DIAGNOSIS: HOW TO

A lecture given on 15 November 1956

[Start of Lecture]

Thank you. Okay, I'd like to talk to you about the handling of difficulties when they are difficulties and avoiding difficulties when they aren't and otherwise indulging yourself in looking over preclears.

Never tried to teach diagnosis to a unit before. I never have. That's diagnosis: it's after Dianetics; direct word source. It's not medical diagnosis we're talking about. It's „*look-agnosis,*" and we were going to coin another word on it and call it „*obnosis*": knowing the obvious.

The great unlearned item in all of Dianetics and Scientology has been diagnosis. That is the one thing which auditors never seem to learn very well.

Never had any reason for this, until one day we were looking at some gamma rays, and we suddenly decided the reason they were attractive to people, and people were attracted to them, and they did things that were bad, is because they were invisible. One couldn't see them, and not being able to see them, he then got nervous about them. Got that?

What you can't observe and which might or might not be present becomes an anxiety. One doesn't know whether he can confront something or not, because it's not there to be confronted. He cannot prove it, then, to himself If he could prove it to himself, he would no longer be nervous about it.

You find young men enlisting in war, usually, merely to prove to themselves that they are not cowards. Although what's cowardly about not using a body for a bullet screen is something I wouldn't know. I mean, it doesn't seem to have anything to do with courage or bravery. It has a lot to do with wasting mock- ups, but young men go to war to confront the enemy to prove to themselves and their girlfriends that they are not cowards. Of course, since it's become rather fashionable to be a coward in this

particular line, I don't know how they're going to fight the next war. But I imagine they'll manage.

Now, the hidden influence: If you don't have an enemy, you cannot prove you are brave. It's one of these fabulous stupidities, you know?

All right, diagnosis could cover what the fellow is trying to prove. It could cover who he's trying to prove wrong. It could cover several items as you go down the list. One of the things that it could prove very easily is whether or not the individual is sane. See, I mean, the fellow is trying to prove that he's sane. Well, that's an interesting thing, because you can't prove you're sane unless you can prove that you can react against insane duress.

See, you can prove you're sane by reacting favorably against insane duress. You have insane pressure against you one way or the other, and you react sanely to it, that proves you're sane, doesn't it? So it demonstrates that you can confront insanity. That's all it demonstrates, very easily.

But there's many a fellow down here in the insane asylum who is simply proving this madly. The first thing that an insane person tries to do is prove to you how sane he is, which I think is rather remarkable. We look it over -- rather remarkable, because he obviously is sane. But something around there is insane.

The auditor has already learned that it is the something around there which is nuts. It is the something around there. It is not the preclear. The preclear is always -- no matter in what unconscious or comatose condition -- reacting as favorably as he can to the circumstances in which he finds himself. And he has the circumstances which he is surrounded by clutched to him, so as to demonstrate his ability to confront it.

Therefore, any man rushing down the street, spinning in small circles and leaping into the air with high-pitched screams is, of course, the sanest man in town. He can confront insanity; he's demonstrating this. You see, we have to think of him as a thetan confronting this insane body, and we demonstrate at once that the fellow is the sanest fellow around. Because only he could confront insanity to this degree.

Now, the psychiatrist with his obsessed sanity -- he is usually a case of dramatized sanity (a good phrase for you to remember, by the way: dramatized sanity) -- is actually unable to confront insanity. He's not capable of confronting it. Therefore, he has a lot of dramatizations which he calls „*sane*," which are about as silly as you could possibly look at.

Now, if everybody is proving that he is confronting, is proving that he can at least confront a substitute to something or for something, then the whole problem of diagnosis becomes rather involved. Because we see an insane preclear as a sane person. We see a „*sane*" (unquote) psychiatrist as being a very insane man. Don't you see? You get this? We see these manifestations taking place where the individual is clutching to him things and is proving that he can confront them, and this makes him something. This is a game: proving what you can confront. This is a game.

It's not the only game there is, and you understand that confrontingness is not the highest order of human aberration and so forth. But it is certainly a common denominator to people in this universe, involved with this space and energy, these masses and distances. And confrontingness goes a long way toward explaining these things. It's a common denominator of everything until you get into -- right up the line -- until you get into creativeness. And when you get rather full scale into creativeness, you of course jump this whole thing of confrontingness.

You can use creativeness to solve confrontingness, but you can't use confrontingness to solve creativeness. Wrong way to, you see? I mean, you got that? You could use creativeness to solve confrontingness, but you can't really solve -- this is by actual test -- you can't use confrontingness to solve creativeness very much. They are different classes of action.

