

AUDITING TECHNIQUES: ACTION AND REACTION

A lecture given on 29 January 1957

[Start of Lecture]

Thank you.

And this is the 29th of January, 1957, the nineteenth lecture of the 16th ACC.

I want to talk to you at once about collapsing cases, but I'm going to talk to you -- continuing this little series here -- on the subject of techniques. This is continuing the material I've been giving you on techniques.

Now, we're actually going to take up some techniques of one kind or another, but what I have to tell you at first here fits exactly with action and reaction, or activity versus activity, or retribution, or punishment, or overt act-motivator phenomena or anything else you want to call it, which is simply the reactivity of the physical universe which is: *„I do something to you; you then do something to me. I do something to you; you then do something to me“* -- which everyone would like to think is an inevitability. They would like to think, if they were clobbered, that somebody who clobbered them will get clobbered. You see that as a wishful thought: *„The judge sentenced me to ninety-nine years and he died eighteen years later of old age, so therefore I have been revenged.“*

This whole idea of revenge, vengefulness, paying people for what they did, justice: all of these other mechanisms are categorized under reactivity.

You go around trying to get even with the people who have gotten even with you, you are being a very foolish person. You should realize that they are not really getting even with you when they did something to you; they are disassociating. Somebody did something to them and then they do something to somebody else. A disassociation of this character is one of the more fantastic things. I hit Joe, so therefore, having been hit by Bill goes into restimulation. Joe is not Bill; an improper identification is made, and what we call identification takes place. Joe is identified with Bill, and we get an overt act-motivator sequence. But that is a disassociated situation.

Now, physics would love you to believe that every action has an equal and contrary reaction: you stamp against the Earth, Earth stamps against you. The first time I ever saw [see] the planet Earth wearing a shoe, I will agree with it. That's disassociation, actually.

Here we have a number of things which get identified with a number of things, and we get identification, or the A=A=A=A of Dianetics: The Modern Science of Mental Health. That is total identification. Now, that means a disassociation really. We identify horses with beds, we identify airplanes with pillows, and it's too far apart as a substitute to be a similarity and is therefore a disassociated identity.

We don't say „*Airplanes are similar to pillows,*“ or we don't say „*There are pillows on some airplanes.*“ We say „*Airplanes are pillows.*“ You get this as an associative mechanism?

When association becomes a total identification, it then overdoes itself. We say, „*This piece of paper is similar to this piece of paper.*“ Now, that is a correct or logical statement. Now we say, „*This piece of paper is this piece of paper.*“ It could sort of seem so.

One of the earliest tricks on the track that thetans pull is simply substituting this. You've got a mock-up here, it's your mock-up; somebody goes... See that? They slip their mock-up in where your mock-up is, and you have got an interlock. That's an apparent identity which isn't true.

Now, when this piece of paper becomes this other piece of paper (which it never is), you then have a closure which doesn't exist, and you have a nonexistence then -- a condition which isn't except by new postulate. But having become that, we then get into this idiocy: we say „*This piece of paper isn't itself.*“ Now, that's the inversion.

First, these two pieces of paper are similar, then they're the same piece of paper, and then, because that's untrue, we can get this next one: „*It isn't.*“

What survives there? It's just your rejection of „*this piece of paper is this piece of paper,*“ and only the rejection lives.

The first postulate is „*This piece of paper is this other piece of paper.*“ Now we say, „*But that isn't true.*“ So one sheet of paper here, to a preclear who is suffering from unreality, isn't true. Therefore, it isn't. Therefore, you can look through it. „*Yes, but you can feel it; it has mass.*“ „*Yes, but it isn't.*“ You get the argument? It isn't even itself.

Now, when it isn't even itself, then it can be anything. So we get hidden influences. Isn't itself; it can be anything then. This piece of paper is the Declaration of Independence. If it isn't, then we can always make a new postulate that it is something. Of course, that's so far-fetched that it isn't. So from there on we get „*It isn't, it isn't, it isn't, it isn't.*“ We guess at what it is but we have no certainty as to what it is.

Now the body which you've got sitting in the chair at this moment isn't the body which you lost in the Franco-Prussian War or the Revolutionary War or the Jamestown Flood or at the landing of Roanoke or in the Tower of London.

An American visitor over at the Tower of London (quite a fascinating girl) walked through the Tower of London, came out the other end of it... You know, that's where

Elizabeth executed all of her lovers before they could talk. She really had a good time there, and so did other rulers. Henry the VIII used to use it as a divorce court rather thoroughly.

