

ABERRATION AND THE SIXTH DYNAMIC

A lecture given on 13 November 1956

[Start of Lecture]

The difficulties of processing are nothing compared to the difficulties of preclears. Preclears are often more difficult than processes. A process is very easy to understand but preclears aren't. You can run a process on exactly what is wrong with the preclear, and you know it very, very well, and it doesn't work. And the preclear is difficult, and he won't do anything about it all. He refuses to cognite. He refuses to leap up in the air and say, „*What do you know!*“ He refuses to do anything. He just sits there, as a sodden lump of dough, and says, „*Nyah, nyah, nyah.*“

You say, „*Are you doing the process?*“

And he says, „*Nyah, nyah, nyah.*“

This is a situation which we're addressing today, and procedure could be defined as that action which forestalls your busting his head in. It is a gradient scale of doing so which doesn't excite the more bestial impulses of auditors, you see. It warns him in due time that he's not going on the right line. Now, we have that in procedure, too.

Part of the procedure that I haven't stressed very much, is the auditor, sitting forward tensely, no longer leaning back in the chair, with a rather strained look on his face, and a sort of a hopeful light shining in his eye. And this part of procedure is that point where we have to have better processes or we'll get dead preclears!

Now, there are several processes which are designed to keep procedure from going to its ultimate conclusion. Now, processing is a fight between procedure and a process, really. Procedure tends to defeat a process, of course -- tends to -- because if you carried it forward to its ultimate, there would be nothing left there to process. In other words, you would have controlled him down to nothing. You would have acknowledged him until he didn't have any head left. You would have completely fixated him

on you to such a point that he would no longer be aware of anything in life except an auditor looking at him tensely.

Now, the process is there simply to interrupt this cycle. That's the only reason there's a process there at all. Now, if you carried a process through to the ultimate, he'd get up to a point where he wouldn't obey your commands anymore. So you mustn't carry a process through to the ultimate, either. We've got to keep this whole thing in a state of balance between procedure and the process, and that's why we stress the two of them these days.

You lose preclears, actually, if you don't balance these things properly. They get well, they leave, they recover, or they kick the bucket, or they cave in. You see, if you bring too much imbalance between these two things, why, you get a change of case. Now fortunately, it's very difficult for a person to -- very difficult for a person -- to change for the worse. This is an unfortunate fact. I've lamented it several times. It's just been forced upon us by nature. We can change him for the better, always, but change him for the worse is much more difficult.

So if you are trying to change him for the worse, the procedure you use actually has to be reversed procedure: When you should acknowledge, don't; when you should throw in a communication bridge, drop an ashtray; when you have an ability regained, unflatten it again by running the process in a tone of voice which seems to indicate that he's gotten nowhere! You actually have to run procedure in reverse, and even then you're simply holding your own with the preclear. He's really not getting much worse.

Of course, preclears can be thrown downhill rather suddenly and rapidly by Scientology auditing by sudden and surprising gambits, which have to be well thought out in advance. Don't leave these things up to automatic at all; don't leave them to chance. You have to plot them very, very carefully.

When he says he has had a hard night, say in a mock-sympathetic voice -- here's this interesting gambit -- say in a mock-sympathetic voice, you see, with no sincerity in it at all, you see, „*Oh, that's too bad.*“ But make sure you say it in the tone which should say, „*I couldn't care less,*“ you know? And when he originates some communication or another, receive it in such a way as to make him realize that you have heard it often before, and it seems to be very old and useless for him to do anything like that. Every time his case betters, accuse him of trying to avoid the process.

There are a number of these things. They have to be carefully thought out in advance and carried through with a complete plan. If you just put it on automatic and so on, why, the case doesn't worsen. It's very difficult; it's almost impossible to worsen a case. And as a result an auditor has to work harder at that than he does to better a case.

Now, if you're just in a calm frame of mind about life and you're doing all right, and you're merely processing people for the fun of it, and that sort of thing, they get better; they get better. So you want to watch carefully this attitude of careless insouciance, you know, of just, you know, mediumly sloppy procedure, and so on; they'll get better under it. And you have to be more careful if you want them to get worse.

Now, the fact of the matter is that bad auditing -- by which we mean simply auditing which is somewhat offhand, indifferent, incorrect, the auditor auditing his own case out of the preclear, you know, that sort of a thing (well, we'll call that bad auditing) -- is actually better than no auditing at all. It actually is. So you have to be very careful if you're going to worsen a case.