Confrontingness concerns itself in the main with „*that which is.*" It conceives that things are and that they were not created, that they exist, and that their sole purpose is Axiom 10 -- cause- distance-effect.

Now, you enter into Axiom 10 with confrontingness, so you actually have the totality of Axioms from 10 up to 1 standing senior to confrontingness. I just don't want you to go too far overboard on this thing called confrontingness. Confrontingness works. It works like mad! There is nothing more workable in the work-a-day world in which you find your preclear. But it's the suborder of things. It works on him; he can get reality on the processes connected with it and, as a result, becomes highly functional to the auditor -- very, very functional.

The principle, then, explains on this low order, human phenomena. It explains actions and reactions, and it explains diagnosis.

You see, you're diagnosing somebody who is working in a work-a- day world. He is working in a live-a-day world. It's a world in which the space already exists, the walls are there, the particles are there, planets, suns, moons, politicians; all kinds of things are there. And you get these items as the items of the game, the units of which the game is composed.

Now, only to that we need to add the living beingness of a thetan and many thetans to have the game in its actuality the way it looks in this live-a-day world. That's the way it looks. It looks like, „*Here's this universe, and to this universe we have added all these living beings. And they are in contest in one way or other against each other, against various types of beingness and against the universe itself*". That is the way it appears. And his reality on this is so strong that he processes in that sphere of action. The truth lies from Axiom 10 on up, all of which is above confrontingness. Do you understand that?

You see, you mustn't go too far astray on this, because, a preclear will get just so well, he will just get so able, and then he will hit a null point. And for a long time I was looking for this null point after which these processes did not work upon him. Well, at that moment, the Axiom 10 processes and all of the Creative Processes become intensely workable. Once you have run all of these Confrontingness Processes flat, you then have the entirety of processes from Axiom 10 on up to Axiom 1, which is,

naturally, a considerable lot of stuff. But it's all creativeness. It's all under the heading of creativeness -- one phase or another of it. Do you see that?

So that 8-C, Part A works a certain distance on a case. Op Pro by Dup works a little bit of a greater distance on a case. Communication all by itself common-denominator's this. You can't communicate unless you can confront. And it works a considerable distance on this case.

But then the case will hit a null of some kind or another; it doesn't seem to be gaining or advancing very rapidly, and then we must look at processes which we already have and had long before we had these other more basic processes.

This whole subject has been evolved backwards. You notice that. We had first, a fairly complex series of processes in Dianetics. Then we had, with a leap, the most elementary processes. People just didn't understand them in droves. They were just too darned elementary. And those were the processes from Axiom 1 to Axiom 10. And those processes, most of them, have been around for a long time.

Then we had to develop processes which were again on the engram, live-a-day-world level. And these all head up under the heading of Confrontingness.

Now, as confrontingness goes downscale we get substitution, about which I have talked to you. That fits, really, below confrontingness -- substitution: substituting this for that. Then below this, we have pure identification processes; processes which are entirely identification processes. They are so far below significance that there is no significance as to why they should be done at all. And you will find yourself occasionally at a loss to understand why they are producing the results they produce.

After an individual has failed to confront consistently and continually, he has things. Look this over, see? He's failed to confront things completely; now he has things. Got that?

Well, to fail to confront completely would be to even run out of *„substitutes for.“* You know, *„I can confront that wall, but I can't confront that wall on fire. Therefore, that wall could be a substitute for a wall which is on fire. Therefore, I confront that wall and the wall which is on fire becomes less terrifying to me.“* Do you understand that?

Well now, first there's pure confrontingness. As we go down -- let's go from Axiom 10 down. We're not making an effect yet, we're merely confronting, don't you see? Effect has no bearing on this whatsoever. We're not ranging in that purpose level. Here we have effect as Axiom 10. Now, let's just drop just below that level of processing -- not necessarily to Axiom 11, but just below this in importance and height -- and we have direct confrontingness.

„I may not be able to knock an elephant's head off, but I can face one.“ Got it?

Now we go down just one step below that, and we get into much more interesting data, which is substitutes for elephants. See? *„I may not be able to face an elephant vis-÷-vis, but I can face the stuffed head of an elephant. There it is on my wall. Shot him in Kenya, I did. Uh-hah, rather! There he is. I faced him. Here's the substitute. I can continue to face him,“* don't you

see? Now, that's just about the shadow. The fellow has faced something, and he is demonstrating to people that he can continue to face it. Do you see that?

All right, now let's drop down below that, and let's find out that the fellow failed completely to face the elephant in Kenya. He stood there with his double-barreled derringer, and he just completely missed the whole show. The elephant came charging at him, and when the elephant got to about a quarter of a mile away, why, he threw the derringer down and grabbed the nearest tree, and nobody could get him out of it. As a matter of fact, three days later they had to have the fire department from Nairobi up there to get him out of that tree, see?