And our American compatriot walked through the Tower of London and came out the other end with the awfulest neckache you ever heard of. Now, hardly anybody had spoken to her about beheading blocks or anything; she hadn't even stood around beheading blocks. It turned on actually in the cells, this horrible feeling across her neck that it wasn't there.

Now, exactly what had occurred? We don't go so far as to say that she lost a body in the Tower of London, but we do say that she probably had a bank that lost a body at the Tower of London, at the very least. You see?

All right, now we've got a direct association taking place here. We have a series of things which went into restimulation the moment that she saw the Tower of London. So she had to misidentify the thing this way: She had to, originally, or some part of that bank, or whoever was running a bank -- that bank at that time -- had to say „*The body is the Tower of London.*“ You see, it somehow or another moved over from „*The body is in the Tower of London*“ to some identification here whereby some part of this body is the Tower of London. Got the idea? „*I'm in prison*“: Therefore, which is the prison? The Tower of London or this body? You naturally would come to that conclusion because somebody'd try to back out.

Somebody's going to be beheaded; they think this is a disgraceful spectacle and they'd rather go pick up another body, so they try to exteriorize and run. Well, somebody failed to do so, right there -- bang! -- the way they should have. They failed on exteriorization, so they said, „*I'm in prison. I'm actually in two prisons: prison one, body; prison two, Tower of London.*“ But they didn't realize they were in prison in the body, so they had to realize they were in prison in the Tower of London, so to this degree they could identify the Tower of London with that body. You got the idea? All right.

Then she had to do another misidentification: that that body which perished in the Tower of London is the body which just walked through the Tower of London. All she's saying then is „*All bodies on the past track are this body.*“ That's a fine piece of misidentification if there ever was one. So she could get a neckache. But look at how many errors had to take place before she could get a neckache. Look how many mistakes she had to make in identification, in singling out things.

But the first and primary mistake which you're interested in is that she was involved with reaction: There's the Tower of London. What do you get when you get the Tower of London? You get a neckache, of course. In spite of the fact, actually, that I seriously doubt that the body which perished in the Tower of London ever got a neckache. It was incapable of aching a very short time after the ax.

You see this now? She had to be working, then, in this field of reaction. A disassociated reaction of this magnitude: We strike at this because it isn't it, and something else is it. Boy, what a confusion. Fantastic, the degree of confusion necessary to produce a restimulation from a restimulative item in the environment. It's absolutely fantastic. A

guy has to be stark, staring goofy. He has to be spinning in some quarter of the bank to get a good restimulation, or he simply postulates a restimulation into existence knowingly and aboveboard.

You should be able to turn on any somatic you want to because those Coke bottles up there are there. See, you just say, „*Well, there's the Coke bottles and I got a somatic*.“ Now, you could go ahead and explain it; you could say, „*I got a somatic. I look at the Coke bottles, they give me a somatic because when I was four years old, why, I drank too much Coca-Cola on a hot day, and it gave me a stomachache*.“ Then an auditor can come along, get you to remember the incident, and the Coca-Cola bottles don't give you a restimulation -- reactivity.

Now, a fellow by the name of Einstein was interested in relativity. All things are relative to all things -- fascinating study. If you want to know more about the Einstein theory I invite you to read any one of thousands of popular books which include it, have been written on it and so on. But it says all things exist in relationship to all other things. All he said was „*one universe*“; that's all he said. Theory of relativity is the theory of one universe, period. Warning: Do not remove this tag!

Well, when science goes off on this kick -- that there's only one universe and no time continuum except the time continuum of that universe -- they've certainly been overwhelmed by solids. See, they are „*overwhelped*.“ They are not in an „*unwhelmed*“ condition.

He says, „*All things are relative to all things*.“ Well, he didn't spread it that thick, but his same equations that he wrote, carried on a couple of more steps, say so. Only, I guess he carried them on a couple of more steps, and probably erased the bottom and released his theory.

It's not true. The theory of relativity also includes what has latterly become quantum mechanics, which is fascinating. And they have relationships one with the other, because all things are related to all things, of course. And what is that but this one motto: „*Thou canst not escape*.“ All things are related to all things. In other words, you can't escape: Everything which you do is related to everything you have done. Every place you've been is related to anyplace that has been and where you are. Where you are is related to the Tower of London where you got your head cut off. You get where this relativity goes?

The entirety of physics and the natural sciences pursues from a degradation of the mind. Awfully broad statement, but a very true one.

If every place you've ever been is related to where you are, you've had it. It says at once you never could have had, and promises that you never can have, another universe -- which I think is very cute; it's a total trap.