See, it isn't enough to be merely offhand and careless and kind of dumb about what you're doing, and so forth. That is not enough. The case will get better. I'm just warning you; case will improve. You have to get down and plot it. You have to make sure that you have decided that you're tired of auditing. You have to make certain that the preclear understands that your treatment of him is merely an imposition, as far as you're concerned.

One of the things that works very, very well in that regard is tell him after he pays you for the intensive, right there at the beginning, „*Now that I've got your money, I couldn't care less.*“ You know, that sort of thing. These things tend to worsen a case.

But now, if you really want to make one worse, I'm afraid that you have to go in for mechanical assists. I think you do. I think it takes a mechanical assist like a fist, or it takes... Well, I'll tell you the best one I know; how's that? The best one I know is to take a sheet of glass and put it in front of the preclear -- clear, very clear glass -- which is supercooled, preferably about a -100 centigrade. You got that? Supercooled, you know? And then put the preclear right in front of this supercooled sheet of glass and suddenly shove his face into the glass. Now, that's pretty good. I mean, that was developed about five billion years ago by a whole-track psychiatrist. And it's pretty thorough, because its conductance is such, the whole bank of the thetan -- which is already short-circuited to the body, you see, it's connected to the body -- now connects to the glass, and you get a total collapse of engrams, facsimiles, locks. Anything electrical -- ridges, anchor points, anything like that -- collapses at once upon the glass. See, you put the body in physical contact with it.

Now, you can do better than that by throwing some water in his face just before you shove his face into the glass; it does it faster. But this refinement is only worth another ten seconds.

Takes about twenty seconds, then, to accomplish a total brainwash of a case.

Now, if you wish to play God, as the whole-track psychiatrist did at that time, all you have to say at this time is, of course, „*Go to Earth and be president,*“ or something like that, you know? And a thetan, being properly brainwashed now, will take off, and that's that. But that's a rather thorough, purposeful procedure.

It's much better to say, „*Stay here, you dog*“ or something like that, or „*You can't leave,*“ in the midst of all of that confusion so as to give him a stable datum to as-is that amount of confusion. Now, in the future as he goes along, whether he exteriorized or not, it's quite interesting to note that any electrical energy which comes in his vicinity will continue to collapse upon this vacuum. So that if he does form, or he has a body that forms a great many facsimiles or engrams or something like that, these facsimiles and engrams will then collapse upon the old vacuum, and this keeps him rather per-

petually brainwashed. And he's not much troubled with facsimiles. He has a black screen or something like that.

Well now, as the engrams and so forth collapse upon the glass, they turn black, and they leave a field there, which is quite interesting. A fellow can't see. He has to have some other means of seeing so he can see around the field. Also, it interrupts the mechanisms of perception in various ways. So that you can do most anything you want to do with this particular regard.

Now, there are other ways to do it. You can take liquid air, for instance, and put it in a glass and give somebody a drink of it. This is always good; it's always good. You can take -- there are many ways to go about this, you understand -- supercold, just supercold items, one kind or another, any way you wish to apply them.

I know I myself had a rig worked out in order to take care of witch doctors down in Africa. Ran this way: I was going to get an asbestos glove, you know, and -- it doesn't matter whether something is supercold or superhot, you know? They both burn and there is sensation, so the practitioner should be careful when he's doing something like this. I was going to take an asbestos glove and I was going to put a metal disc, preferably a lead disc, in the palm of the glove, you see? And there'd be a little snap in there so that it could be taken out and put in easily. And get this little disc supercold, totally supercold, you see? Get it down there to maybe -200 or something like that -- way down, you know -- and then snap that quickly in the glove and go out and shake hands with the witch doctor.

Well, the dampness of a palm is quite adequate there, and it would of course brainwash him. Be very, very effective. As a matter of fact, one could probably take over the entirety of witch-doctoring throughout Africa with the greatest of ease, particularly if you shook hands with all of the witch doctors in front of the tribe, and they instantly went down on their knees and went „*gaggo bulla*,“ and you said, „*Bark*,“ and they would thereafter bark.

You see, they hold all the natives in that sort of a thrall. And so if you held them in that sort of a thrall, why, then the natives would of course do what you said twice as good as they would do what the witch doctor says; and this is already perfect.

You see, this is a very good method of throwing people downscale, but it's mechanical; that's its disadvantage.