Now, this fellow is unable to face a live elephant. It is doubtful if he will. It's doubtful if he will go and buy an elephant head. See, it is doubtful if he'll go and buy it. He failed on this one completely. It's doubtful if he'll go and buy an elephant head. That is not a good substitute. He doesn't have an elephant head on his wall, but you'll probably see the most beautiful collection of butterflies.

Now, why is he collecting butterflies? He doesn't like butterflies. He is colorblind and so forth, but these butterflies are all from northern Canada. That's far enough away from Africa.

Now, it'd amaze you to discover that a case of butterflies hanging on his wall was a substitute for an elephant he didn't shoot in Kenya. Which lifetime, who knows? Got the idea?

All right, now, there is a case of substitution. He is substituting for something. He will at least substitute, don't you see? He's really not in terrible bad condition. He's not in awfully bad condition; he'll still substitute. He had a failure and so forth.

Some guy has been driving in races, and he's banged one into the brick wall and torn wheels off on other cars and done other interesting odds and ends, and so on, and he will still keep a cup around for a race that he won, although he doesn't race anymore; he knows it's dangerous. He will face the win. He will face the cup. He will face the token. But the funny part of it is, he wouldn't put a steering wheel from his first car on the wall. Just a little bit close, see? Little bit too much on. But the cup, that is an association, you see; that's a substitute.

Now, out of this, we get everything that you know as logic. It's a gradient scale of substitutes.

I ask you to jump your logic on purpose right at this point, you see -- at that point -- just to look at this. You actually have to look at the principle of substitution. First you have to look at the principle of confronting, then the principle of substitution in order to see the gradient scale of logic. It's quite interesting.

Well now, you see, logic has been jumped when we get a case of butterflies on the wall. That's not quite logical outside the field of Scientology. It is logical within Scientology, but it's not logical elsewhere because we cannot proceed along any gradient scale and achieve the answer to the case of butterflies and, at the same time, why a case of butterflies sometimes makes him nervous. Do you see that?

Now, that's what we used to call an associative restimulator in some fashion or another. A little bit different. There was a butterfly, but we explain it now by mental image pictures. A butterfly was present while he was running from the elephant. He sees a butterfly -- associative restimulator. Now also, space was present when he ran from the elephant, so that any space that is present there at all is an associative restimulator, and he doesn't want to face that space because it was present when he ran from that elephant. And there was a tree there, so that any forest, suburban -- or even suburban living is just a little bit uh-urh to him. And another thing about it, he was recovering from his fright for days against a rather yellowish plaster wall. And the yellowish plaster wall, a butterfly, a tree, any one of these things could act as associative restimulators.

Let's say it in some other fashion. They are too close to the thing to be an acceptable substitute. They are not acceptable substitutes at all.

Now, we would have to go all the way away from this whole incident to really get total comfort. There were no women present at all. He really likes them. Get the idea? He can confront a woman any day. Nothing to it.

Men, by the way, carefully preserved this area of confrontingness -- women -- by not permitting women to engage in hunting, sports or outdoor activities of any kind for many generations. And then the women, having been armored against this and not having had to confront anything for a long time, began to become bold. And they started to take up archery and that sort of thing. And eventually women got wound up in his sports, automobile accidents and things like this. Even a safari in Africa probably contained a woman, so she became an associative restimulator for all this sort of action.

You'll find men are probably being more brutal and more careless of women these days. They are less willing to confront them. They confront them with more ferocity or less care. It's very hard to confront a woman, for some men. That woman is an associative restimulator.

Of course, the deathblow to womankind was Florence Nightingale. That was that. This is a horrible thing to say about a beautiful, lovely lady like that. It's a terrible thing: She probably did more for homosexuality than any other person in our modern times, except maybe Oscar Wilde. How do you get that? You put a woman into every painful incident: the treatment after the accident, the illness, and so forth. You keep putting a woman into the scene. Don't you see?

Why put a woman in the scene? She's something you're supposed to be able to confront when you're not able to confront anything else. So you get her in there as an associative restimulator, you run fellows downhill like mad, and they eventually won't even confront a woman. You get the idea?

All right, now, let's look over this idea of substitutes for confrontingness. And we get this long parade of items, just on and on and on, and somewhere along the line, we have something the fellow will confront. Therefore, if you run substitutes one after the other, he will follow along the line of a gradient scale which will lead him eventu-

ally to the thing he won't confront, with the discovery that he can confront it. Do you see that? He will be more knowing and less reasonable -- be more knowing and less logical. Do you follow that?