Now, of course, Einstein only said that arrows moved in relationship to fixed points and positions and that the speed when it got so fast became infinite or nothing and that when you exceeded... This is the grandest boo-boo of all time. I wrote a novel on it, by the way, which made a lot of people very happy; made a lot of people very unhappy.

Einstein's whole theory was „*As mass approaches the speed of light, why, time approaches zero.*“ It was very amusing, by the way: I didn't have his formulas in front of me, and I had to turn around and figure all this out from scratch on the theory of relativity just to get the formula to put in that story. The thing was released not too long ago again as a pocket book. Something about „*Tomorrow*“ was the title. I've forgotten the title they put on the pocket book. Never seen a copy of it. I just know it was out, and the checks the publisher sends me are very good.

But here we had an occasion where you reduced this *reductio ad absurdum*. If you approach the speed of light and time becomes zero, then other time would have to go on, but your time would be very short, but other things' time would be very long. So, of course, by the time you jumped off and made a passage to a star at close to the speed of light, many years would have passed by at your home airport -- or spaceport -- while you only would have aged a few weeks -- *reductio ad absurdum*. You see, the speed of light isn't even true. Isn't even true. „*You blow up at the speed of light.*“ Any time you start dividing things by zero and so on, in mathematics, you can get a wonderful potpourri of answers.

Just how does light or a photon get from the Sun to Earth? At what speed does it arrive? Well, everybody has decided that it takes it the same speed as 186,000-some-odd miles per second. They've decided this is the speed of light and that it goes through space at this speed. Well, I don't know anything about its going through space at this speed, but I know that it travels at that speed on Earth, because they've set up some mirrors and things and tested it on Earth, and have gotten more or less that speed -- they keep correcting it. But space is at zero temperature, and we get this complete puzzle: Things don't travel that way in an area of zero resistance. How fast does light travel or does light travel through -273 degrees space? Does it travel through space? See, we don't know that.

Actually, we don't know that light travels at all. All you know, really, when you look at that light, is that the wall over there reacts and is lit. You don't know that anything goes from there to there. „*Oh,*“ you say, „*but look, look, look, look now,*“ you say, „*if you put up a board between that light there and that wall, then the board will light and that wall over there will appear dark at that spot.*“ You say, „*Well, why not, the board relieves the wall of the necessity to react directly, and the board itself knows how to react.*“

I told the key theoretical philosopher that's hired by the U.S. Air Forces, one time (came around to see me) that I was working on -- because I had to have something to talk about -- the reactive-mass theory of light. He got very fascinated with this - - something that you could fool around with. How do we know, you see, that anything flows through that space? Well, we say, „*But streams of water flow, and you can see them.*“ We don't know that has anything to do with light. We say you put your hand out here and it gets warm. How do we know that the hand just isn't trained to be warm when it reacts to light? You get the idea? We don't know that there is such a thing as an invisible particle to this degree: it is probably completely true that there is no such thing as an invisible particle. See, there probably isn't such a thing as an invisible particle, because every nuclear physicist today is searching for it and doesn't find it and is going mad in the process.

The search for the single button engaged upon by one or more of your preclears -- he's got to find the single button that explains the universe -- is really only the search for the invisible particle, and he'll get no place doing it.

I have a technique that turns this on, by the way. You say, „*Get an idea of the effort necessary to create an invisible particle.*“ And the fellow goes half mad and then begins to laugh like hell. It's just not something that you do.

Yes, I'm sure there are such things as particles, but not invisible ones. Invisibility says, „*undetactable*,“ „*unperceivable*,“ „*unseeable*.“ It's a swindle.

Well, look, you can put anybody in an hypnotic trance and tell him the room is filled with invisible particles. He'll react, but the room didn't have to be full of anything for him then to believe that the room is full of invisible particles. Is that right? And this is a fact -- this is a fact (we're talking about techniques now): that the processing of particles of any size, shape, dimension or position is fruitless. Don't process them. Forget it.

The existence of a particle only denotes this one fact: that somebody has not been able to hold a terminal together. It chipped, it leaked, it didn't hold itself solid and it trickled off in some direction. It went to pieces. You understand? And the symptom of its going to pieces is the existence of a particle independent of it. Look at that.

We don't know that that light is sending any particles over to that wall, because we can enter a substitute explanation anyplace along the line that explains it beautifully. We could probably chip in here and get a dozen explanations of how the wall lights up because this tungsten filament lights up, see? We can get all kinds of explanations as to why the tungsten filament lights up when something happens up at the light plant. We can do all sorts of things -- get very, very interested in doing these things -- but it's all fruitless.

