purposes...

It's like building a Wright Whirlwind airplane engine. They pour the gasoline in through the carburetors in order to create heat which forces the pistons down and causes the propeller to turn. Very interesting, because they have huge vanes; the air rushes by the vanes to cool off the burning of the gasoline so that the heat won't drive down the pistons. That's bad enough. But take something like an Allison: it burns up all this fuel to create heat so that it can circulate fluid to pick up and exhaust all this heat. In other words, it burns its fuel to cool itself. Of course, oddly enough, they actually do get somewhere. And that, I'm sure, is by postulate.

When automobile companies get old, their postulates get so they don't hold and their cars don't run anymore. That's more or less a fact. Quite interesting. They can't make a motor stick in the frame. Their postulates aren't working well. But whether their postulates work or not has nothing whatsoever to do with the actual identity called a motor minus its functional characteristics. A motor is a mass. What is a mass? It's a mass. Where did it come from? It got mocked up. Who mocked it up? I don't know. You're looking at it, aren't you? What you asking me for? Now, as we examine this whole field of the body, we discover that its one struggle is to retain form. It has a hard time doing this. People use them in racing cars and throw them off cliffs. But a body could retain form perfectly if it were not for the additive functional characteristics given to it, and the modifying pictures which have been taken of it when it was in bad shape.

How would you like to come around and every time you were trying to convince somebody about what a wonderful fellow you had been in college, somebody kept dragging out albums full of pictures which showed you in an automobile wreck, which showed you dead drunk, which showed you right after you had flunked, which showed you just after you'd been jilted, which showed you being carried off of the football -- they didn't show the beautiful run-punt you made; they just showed you being carried off the football field with one arm dangling. An album full of these things.

The chief and principal pictures on the track which are in restimulation are the pictures of loss. That is what confirms this time theory. And what if somebody accumulated all the pictures of every time you'd lost anything; do you think you'd have a good time or an easy time retaining your form?

Walk up to an old lady on the street and grab her pocketbook and start to run with it. Now, I can assure you that her form and presence will not be as good as it was before you grabbed the pocketbook. Yet you now have given her a picture of herself looking that way, and that is the one which is in restimulation. Real cute, but that's the mind.

The only thing you can patch up about a body is its form. That's all you can patch up about a body. Its function and so forth have to be patched up more complexly, because they're the mind at work. But you can cancel the action of the mind on the body, thus to a marked degree restoring original body form, by bypassing and nullifying the influence of the mind.

The healer depends on this mechanism and doesn't know it. He depends utterly upon the body's ability to get well, no matter what he does to it. I said „*healers*,“ not psychiatrists. They depend on the body, you see, to return to original form.

Fellow by the name of Hannecan, about, oh, I don't know, 140 years ago, some thing on that order (a very, very brilliant man), invented something called, I think, homeopathy.

And this chap, although he did not really make this an isolated principle the way he should have -- to the degree... If he'd studied a little further, he would have been better off -- easily during the last couple centuries, this man had the cleverest things to write. I mean, he was the smartest. A very, very intelligent fellow.

He claimed that the body was running some sort of a cycle, and if you simply let it get over the cycle of its illness without interrupting it, it would then recover, but that interrupted cycles of illness were the current illness of the body. Quite interesting as a theory.

I've talked to some of these chaps and told them how to complete the body's cycle in a few ways and so on, and they've done it and had remarkable results with it. Old-time Dianetic cycle-of-action processing fits in exactly with homeopathy. All right. They're fascinated with this, by the way. This is of tremendous interest to them. We've solved that, you see, and they can do all sorts of things with it. These are usually very good chaps too, by the way.

Now, if you want to address the mind directly to heal the body, you aren't addressing what's wrong with the body. That's the truth. The only thing that's wrong with a body is altered form. The mind merely confirms this. The body is running on a postulate that says it should be a body and have this form; that's the postulate it's running on.

Now it runs into walls and gets dropped down wells and is given other changes; it's given changes. Now, it would always recover from these changes. This is factual; we know this and can prove this in Scientology. It would recover from these bashings and batterings instantly if they were not held in place by mental image pictures. You could drop a fellow down the well; he would break both legs. You fish him back up to the top of the well, you dry him off, and he's well -- unless you take a mental image picture of the fall, the break of the legs, fishing him back up and all the sympathy that he got, and all the horror that it occasioned; the fear of the thetan in that body or controlling it, concerning that fall. The body couldn't think less of the situation.

You could probably take a body and flatten it against a wall at a terrific velocity -- just flatten it flatter than a pancake, peel it off the way they do in these cartoon strips.