In other words, you, with processing people with substitution, can start anyplace you like. The substitutes they give you for things are the wildest things you ever saw in your life. I just sit there and boggle at some of these preclears. It's one of my more amusing things to do lately is to run Substitution on somebody.

„Now, give me a substitute for your mother.“

„Well, good, good, yes, all right, I will. Now, let's see. Oh, that tree.“

„All right. Now another substitute for your mother.“

„Well, that rock out there.“

„All right, good. Give me another... Now, make sure this is a substitute for your mother. Another substitute for your mother.“

„Uh, well, yes. Now, that grass. That bit of tar.“

You say, *„Now, wait a minute.“* If you start straining your own logical processes to draw the concatenation from what he considers an adequate substitute for Mother -- right on up to Mother -- you're going to strain or sprain your medulla oblongata! Because the substitution pattern lies only in his bank. Get that.

The only place this pattern exists, and the only pattern like it, and the only approximating pattern in existence, is in that one bank, peculiar to that bank, and only in that bank! Now, you got the idea?

There's no telling on what route he would go from a bit of tar, up any kind of a gradient scale to finally confronting Mother. The second he says, *„Substitute for Mother: That tree, that tar, that grass,“* you know doggone well that this boy will not, cannot, confront Mother. If he did, he would be looking straight through her. She would be unreal. He would have another mother mocked up in her place. Get the idea? See, I mean, there's a real distance here. Follow me closely. Hm? It's a big jump from a bit of tar to Mother, let me assure you. And that is why I look at these substitutions with such amusement while I'm processing a preclear.

I don't hide my amusement. I'm not sitting back laughing at him. I laugh right out loud at him. And that's really a bad thing to do to a preclear who is being very serious about this. He knows for sure that that tar is a substitute for Mother. And I say, *„No kidding?“*

And he looks it over. *„Well... Well, maybe... maybe that wall over there would be a better substitute for Mother.“*

I say, *„No kidding? Is that a fact? That'd be a good substitute for Mother, huh? Well, all right now, let's find a better substitute for Mother.“*

And he eventually gets into things that we could understand, like „*that lamp.*" Naturally you could associate a lamp with Mother being the actual thing. Don't you see? You don't see that.

That's what you do, you see? You look at him and you say, well now, there is no logical track between what he's saying and Mother, you see? But to you, some other track would be totally logical, don't you see? Follow me? So therefore, when you're trying to diagnose his case, you're diagnosing a near incomprehensibility.

„What's wrong with this fellow," you say. *„That lamp -- Mother. Now, that's logical. But he says tar -- Mother! That's just completely insane."* You follow it out?

Well, that's the basic difficulty of diagnosis. So the safest thing to do is to go into a field where no gradient scale is even vaguely traceable on any subject whatsoever, which has no relationship, and one doesn't even know what he is substituting for or that he is substituting while being audited. And that, of course, becomes a very workable, usable process, and that process we call Havingness.

We say, *„Look around here and find something you could have."* Well, running an undercut -- actually, those things which he couldn't make confront things are things which he can have, which he has to have, by the way. He has no choice. Don't you see?

So, we're running *„failure to confront,"* bottom rung of, with total identification. There is no rationale at all why he says he can have that wall.

Now, back of that statement, *„I can have that wall,"* would lie the total collapse of walls on him. See, the wall -- whole subject of walls has collapsed on him. He no longer is not only not able to confront walls, but walls are something which collapse on him. And if he were permitted to go along this line too long, he would find out eventually that walls were him and that he was walls. See?

I've seen people do this, by the way. They stand up in front of television screens when you're trying to look at the screen. They'll stand between you and the screen. Obsessive thereness. They are being things which collapsed on them to such a degree that they are them. And the function of such a thing was to debar sight, cut out light, or do something of this character. And they dramatize its potentials. And you'll see them dramatizing this thereness. And they'll get up and walk -- you can't explain why, but you're sitting there comfortably looking at the television screen, and they get up and on the pretext of adjusting the knob, or something of this sort, step forward to the screen and then step back to observe the effect, between you and the screen, and will continue to stand there.

So, below the level of being able to confront, we actually have the capability of being on another determinism. And then we get doing and having and we get all sorts of interesting lower-range manifestations, you see, that are also high-range manifestations, but these are the obsessive *„have to be."* This fellow has to be a wall because he can have walls. Why can he have walls? Because he has not confronted enough walls so that he became one, see? Now, there's no logic that you could trace between his -- first, his being able to have a wall, his being able to be a wall, his being able to con-

front a wall, except just those exact steps which I am giving you. That is a series of very exact steps.

Now, how he got that way is some other thing, and that comes under the heading of speculative diagnosis.