The flow of the particle and the theory of the particle and the theory of invisibility and the theory of a molecule and the theory of an atom are each and every one of them proceeded from degraded postulates. They're on-the-way-out postulates. You get the idea? They're broken down -- exit.

But more important, every single such consideration, when it's malfunctioning in the preclear, repairs on Solids. Let me take you back to Scientology 8-80 -- power. Power. Power derives from the ability to hold fixed in space two or more terminals. That's power. If you can't hold them fixed, no power results. If you hold them totally fixed, no flow results. Power is potential without flow.

Give you an idea here: You can take your right elbow and your left elbow, stick them down on a table or your chair. Go ahead, do this. Now hold them apart. Hold them there; hold your two forearms apart. You can do that, can't you? Practically an effortless procedure, isn't it?

That's all. You can cease and desist. If you're spastic, you can't. A person who is very, very weary can't. A swimmer who has just swum a couple of miles at a sprint can't. Yet that was easy for you, huh?

All right. All right, let's do it a little bit harder, huh? Let's go just a little bit harder. Let's hold this house here, and let's hold a house across the street. Let's hold them apart and hold them there. Can you do that? Can you get the idea of doing that? Hm? That's not very tough, is it?

All right. Now can you get the idea of holding Earth here and holding the Sun where it is? Get some vague idea of that?

That's all there is to power. As you did that and I made you face that much power, however, you probably felt an irresponsibility. You probably said to yourself, „*Oh, I'm not really doing that.*“ You liar. You got it? All right. All right.

Flow or current is a symptom of the degeneration of a terminal. Being able to hold a terminal together is actually more important than being able to make one flow. But if you want a game, you make it flow. If you want to make a substitution and redirect it and send it someplace else and make it interlock with something else someplace else, and so forth, you have to set terminals up so they don't quite hold together. They trickle.

You hold your body up and it leaks words. Got the idea? Now, we all know that „*the silent man is a very strong one.*“ He is strong if he's silent. Everybody sort of knows that this thing exists: that if a person was totally strong he could totally hold any terminal together, and it wouldn't leak, strip off, chip, flow, do anything. It would be a terrific case of isness! See, it'd be thereness, isness, it is! -- no reaction, no reactivity, no inter-related flow of any kind, no reactive mind.

See where I'm going here? Now, I've led you through a terrible morass of physics. For that I apologize, because there is no morass there to go through. That's what's cute about it.

There's a whole bunch of postulates that say there is a morass, but the morass has never taken place, really. It can't take place unless you keep resupplying the morass with held-together, not- quite terminals. You have to keep putting up terminals. In other words, batteries require terminals that leak at each other. Got that? Two people: put them together, hold them totally out of communication. If they were in a total no-game condition, or if they were totally cleared, this could happen: You'd have two people, and they would never talk to each other, they'd never warm each other, and they would never see each other.

So at once, we see that the theory of relativity is only true relatively. And that relativity is only relative to this particular universe at this particular time.

The moment that we exert total isness or total power or total positioning, we get no reaction. See? We're going to hold this electrical pole here so solidly that it won't even discharge down a line toward a dissimilar pole. I think a thetan could do that rather easily.

That's the secret, by the way, of stopping an electric motor if you're ever interested. You just say „*Hold together!*“ See? Huh! No current flow. No motor. It's running, but it stops leaking. You say, „*Thou must not leak any more.*“

Now if you wanted a person to last forever or live forever or be is forever, the thing to do with him would be to totally bottle him up and never let him talk, leak, spit, do anything. He mustn't do any of these things. See? He must never receive from or discharge against the remainder of the environment. And what do you know, they get down to doing that on whole-track activities. There are places where they put bodies in totally enclosed, insulated drums. There'll be a cylinder there, and they'll put it in a fluid that is totally preservative. The body doesn't discharge anymore. Therefore, it lasts forever, of course -- as long as its insulators last, as long as the drum lasts. Do you see that? No discharge, no game, no reason why at all, no purpose.

The second you get a terminal which won't discharge or interact in any way -- why?

Well, I could give you an argument right now: To demonstrate Hubbard's right. That'd be about the end of the thing. As I've offered you this situation, why, you'd say „*Well, that proves he's right,*“ and so on, and that'd be the end of that. Or you would say „*Well, I thought this up on the whole track myself, and that means I was right. If there's no discharge from a terminal, it lasts and it goes right on lasting*“ You get the idea?