Now, working as a thetan, you can drive a beam through somebody's skull and give him a stroke; this is very easy. Nipping, it's called, and so forth. And you could reduce people on the Tone Scale that way. There are many mechanical means, therefore, by which you can suppress the survival rate of a thetan who has been foolish enough to get connected with a body -- many mechanical means. There are practically no mental means which are effective which do not depend upon the person's already-existing dependency upon mechanical means.

Now, the only reason a person could be brainwashed is because his brain has become mechanical; only mechanical means can reduce it. Therefore, if you work in the direction of handling good Black Dianetics -- if you work in that direction -- you must be

very careful to utilize all the mechanical means possible. Now, you can impede somebody's action in a certain field by telling him he has to do something by several ways. If you make these ways convincing enough, you will simply impede, however, that one skill. You actually haven't hurt the person very much. This requires a mechanical approach.

Now, if it does require a mechanical approach, then let me ask you this: Why? Why does it require a mechanical approach? Actually, there are no vis-à-vis mental means of totally, swiftly reducing a case down to the last notches without a mechanical assistance. You need energy and spaces and tricks with heat and extremes of one kind or another. You need mechanical renditions of pain, as the Spanish Inqui -- Spanish Inquisition, by the way, was quite practical until they wore it out completely. They got [to the] point where nobody would belong to church anymore; he might be inquisited, and so on.

But they used pain and so on. In other words, they could pull people downscale rather easily by use of mechanical means. Now, why is this?

Dependency on mechanics, then, must be the entrance point to a downscale slide. Dependency. Dependency on spaces, particles, masses, so on; dependency on these things. Because the dependency becomes an impossibility to have, and when one can't have it anymore, why, it then becomes painful when he accepts it.

Now, I'll give you an idea of this. Somebody loses his wife. And years later somebody comes along and says they found something out in the garage, something interesting. And they give him the sewing basket she used to use. His reaction will be pain. Mental pain, we call it, but actually it's physical pain too. It's actual loss of the body restimulated, don't you see?

So here's the case where being given something causes pain, and yet the something is not capable of causing pain. Let's look that over rather carefully. An individual has no associated pain particularly with anything, and he was very fond of his wife, and he doesn't associate any pain with her materials at all. And she's gone now; she died, and he felt very bad about it. And for years he was getting along all right, and somebody dug up this sewing basket, and they simply shoved it in his hand. He'll experience pain. He cannot at that moment have a sewing basket. Well, that's silly, isn't it? It's not a threatening object.

Now, if we look this over carefully, we will find the course of havingness tracing the course of pain and upset. To give somebody pain you only need to deny them this thing for a long time and then present them with it. If you can go to a sufficient extreme, it'll work every time. But you have to go to a sufficient extreme.

Now, this loss of the wife had to do with his dependency upon a wife, to make him sad. He had a dependency, and he became sad. Do you follow this?

Well, why do doctors today administer pain? Why does one associate pain with doctors and dentists? Why? Could it be because they were scarce? Were they ever scarce? Well, were you ever hanging up in eight thousand cubic light-years of space -- in the middle of -- all by yourself, badly injured, without ever a doctor to assist you? You

wanted a doctor. You were shot by some means or another -- got in a space war or something of this sort. You're hung up in the middle of space, you're shot. You need a doctor, otherwise you're going to lose that mock-up.

You say, *„I want a doctor.“* “There are no doctors.

Years later, you run into one. What he does to you is quite innocent; it hurts. Have you ever seen a little child simply recoil from a doctor? Doctor didn't hurt him any, child recoils. Doctors can become so scarce that the faintest idea about them could be painful. Follow me? It's possible for this to occur. You admit it's a possibility. Medicine could become so scarce that to take it would kill you. Now, how does this come about?

Let's look at death. Death is the greatest therapeutic measure ever dreamed up by a thetan. It is probably his best invention. Since it is terribly easy for him to invent mock-ups and terribly easy to give them significances, where does he go from there if he is already committed to a line of action and identity which he no longer finds desirable? And he invented death. It was a wonderful thing.