Now, we start in there, then, that the individual is unaware of it when he is standing in the middle of a wall; he'd be unaware of the wall. To some awareness that he was in the wall; he could have a wall. In other words, this says, „*A wall would collapse on me.*" This he recognizes. But that's still a communication, so it's good processing.

Now, the next little gradient scale up from that is that he could be the wall, you see? The wall would collapse on him, he could be the wall, but he could recognize this with some awareness that he was being a wall. Next, he would confront or could confront in some fashion, with some substitute for himself, a wall. Next step up the line is he could have an effect on a wall. And we move into the Axiom 10 range. You get how the -- what these steps are?

Well, I'm not trying to arrange for you the perfect pattern of exactly how this happens because there are inversions lower on the line of be-do-have and so on, and these are all enforced. These are a DEI Scale of the fellow desired something, and it was enforced upon him, and then it was inhibited in some fashion. And he is in an unknowingness band. So that we get Havingness Processes being totally identified processes to such a degree that we don't even know what the preclear is identifying them with. It's just a total identification process.

Therefore, if you start to run Substitution on total identification, you're going to get results -- that I assure you -- because it would be a low range that's low, low, low, low, low. And this is why people go unconscious when you start to remedy their havingness. It's right in the range of total identification, unconsciousness: See, everything is everything; all things are substitutes for all things; anything is a substitute for anything. You take a workman who misuses machinery, continually misuses machinery. He's an artist at it, let's say. How do you mean, misuses machinery? Well, the chronic way they misuse machinery -- and you'll laugh about this if you ever go around investigating. You'll find somebody who is an apprentice carpenter, and not a very good one. And he's struggling along somehow, and he's pretty low-toned anyhow, which is why he's doing this. You'll find him using tools, and he uses the pliers to hammer nails. He tries to use the chisel for a screwdriver, don't you see? He at least can get the similarity of shape there. The pliers have mass and the hammers have mass and the chisel, and so forth.

Well, they get wilder than this. They get much wilder than that. You can understand that one. But how in the name of heaven they could substitute some of the things they substitute is quite remarkable, because they substitute uses. And then you could say they abuse machinery. Abuse machinery.

You'll see a passenger car going down the road loaded up like a truck. That's understandable; the fellow doesn't own a truck, but he does own a passenger car. All right, that's understandable. But it is not a very bad misuse. But if this fellow needed some-

thing to haul dirt with and had the money and walked out and bought a passenger car, then you'd have it in the aberrative band, you see? The aberrated band.

And people do this rather consistently. You'll find them misusing things. For instance, a very fine ironer that was installed the other day is being used by the maid as a clothes dryer. Well, that's understandable. There was nothing to hang clothes on, you see? There was not an immediate clothesline that was close to the tubs and so forth. And so one says, *„Well, that's better than nothing. You can hang clothes on that ironer because it does hang up."*

But then a clothesline was provided, a very good one, very easy to reach and much closer to the zone of actions than the ironer. And the ironer continued to be used as a clothes dryer. Get that? The misuse of machinery.

The fellow who goes to see a lawyer when he should see a doctor. Misuse of personnel.

I hate to tell you what leads into that category. You look at any organization that can't use or place personnel in the zone of their capabilities and you're looking at a psycho organization. Now, I did not mention the U.S. Army, Air Forces or Navy. Now, you're just hanging me with libel.

I've fished more firemen out of engine rooms -- they were rated firemen, who were good deck men -- and have put more deck force people in engine rooms who were good firemen than you could shake a stick at. And it didn't take any great personnel sensibility to do this because their former experience had been the experience of firemen and their former experience had been the experience of deck men, and yet they were just completely wrongly rated and classified and sent the opposite direction, don't you see?

Takes a lot of straightening out -- I don't care whether you're in a business organization or a service, or something of the sort -- to get this misuse, misassignment, misidentification of personnel straightened out. But organizations which are batty will always misuse and miscall tools, machinery, personnel. They always will. They just -- because they're running a total identification. A truck isn't a truck to them. It may belong to a class of something like metal objects. That's their nearest ability to identify. Best identity that they could assign to a truck would be a metal object, don't you see? Now, really, they're incapable of calling it or using it as a truck. Do you see this?

Now, that is just nothing more or less than the band of total identification, and that goes down to *„we don't know for what,"* and we have havingness. And you run Havingness on an awful lot of people and they go unconscious. They're running in the band of total identification, and no one knows for what anything is identified. There is no starting point to it. Eventually they will cognite and tell you something. Well, they have found a starting point. They have found something that they could vaguely confront. Out of this bundle of identifications they found one item that they've walked back up on and they've confronted it, and we call that a cognition.