You wonder why these cats and mice in these cartoon strips recover their physical beingness only two frames later, having just had all of their whiskers, fur and tail blown off. They're just bodies; they're not being run by minds. Nobody who draws cartoon strips, in other words, has a mind. So naturally you get a recovery of these bodies, don't you? There is no reason to keep them in that state.

In other words, there's nothing going to happen to a body if it isn't held in suspense, if you don't have a mental image picture, or the pattern confirmed by something.

The body is running on a postulate to be a body and to look as it should look at some period of its cycle. That's the way it should look, and unless one alters this with a mental image picture which keeps it pressed against a wall or something of the sort happening to it, it will then return to and look like a body.

The mental image picture as an installed mechanism is an effort to recover from time. For whom? For the thetan, so he can know the incident has gone by. Why? He has a picture of it now. And he's all right till the picture is the incident.

So what is body therapy? What is body therapy? Would it be a mental therapy?

A mental image picture of a moment of loss is an obsessive duplication of a moment of injury. The core of that is duplication. Now, you might not be able to remedy the time, but you can remedy the duplication.

Therefore, mimicry processes work. They ignore the fact that the mind is holding other pictures in suspense. You just bypass the whole thing...

Please note: at this point in the lecture a gap exists in the original recordings. We now rejoin the class where the lecture resumes.

You could saw off its legs and you'd then have a body without legs. But remember its postulate is to have legs, so somehow or other its postulate must be interfered with or

made more complex by having an additional postulate of no legs laid into it. What laid the postulate into it?

If it'll run forever on its original postulate, then what would be the consequence of laying original, additional postulates into it? New postulates into it? What would be the course of difficulty?

You'd eventually get a confusion, and so many of them would be unknown you'd get a destruction, wouldn't you?

The one postulate which you mustn't erase from an individual is „*I am a body*“ that is in the body. You can erase this out of a thetan, but in view of the fact that the source of this postulate, the postulate itself isn't available to you, you will never erase it.

If you want to become indestructible, don't postulate that you will have no effects. Simply make the body capable of carrying out its original postulate, that's all.

One of the best ways I know of to achieve this is just Mimicry. This bypasses the mind utterly.

All right. There's another version or two of Mimicry which you should know now, another version or two of Mimicry you should know all about. And that version is to tell the fellow to mimic other things than the auditor. Obvious process, isn't it? It's a walk-about process. Walk-about processes -- you take them outside. Go on, think it over. We assume you have established communication with the preclear. Most cases, I think you have.

Now let's look at a walk-about process. The auditing command would be -- unless you get locked up; the little men in white coats come out -- would be to the thetan, not to the body, wouldn't they?

Certain postulate and conclusion, certain cognition is arrived at if you tell somebody „*Is there anything around here you could mimic? All right, mimic it.*“

You got the auditing command? That's it. „*Is there anything around here you could mimic? Okay, mimic it.*“ Got it as a technique? The exact wording is „*Is there anything around you could mimic? All right, mimic it.*“

Example: „*Is there anything around here you could mimic? Well, all right, that fireplug. That's fine. Mimic it.*“ You got it now?

The only improvement that you might put on the auditing command, that you might find necessary, is „*You mimic it.*“ Saying it here that „*You mimic it*“ undoubtedly would register better with the preclears being audited. You got it? Hm?

That is a walk-about process. The not-know processes, Union Station and all the rest of them, they're all walk-about.

We assume now that you're in communication with your pc. Think you are? Think you are? All right.

Now, let's do a walk-about. „*Is there anything around here you could mimic? Well, mimic it.*“

Now, whatever happens, happens -- the way it says in The Arabian Nights. Whatever happens, happens. And you got the idea, you're not there to stop things from happening. Don't get yourself mixed up with the cops. The fellow tells you, well, he has to do this and this and this, or this and this and this, or that or that or that, or it goes this way, or it goes some other... That's the way it goes. In business the customer is always right; in this process the preclear is right. That is the way you mimic a fireplug. You're in for some surprises.

Now, we assume the weather will be fairly decent tomorrow. Got it?

You don't necessarily have to go places where there's lots of people, you understand. You just go places where there's lots of things. You know? Got it now?

Well, that is your assignment. The only way anybody blows this session, by the way, is by being made to mimic it in some other fashion. You recognize that the eventual resting point of an engram is in the physical fiber of the body. Recognize that. When it does that it becomes a dramatization.

Now, the way you mimic is the way you mimic. Got it? Any questions? All right, that's that.

Thank you.

[End of Lecture]