It took a lot of inventing. A mock-up would fall down. And somebody else would say, *„What are you doing? Stand up and fight.“*

And he'd say, *„I'm dead.“*

„Oh, you're dead. What's that?“

„Well, while I lie here I am incapable of motion. I am no longer damaging to anybody. And just to prove it to you, the mock-up will decay from here on out. It's not alive, see?“

Look at the amount of sales talk that it required. Now, you shot somebody, and he stands there with a hole in his chest, and you say, *„Well, fall down!“*

He says, *„Why?“*

You say, *„You're dead.“*

He says, *„What's that?“*

„Well,“ you say, *„I'll explain that to you. That's a state of inaction on the part of a mock-up, complete inaction.“*

„Oh? You mean a mock-up can go into complete inaction?“

„Yes, and it doesn't exist anymore, and it has no further significance of any kind. It has no further identity, and it's not alive.“

And he stands there.

And you say, *„See, now you got a hole in your chest. That proves you're dead.“*

And he says, *„How does that prove I'm dead?“*

„Well, a chest can't operate with a hole in it.“

He says, *„It can't?“*

And you say, „*That's right, it can't. Now try to operate it!*“ You see?

And you hold him carefully with a beam from another quarter while he tries to make his chest operate, so that it won't operate anymore.

And you say, „*You see? Chest won't operate. Now, that means the rest of the body will go into a decline, and it'll decay, and it will die. So you might as well do it right now.*“

„*Oh, I don't know,*“ he says, „*You're not being very logical. But I'll try it; I'll try it.*“ So he kicks the bucket. Terrific amount of sales-talkery connected with this whole subject of death.

But after a while people got tired of the mechanism. They decided that every time you wanted to die, they'd make you live. They decided this is a bad mechanism. Somebody prevented them from dying when they wanted to die, and so on. And it got worked around after a while to where this dying thing became scarce; it became hard to die.

Well, it was working at the same time that mock-ups were becoming scarce. Laws had been passed and agreed upon: Thou shalt not mock up more than three mock-ups every blue moon, you know? So we had a case there of mock-ups getting scarce, but this particular action of the mock-up became scarce: This condition called death would not be admissible under certain circumstances. They invented all sorts of things. They invented suicide forbidden, murder forbidden; all kinds of things became forbidden. In other words, this thing became scarcer and scarcer, and all of a sudden somebody one day hurt when he died. It hurt to die. Couldn't have it; didn't want it -- he said.

Yet if you keep company with any three-, four-, five-, six-year- old child for a little while, when they get too driven they tell you they're going to kick the bucket. They're going to go away and die, and everybody is going to be sorry. And they give you quite a rendition on this.

Well, they've lost the capability of putting it into effect because it'd make Mommy and Daddy sad; and a lot of odds and ends have been entered into it. It's gotten complicatedly significant, and so they don't die every time they say they want to die.

Well, it'd be perfectly all right for them to die every time they said they wanted to die if they could mock something up in its place. But that's explained to them as a very painful action. It requires childbirth, and it requires all sorts of things. And all these complications are added onto the situation of a mock-up, so that death is again debarred by the scarcity of a mock-up.

But death itself becomes an unwanted, a very painful and an extremely difficult mechanism. But it was once a therapeutic mechanism. It was once one way to get out of the game you were tired of playing, and one could do it rather easily; he could do it at any time.

It is today no less a pretense, since you can walk up alongside of any corpse and call the thetan back. It's no longer as fashionable as a game-end condition, but it is very definitely present. And it's now compulsory and inhibited at the same time and is quite a confused piece of stuff. Do you see that? It's very confused, this whole subject

of death. It's quite funny, as a matter of fact, the amount of this and that that is paid, the amount of flowers and that sort of things which are shipped around at dead corpses after the thetan has shoved off, and so on. It's very amusing.

Well, was there any other mechanism like death? Yes, there was another mechanism that predated death, and that was insanity. Now, you could say it predated death or it followed death. You could fit it into either logical sequence rather easily. But point of the matter is it simply said, „*I am now incapable of further responsibility for my own acts, so cessation of punishment is thereby indicated.*“ It was a method of declaring that one was through with a game.

Therefore, death was a cure for insanity. That's one of the mechanisms. The reverse, too: Insanity is a cure for death. Death was a cure for insanity. You get the catatonic schiz. Catatonic schiz is stopping being insane by dying. But, you see, insanity itself was a method of ending the game.

One had to work real hard. He said, „*Look. I'm irresponsible. I'm no longer capable of doing anything I can't direct my attention; I don't know who I am; I don't do anything but this silly motion this way. I'm no longer a menace or a danger to you in any way, and therefore you should go away and leave me alone.*“

Well, this was a thetan mechanism, whereas death itself is a mock-up mechanism. Nobody ever will buy the idea that a thetan can die. It's too much subjective reality on it. But they will buy the idea that a thetan can become non compos mentis or that he can have a mock-up which dies.