Now, it's an upper range of that to have an effect on this thing. You see, just to stand and face something is a high skill. See, that's a big skill. Stand and face a wall? Oh, wow! Why, that's pretty terrific! Stand and face a wall. Hm! Really takes some doing.

Now, to do something to the wall is higher than that. But to do something to the wall, believing that the wall is a blackboard, is of course lower than that.

Now, what about the case that can't remedy havingness in any way, shape or form? Now, you look at this case and you say, *„Well, I know exactly what's wrong with that person. I can just add it up just as neat as you please. Can add it up just as fine as you please. I know what's wrong with him. It's so-and-so and so-and- so and so-and-so.“* And we process him on this and nothing happens.

Well, it's obvious what's wrong with him, but what he's substituting this for, Lord only knows. What he's having, Lord only knows. What he can't have, Lord knows. We're just wham, you see? It's a level of substitution on a complete identification.

And people will tell you, *„Yes, I know that's wrong with me,“* and go right on in the most conversational tone of voice you ever heard of, see -- just go right on. Yes, they know they shouldn't beat the car to make it start. You point this out to them.

The living of life in this day and time mainly consists of pointing out to people things which are terribly obvious to you but aren't at all obvious to them, and having them not listen.

Now, there are ways to get almost any datum across, but to go through a total identification instead of any logical chain at all -- no logical chain, no bridge left... The fellow who is below havingness, however, can still -- can still be salvaged. By some gradient scale he can be walked upstairs. You still have to find out some zone where there is a recoverable ability and improve it. That is the formula of making anybody well. Find a zone, area, class of recoverable ability and improve it.

Now, that might be a recoverable ability to have. You see, you'd have to get more complicated, see? You'd have to say, *„What would you have to do in order to have that?“* See? We've run Havingness on him for half an hour. We notice that there's no change of comm lag, nothing of the sort. He just doesn't cognite. The wall isn't there.

So we ask him, *„What would you have to do in order to have that wall?“* Oh, and he will give you some long, involved logical chain.

Now, have you noticed in running Havingness on some people that they will explain to you continuously that, *„Well, I could have that if...“* or *„I could have something just like it if I bought it, if I had enough money.“* You got that?

Well, that -- they actually have altered the auditing command. The auditing command is *„Look around here and find something you could have,“* and when they add an *„if“* they have altered the command.

By the way, they don't get any better. The preclear who is altering the command on you like this is not running the process and is not improving.

You'd have to ask an auditing command which was answerable by those phrases in order to get any improvement, you see that? Otherwise he's avoiding you. You've permitted an avoidance.

You find out he can't have. All right. You'd alter the auditing command. *„Look around here and find what you could have on how many vias.“*

Now, it's quite remarkable that the people you are processing, most of them know they are being processed in some vague way. Most of them will sit still, most of them will answer questions, and so on. Now, I want you as auditors to look on that as an asset. It is a tremendous asset.

You start processing people who can't sit still, who can't answer your questions -- and you haven't gone into an insane band to find that level of people, either, you know? They're hardly even classifiable as neurotic. They're just totally unable to have or be or confront anything vaguely resembling a personal approach which is a personal approach -- personal to what their actions are or their beingness or something. They consider all these things a wild criticism, as hot as being hit with a ray pistol, see? Just the thought of standing there, the thought of being there, the thought of answering any of these questions and so forth becomes a subject for intolerance.

Now, there's a whole lot of people like that. They're crazier than hell. They can't play a game. But they're getting by in the society for being sane. Everything in their vicinity is going at a hot spin, that's for sure. You look for such a person, look for the unprocessable person in a household, and you will generally discover the person in that household who, on how many vias, is upsetting the entire household.

This explains to you the difficulties of the squirrel. You know, it's an odd thing about squirrels... Just the scientific- technical word *„squirrel.“* Something very odd about these people is they always have -- a real squirrel has in his vicinity somebody who is unprocessable by him and who is opposed to the subject of Dianetics or Scientology. You look at the squirrel, you have to look one step beyond the squirrel, and you will find the opposition to the subject. Now, because he can't get this person to confront the subject he eventually takes on the valence of that person who cannot confront, and so he himself becomes critical and upset about it.

Now, he doesn't become critical to the point of moving completely out of the sphere. He unfortunately stays halfway in and halfway out. You got the idea?

Wherever you've found a squirrel you find this kind of a condition. Now, that's a little rule of thumb that we've developed here for years because we've had experience with this line.

But let me show you something: That person who is unprocessable, no matter how logically this person declares it, is actually incapable of confronting any part of anything anywhere, don't you see, that even vaguely relates to personal experience. And this person is unable to confront personal experience in any way.

Have you ever had a preclear fly into a dispersal somewhere during a session? You tell the person to look at the wall or do something like this, and the person sort of rises

half out of their chair or something and they flinch and they say, *„Rrrowrow,"* and they go off on some other subject or other. You've just hit one of these total-identification areas, and it is so strong in its command power over the preclear that it causes the preclear to go into a frenzied dispersal. You ever see that?

Well, these people go into that as their only dramatization. Doesn't matter how they phrase it, put it, say it. You ask them to be audited, you ask them to let you ask them to do something, and they go into one of these frantic dispersals, or they simply go into an apathetic sort of a collapse state. You understand? I mean, there's just no co-operation in there at all.

Now, what do you suppose a person like that would do to somebody else's private life? This person cannot confront any personal problem of any kind. Let me show you, then, that the person who is associated with them in making them -- trying to make them confront personal problems gets this person falling back on them all the time. And this person falls back on them, falls back on them.

This guy or this girl cannot hold this other person up into a position of confronting any personal situation of any kind. The person falls back on them, fights them, talks at them, does something or becomes totally 1870 -- you know, *„I'm so weak and helpless, cough, cough."* Get the idea?

Now, that person's action of falling back on them in this fashion eventually brings about this interesting phenomenon of causing the person who is making the other person confront, be that person. Now, you'll see this phenomenon untangle, and you yourself could experience it rather easily, by mocking up people and making them confront the wall. Now, the same process, almost, with the added thing that it has some motion in it, is *„Make so- and-so fight the wall. Mock up somebody and make them fight the wall. Mock up somebody and make them fight the wall. Mock up somebody and make them fight the wall."*

And you find out one of these weak universes and have the preclear mock this person up and fight the wall, you will have the personality, the nonconfronting personality that collapsed on him. And now he's having trouble with that valence.

You see, this doesn't violate the old communication and distance formulas and so forth. His attention gets so fixed upon an effort to make the person confront and gets so many failures in making that person confront that eventually he is totally fixed on that person with no distance -- no affinity, no distance, bang -- and as a result he be-comes that person, and that is a valence. That's all a valence is. Doesn't matter much how you try to separate these valences. Doesn't matter what you do with a valence. The basic mechanism of happenstance in a preclear is that.

Now, you're thinking at once in terms of, well, he had a mother; he couldn't make his mother confront things. This is rather usual for a child. He had a wife, she had a hus-band, had a schoolteacher, somebody. There was a drunk uncle. We have a case hang-ing fire right now, not too awfully -- well, at least on this continent -- that we will have to round up one of these days, that had a drunken uncle and was so thoroughly (this drunken uncle) in a drunken vomiting spell and so on that it was rather peculiar. We

did not have the mechanism which I'm giving you at the moment these years ago that we processed the case, and we never were able to strip that valence.

We finally got the valence isolated, but what could we do about it? We know what we would do about it now. We would find somebody she could make confront a wall, and then we would have her run this long enough, arduously enough, until we could finally pick up the uncle and mock him up confronting the wall, and that valence will break.

Now, you also have the entrance of havingness. We want to know what Uncle can't have in the room. Why „*can't have*"? Well, it's a games condition: the opponent. See, the opponent must never have anything.

Never run „*What can your mother have,*" see? „*Look around the room and find something your mother can have.*" Boy, is that wrong! See, that is just wrong. It just -- it's a no-game condition, and so on. The proper phrasing -- I know it defies logic, but one isn't being logical; he's treating aberration -- is „*Look around the room and find something your mother cannot have.*"

Well, do you see that that gets an identification? We're striking at a basic identification there. So we might have to run that before we ran „*Mock up your mother and make her confront the wall.*" Do you see that?

We're walking up this same ladder of steps I gave you just a moment ago. Total identification, total collapse, doesn't even know what he's associated with or what what is associated with, has no knowing of this at all. That would run, perhaps, on a „can't have-have" basis, some substitution on a „*have*" basis, but you're not even asking him to substitute.

Then the next thing you might do with him is find some substitutes for one of these things, you see? And the next one up is mock-ups and „*confront these things.*" Follow that?

Now, 8-C, Part A is running on a total-identification level. You don't know who he's being while he is confronting the wall. You don't know what's confronting the wall, see, but neither does he; that makes you even. And he'll eventually be able to make something confront the wall, and he confronts the wall with more and more accuracy. And he may have made five hundred or a thousand people confront that wall without himself knowing it and without the auditor having had very much view of it. Just running on a total identification all the way on the track.

All right. Do you see this mechanism of the collapse of a valence on the individual?