Now, both of these things are therapeutic; they remedied a condition of existence. And so it is that every single evil, every single poison, every single bad situation you have today, at one time or another was a desirable situation and was therapeutic. The common denominator of practically any condition there was, at some time or another it's been a cure for something.

The reason why you have difficulty with atomic fission today is because it was used too thoroughly as a curative potion. It cured anything; it cured everything. Very interesting; fabulous device. An invisible particle that came in and went woggle-woggle and kept bursting, and it straightened everything up for you, so forth. Fascinating mechanism; very fascinating mechanism.

Now, what do we have as a result of it being used therapeutically? What do we have? It kills a body; it stops it from creating. Therefore, I tell you at one time or another it must have assisted the body in creating. At one time or another it must have been used along this line.

Now, let's just take this possibility that all things which are now poison were at one time therapeutic. Let's just take this as a statement. And now we start to look at some of the poisons and find out if at any time this is true. And let's start tracking them back and discovering what's the case.

Well, we have some processes which demonstrate this. We can waste things until the preclear can have them. We have not made many tests along this line, for an excellent

reason, is that mock-ups must not be knocked off. So we mustn't run the risk of knocking off mock-ups. Death is not that fashionable. It can't be had these days. Therefore, we don't make such a test as having a person waste arsenic, in brackets -- thoroughly care for the whole subject of arsenic -- and then feed him spoonfuls of it; remedy havingness with it, subjectively. If we did this, would the arsenic kill him?

Well, we have this in other gradients. Milk to some people is a deadly thing. We can test milk rather easily. Milk is deadly; milk gives them hives and does all sorts of weird things. Therefore, what are we going to do to make this test? Let's have him waste milk for a while, until he can at length have milk and milk no longer gives him hives.

This is a fascinating observation; very fascinating. „*But*,“ you say, „*milk is a food*.“ Well, once, not many hundred years ago, arsenic was one of the best therapies that could be advanced. It was used by the entirety of the witchcraft, which, remember, was the only therapy in extant in Europe before the encroachment and swindle of Catholicism. Now, that's an awful lot of therapy. An awful lot of people depended upon witchcraft.

I don't care whether it's bad or good. We listen to a lot of Catholic church propaganda these days, and we hear how bad the witchcraft was. Well, one of these days we'll be listening to some communist, and he'll be telling us how bad the Catholic church is. And then one day, why, we'll be listening to somebody else, and he'll be telling us how bad the communist is. All these are, are a concatenation of supplantations. We're supplanting one remedy with the next remedy. And we do this, and we can do this ad infinitum. But the old remedies are pronounced poison, and a new consideration comes into existence regarding these old remedies. Do you see that?

Now, in the data I have just given you, you have a cure for anything. You therefore, for the first time, have a cure for anything, because you can cure cures. Do you see that? So what I've just given you, actually -- facetiously and otherwise -- is actually a total cure. It's also a method of succumbing, used reversely. All you have to do is keep condemning remedies and they become poisonous. Takes a long time to do this.

Just because the AMA, for instance, keeps saying that Dianetics and Scientology are bad is not in this generation going to make Dianetics and Scientology bad. It's much more likely to make the medical doctor bad. Why? Well, because he's saying at the same time that mental therapy is the thing. He's contradicting himself. He is a discredited source. He is the older source, and the older source always has less chance than the newer source.

Now, if we were to go around and say the AMA was bad (which we do), they would eventually become poisonous. They wouldn't be able to heal anything. Now, why? Because the race is going on that cycle of action which shows us that all old things go into destruction. And all you're doing really here is examining the cycle of action. Do you see that? It's the cycle of action applied to remedies.

Now, you can reverse the cycle of action by reversing havingness. Straight Havingness, Trio, and so forth, are the best for this. But there are special and more direct

havingness materials, much more direct on such a thing as substitution. You substitute one thing for another.

You know, you can tell a fellow to take a walk around the block and keep looking at things until he stops worrying. And if you tell him to do this and he does it, he will; he'll stop worrying. What, then, is therapeutic? You're depending on the buildings and the concrete and so forth to be therapeutic.

We then get down to the common denominator of all of these therapeutic measures, which is mechanics, and the thetan still believes these things are therapeutic. But he gets down to a point where he can't have them; he'd have to waste them before he can have them.

Now, most people will be able to walk around the block until they feel better and stop worrying. That's just it. It's „*Take a Walk*“ is the name of the process. You tell them walk around the block until they get interested in things, and you'll find out when they come back they will no longer be worried about what they're worried about. It's the most idiotically simple process you ever asked anybody to do. It works.

But on some people it wouldn't work at all. You would actually have to waste it. You'd have to waste buildings and waste things one way or the other for a while before it would work again. Now, however you did that is beside the point; you'd have him walking around the block, same way. You have restored the therapeutic value of MEST.

The therapeutic value of MEST is why the doctor gives you pills. How did this come into bearing? Whenever a fellow was hurt in this universe, he looked around and he wanted a doctor, all he saw was particles and MEST. So he substituted particles and MEST for the doctor he wanted, and that's the way it got that way. Fabulously simple mechanism. It's just too damn simple. Funny part of it is, is although it's simple, it processes.

Now, you'd start in a case that had had too much auditing, or too many auditors, on having him look around and find a substitute for an auditor. This would run flat after a little while because it's appended to another thing -- doctors. You'd have him look around and find a substitute for a doctor. And all such things as atomic fission and everything else blows off if you run this as a relentless, decent process.

In other words, a person couldn't have what he wanted so he got a substitute, and we get the concatenation of cures. Follow me? He couldn't have what he thought he wanted, or what he said he wanted, so he took a substitute. And he gets, finally, so he substitutes everything for everything on a cycle of action. And then he gets into a cycle of action of substitutes. Anything he has, then, goes through a cycle of action, so when it starts to reach the cycle of action, he needs a new cycle of action, so he finds a substitute for the cycle of action of the last thing.

And this we have, then, as a chain of bodies. He has a man's body in 1800. He substitutes another body for it in 1830. He substitutes another body for it in 1880. He substitutes another body for it in 1915. Substitutes another body for it in 1955. Don't you see how this is?

Only he'll substitute many other things in addition to the body. He will substitute methods of living; he will substitute one for another. Each one is supposed to be better than the last and is supposed to cure the effects of the last cycle.

„If I could just have enough women's bodies,“ for instance, this woman says, *„I would cure having a woman's body.“* See, it's perfect identification. *„I could cure myself of having to have a body if I had enough bodies.“* See the logic? *„I know what's wrong with me. I have a woman's body; that's what's wrong with me. Now, to cure that, I have to have enough...“* See, this is true; but not quite. It's just got a little curve in it.

„I have to have enough bodies, enough women's bodies, to get over having had one.“ You'll see this work out in the mechanics of processing. You get somebody, some girl, to waste women's bodies and then mock them up and accept them. And the next moment, she's exteriorized. Exteriorization is simply that mechanism of being able to depart from or have a distance between self and some havingness. That's all it is.

All right. Do you see this clearly, then? Do you see this clearly that these old remedies are supplanted by new remedies, old havingness is supplanted by new havingness, on a substitutive basis?

Now, the psychologist dreams in terms of association. He thinks that he has to associate everything with everything. Psychologist associates everything with everything, don't you see? Well, that is a completely obsessed substitution. Can you see association as an obsessed substitution? Hm? He can't even quite make the grade of making it occupy the same space; it merely comes close to it. It's an interesting mechanism. So you run substitution, or you run association.

The way you run association is: *„Look around here“* -- you do it, you see *„Look around here and find what you could make connect with you.“* If you want to make it more complicated you say, *„On how many vias?“* *„Look around and find out what you could make connect with you, on how many vias?“* All right. That, you see, is an associative or connective process.

But let's -- that's one process. *„How many other things could that ashtray be?“* This is an identifying type of process. All the closures he has identified with ashtrays will come off.

Now, we take another look at this and we find there's another process which is actually really no better and no worse, probably, than Connectedness. These are both very powerful processes; these are whammies. You say, How many -- on this matter of substitution, *„Look around here and find a substitute for --.“* Now, you don't care what. As long as one part of it is objective and one part of it is subjective you'll win. See? Half the process is objective, half subjective.

You think up something. You say, *„Mother. Mother isn't present, but you look around here and find some things Mother can't have.“* You get that? Well, he's looking around and he's actually spotting objects, and in the process of spotting objects, just in the process of spotting objects, he is getting an objective look on a subjective subject, Mother. Do you follow that? Objective, subjective.

All right. Now, when we get these two things, then -- objective and subjective; one played against the other -- we always have a safe process. „*Look around here and find a substitute for --. Find another substitute for --.*“ Now, we don't care what. Could be any valence, or could be anything. It's a very terrific process.