Well, that is actually the way the individual got into this universe, too. Couldn't make this universe confront anything. First, couldn't have an effect on it, then couldn't confront it, and then became it and had it. Don't you see? So that the way out would be run it on a games condition of what could you have in it, what it can't have, possibly, substitutes for it -- sounds like an impossible process, but substitutes for it. You can run substitutes on data of incomparable magnitude, data not of the same order at all,

and he'll eventually give you data of a similar order. And you've found a substitute for it the moment that you've done that.

And then we go up into the next stage immediately above that, which would be confronting this universe. And that would be the universe as a universe, don't you see? I mean, on the whole thing.

Now, in the live-a-day world we only have small parts of this, and we work with small parts of this, but I want you to be warned that you're running the small part of this rather overwhelming process which I just outlined to you.

Now, we find, then, that there is a scale of what we can make the preclear do. And we have Havingness Processes run on a games condition. They include *„can't have"* processes. Never „can't have" for the individual, you know. *„Have"* for him, *„can't have"* for something else. We go up into substitutions, subjective or objective; we don't care what. There's a way of running substitutions you might be interested in. We call it stable data.

„What would be a stable data to your early childhood?"

„Oh," the fellow would say, *„a chest."*

„What kind of a chest?"

„Oh, the kind you lock up."

„All right. That's fine. Mock it up. Mock it up. Mock it up. Mock up a chest. Mock up a chest. Mock up a chest. Mock up a chest." Never saw so much commotion in the world. Commotion will fly around and hit that chest and go in all directions. And you just do that for a long time. This one gets kind of fozzle-fozzled, and he can eventually mock one of these things up, and it will sit there. And with your coaxing and so forth, you've improved it until he can just mock up a chest and it sits there right in the room.

And you say, *„That's fine."* You say, *„Give me another stable datum for your childhood."*

He says, *„Apron strings."*

You say, *„All right. Mock up some apron strings. Good. Mock up some apron strings. Good. Mock up some apron strings. Good. Mock up some apron strings."*

What are you doing? You've got a cognited substitute for something, see? It's there. And you just run it. And you run it until you run off all of the confusions for which it's standing as a stable datum. See, it's the resistance point.

Why this substitute stable datum? Because a stable datum is something that confronts the confusion, and you're running confrontingness of a confusion, don't you see? Got that?

„Look around the room and find something your mother couldn't have." Very fine. *„Look around the room and find a substitute for Mother."* More or less the same process; if anything, a little more workable. *„Look around and find something you can have."* That isn't even for anything; it's just total identification, so of course it's the undercutting process and on most cases works best.

And as we get upscale we discover that there are other processes that are quite usable in terms of confrontingness. You could reduce a fever with this dodge: *„Look around and find something that is motionless. Find something that is still.“* Fellow finally does. Well, it's a no-game condition to find something that is still without any effort of your own, but that's all right. This just tells you it's that -- that much of it is a bad process. And then you say, *„Now make your body confront it. You make your body confront it. You make your body confront it,“* see? Ah-hah!

Do you know that'll reduce a fever? That'll take a fever down from about 103 down to subnormal faster than seat, half an hour of it, twenty minutes of it. Quite remarkable.

If it doesn't take it down objective, it takes it down subjective. *„Look around the room and find something motionless. All right. You make your body confront it.“* Now, if this was not working and didn't take the fever down, then what would take the fever down would be *„Look around the room and find something motionless. All right. Mock up your body and make the mock-up confront it.“* But that is quite a trick, that process.

Now, the fellow is making his own body that he has, right here and now, confront things. Let me bring that to your attention. He is successfully doing this. Now, that ability can be improved. It is the body that he has, this is what is going on in the world. He is doing this. But there are many things which deter it from doing any confronting.

Now, for a long time we've known about theta bodies, but we've never been able to do anything about them that was very effective. But you can run a preclear on *„Mock up a theta body and make it confront the wall.“* You take your black case, you do this to this black case, and you run this very thoroughly and, brother, he will cease to be a black case. After how much pain and duress we don't go into.

„Mock up some blackness and shove it in,“ of course, is the lower identification. This blackness he has, if you mock up some blackness and shove it in, eventually becomes a theta body. You know, a black Fac One body or something of the sort. Well, what do you do with it? You could do the same process. Or you could remedy havingness on black theta bodies -- identification, some more. Or you could jump to this higher level and -- in many cases, not totally successful -- *„Mock up a theta body and make it confront the wall.“* An amazing amount of phenomena and reaction occur on such processes.

Well, now, this is diagnosis, just this: which of these processes handles the obvious difficulty with the preclear? And the heart of diagnosis is something that needs no discussion at all: You look at them and find something obvious about them and cure it.

Thank you.

Thank you.

[End of Lecture]