We also find that this works on „*Look at me. Who am I?*“ We have „*Look at me. Who am I?*“ as a process. This merely establishes the auditor. All right. Supposing he can't do that, or he's comm lagging on it, or it's over his head or something; you could have him find a substitute for the auditor: „*Look around and find a substitute for the auditor.*“ You'll find he'll pick the most amazing things. Practically everything is a substitute for an auditor. Quite amazing.

So you run the next one (because he'll run into this rather rapidly), „*Find a substitute for a doctor.*“ „*Find a substitute for a doctor.*“ Fantastically workable. It'll clear the auditor. That is to say, it clears the auditor in the preclear's bank. „*Find a substitute for a doctor.*“ He has associated with doctors. You start running this, almost all preclears have this associated: the auditor and the doctor. They do get badly associated.

Now you could find a substitute for a psychiatrist, and he might be off on that kick. Now, you ask the preclear, you say, „*What remedies have you used in your life?*“

„*Well,*“ he says, „*Well, I've used Vick's VapoRub. I've used, I don't know, some medicines doctors gave me.*“

„*What medicines were these?*“

„*Oh, sulfathiazole, penicillin, cough syrup. Quite a few of them. Aspirin.*“

Make a list of them. Now, you take each one of these remedies and ask him to look around and find a substitute for it. You'll find out the whole universe gets substituted easily for the object. You have, then, the therapeutic value of particles or masses or spaces.

Now, when everybody ran out of fission particles jumping through space at a mad rate, when there was no more fission particles scattered around to amount to anything, they invented something in space. They invented a deity who was a therapeutic agent, and if you prayed to him he fixed you up. Couldn't have fission anymore, couldn't have particles; gamma couldn't be there anymore. It was very therapeutic. But you could have empty space, and so you could pray to this empty space and so forth. So we had this fantastically therapeutic quality of religion over a period of a few hundred years, which then waned and disappeared, and it hasn't been back since.

It hasn't been back to such a degree, such a fantastic degree, that churches in some parts of the country now even claim that no such thing as a miracle could ever exist. Only Christ could commit a miracle, you know; nobody else can. There are no miracles, you know, so on. They've reversed on this completely. That's why this particular religion has fallen completely from grace.

Now, if somebody wanted to start idolatry again they would have an enormous success. Idolatry would go. Idolatry does go on at this time. People do worship various shrines. Always has went, one way or the other.

But when a fellow starts really falling out of it is when MEST itself is no longer therapeutic to him. And then he's in trouble, because just the action of living doesn't clear him day by day.

But we have come to this end-of-track as far as this particular set of computations is concerned because we now have the computation which makes the computations. And all you have to do is use this computation to undo all of these other computations which have been used therapeutically. Do you see this rather clearly?

Substitution, connectedness, association, cycle of action. All you have to do is show somebody that something exists to be substituted for something and let him do it on his own determinism, and you start to get results.

Now, „*you did it*“ is the common denominator of all processes that work. You do it. You do it. Now, even when he caused causes, you have the pre-clear do it. You say, „*Assign some causes*“ or „*Attribute some causes to this ashtray.*“

All right. We attribute some causes to the ashtray. We say, „*It makes jute. It flies around the room. It is what...*“ -- that's not quite correct. It'd be „*It is what is causing the air blowing through the window at this time.*“ You get that? Assignment of causes. This is a process, then. It's the assignment of causes.

Now, do you see assignment of causes as fitting into these therapeutic agents which I have been discussing? One assigns a therapeutic quality to death; one assigns a therapeutic quality to insanity; one assigns a therapeutic quality to the universe at large. So not only can we undo all of these things by substitution, but we can run assignment of causes, and so forth, and undo the mechanical obsessive action of assigning therapeutic causes and values to anything and everything on the backtrack. You follow that?

So whether you're pushing people up or whether you're pushing them down, you have to know Scientology. That's all there is to that.

I want to call to your attention, the communists, not knowing their Dianetics very well, having only had a cursory glance at it and depending mainly upon the work of a dog named Pavlov... That's not quite correct, but the Russians get tangled up about things we have so I might as well get tangled up about things they have.

This dog named Pavlov was a very smart dog. He could write on a typewriter, and he made a lot of experiments upon man. And they used this data to brainwash people. They were very unsuccessful; their percentage was very small. They put a people under terrible duress, awful duress. It was very upsetting to them and a horrible, barbarous and torturous thing to do to people, but they didn't brainwash them.

We have been thinking seriously of writing a letter to the Russian scientists, and asking them why they aren't getting their proper 22 percent. Everybody else gets 22 percent. We're going to write the APA that, too. „*Why aren't you getting your quota? Anything cures 22 percent of the people; why aren't you up to 22 percent? Why aren't you getting your quota? You deserve it.*“

Now, this fellow Pavlov was able to make a few remarks on the subject of brainwashing, but he didn't accomplish very much brainwashing. That's because he didn't know

any Scientology. Stupid. He might have been able to have found out an awful lot of Scientology if he'd cared to, but he didn't care to.

You had to study how to make people better before you could possibly have made them worse. The line was totally booby-trapped. You had to get smart enough yourself in order to ruin people, but by that time you'd lost the obsession to, because by learning it, of course, you would have become better. And when a thetan goes up-scale, he doesn't have the same attitude and the feeling of necessity in knocking off all of his fellows, don't you see? So the line, oddly enough, was booby-trapped. It was booby-trapped by the fact that you had to be able to make people better before you could make them worse, and if you were able to make people better then you were self -- you yourself got better and you didn't have to make them worse, so you didn't.

So here we sit today with a total solution, really a total solution on brainwashing; it couldn't be easier. Electric shock is very bad brainwashing, very poor. Hasn't really even been used in space opera for years. Ah, it's two or three million years, hasn't been used to amount to anything. I mean, it's just passé. You know, old fashioned.

But the modern commie psychiatrist here on Earth is not even able to get up to a passé type of electric shock. There are ways of using electric shock which are very injurious indeed. I mean, you can really give somebody hell with an electric shock. But the best way to use an electric shock is to nip him, you know? Exteriorize, and get so you can generate that much power, and just shoot a beam through somebody's head and give him a stroke. But if you can do that, you don't. It's fascinating. Pretty well safeguarded.

The mechanism of brainwashing which I gave you, with supercold mechanisms and so forth, is very well known, was used very extensively in the Maw Confederation of the Sixty-third Galaxy. They had a total psychiatric control of all of their officers and executives, and when they got tired of them they used this specific method of brainwashing. It was the ne plus ultra. The track saw no better. It was the end of all brainwashing. And it was so effective that somebody after a while used it thoroughly upon this particular crew of psychiatrists, and that was the end of the practice.

But here we have an example of our knowing with great thoroughness how to wipe somebody out in twenty seconds. Here we have an example of somebody knowing something that is totally vicious; there is no slightest argument on that. This is the most vicious thing anybody ever heard of. Wipe somebody out in twenty seconds. Bang. Not just electrocute them or hang them; this leaves them with all their impulses. This just destroys the bank; it winds it up in a little ball, and you've got it, see? And I can't think of any single use for it.

It's not that I'm being stupid. I could invent some uses. But I would not at any time be convinced that there was not a better way to solve the situation. See, I would think of a better way to solve the situation, because I don't see that as any way to solve the situation at all, unless it is to give future auditors more cases. That's the only logical, rational thing I've been able to think about so far as a use for this.

But this, by the way, is the way vacuums are made, is the mechanics back of a vacuum, and is what a vacuum is. And you start to take apart a vacuum and all these facsimiles begin to come out of it. But this is not really a dissertation on the subject of vacuums; it's a dissertation on therapy, because that treatment itself was once sought eagerly by thetans as a therapy.

Have I made my point? It was once sought eagerly. The method itself became scarce and eventually they couldn't have it, and now it's painful. You try to get somebody to erase an engram. He knows he can't erase an engram; five billion years ago he couldn't even get a supercold wash when he needed one. So he won't erase an engram. They're permanent; he knows that. You see this?

All right. You know the *modus operandi* by which these things occur. You can undo them by simply following through the same course that the mind got that way, with the person doing it this time. The assignments of causes and so forth run into this sort of thing rather usually, and you can for the first time wind this track up backwards. But you really don't wind the track backwards; you merely postulate the track more simply right where it is.

We have a very rich inheritance in such a discovery because in the light of that knowledge it is unfortunately impossible, then, to invent a worsening mechanism. You could not invent and make stick a worsening mechanism if a person had the information which I just gave you on how to undo it. So that ruins an awful lot of games.

Thank you.

Thank you.

[End of Lecture]