That is why there can never be any other universe than the MEST universe that it can know about. Because the moment the MEST universe became aware of any other universe, nothing would continue to hold it together. Do you see that? Therefore, the MEST universe is totally triggered to absorb any universe which approaches it quickly. You get into the MEST universe and your own ability to create a universe deteriorates. You follow this?

In other words, we're talking about singleness of terminal -- nondischarging, nonreactive terminals. Then we get total survival.

But a thetan doesn't want total survival. We won't go into why and where, and there's a lot of speculation you could go on to about native state and all that sort of thing. But he doesn't want „*no game.*“ He doesn't want „*no conversation.*“ He doesn't want „*no reaction of any kind.*“ He doesn't want this.

Undoubtedly it is within the ability of any person who has ever lived to erect a ceaseless, nondestroyed, non-aging, nondischarging terminal. Why doesn't he ever do it?

Well, the funny part of it is, if he had ever done it or if anyone had ever done it, then you wouldn't know about it, because you would not be able to perceive it, except by shining some light on it. But it wouldn't even give back the light you shined on it. You follow me? If any action had to take place in that terminal, it would not even reflect. It'd at least have to undertake reflection to reflect. There it would be. Where? Well, you wouldn't ever know where.

So there could be an invisible total isness, as far as you're concerned, that is. You get the idea? There could be some terminal, some post, some universe of which you were not aware, simply because there was no interchange between you and it. But it wouldn't be a dangerous universe, because it's a no-game universe. It would be easy to get out of it, unless you yourself were part of it, and of course it wouldn't discharge you. You would have trouble exteriorizing.

Therefore, we get a direct index between the ability of a preclear to make things solid and the degree that he is held in a solid. Follow that?

Preclear is totally dependent on a nondischarging solid called the MEST universe. You are aware of the fact the MEST universe discharges inside of itself, but we do not know of any discharge it is doing against any other universe. See, it is a single item.

The ability of an individual to create a solid, to tolerate a solid or to face a solid gives you, very probably, your best case grade. Common denominator of all cases that are having difficulty: they can't tolerate solids. They can't make anything solid. They quit. They get to be the nondischarging pillar on other-determinism. What happens to them? They must be in a total no-games condition against their will. Now, you could be in a total no-games condition on your own say-so, but that would be quite different, then, to being in a total no-games condition against your will.

Conceive, if you would, terminals, posts, pillars, spheres -- any shape you like -- discharging against other posts, spheres, terminals. We just know they're there and know that they are in communication. We don't care whether it's electrons or invisible particles or whirligigs or anything else. As far as we're concerned, our interest lies in the terminals themselves, the masses themselves, the nondisintegrated mass -- its existence and creation. We're very interested in that. We're not even vaguely interested in what goes from one terminal to the other.

And if you're in there fighting to find out what's in between those two terminals, it must be because you cannot perceive the terminals themselves. If you're looking for the thoughts, the figure-figures between a husband and a wife, in order to solve their domestic difficulties, you're almost certain to fail, because that's the invisible-particle interchange. Those are the words that pass -- the yickle-yackle. You're overlooking what they are overlooking, that each one is. And their entire difficulty and the only symptom of the interchange is their lack of cognizance of the isness of the other. That's the totality of it. It works out to something that is too ridiculously simple for a person to cognite on instantly. And we get the whole subject and science of obnosis.

All right, people get so obsessed with the flicker-flack that goes between terminals that they never see the terminals. And after a while the flicker-flack is solid and the terminals aren't. And then pretty soon the flicker-flack disappears too, and they enroll them in the Atomic Energy Commission. Would have to be.

Look, if anybody really could qualify himself or consider himself to be a genius in the field of atomics, it would be that person who could hold together a sizable chunk of plutonium without it discharging. In that lies the secret of atomic power.

And look at it. Every time they get ahold of some plutonium, it blows up! They get a little bit of plutonium and it blows up! That means they're a bunch of weaklings. They're not restraining it from blowing up. Which shows you that atomic energy is just in the wrong hands, that's all. The trick is to hold it together, not to let it trickle and dribble and go boom! Anybody can let anything go boom.

Now, just add this up with cases. Just add this up with cases. The case behavior that you object to is the case's willingness to let everything fall apart and go boom. An in-

dividual has got a car: Wheels fall off, gas tank falls off; person is still trying to drive the car. You say, „*Look, you idiot. You got to put the wheels on, put the gas tank on and the car has to be held together, and then it will travel down the road. Got that?*“ He doesn't get it. No connection between holding it together and its ability to travel down the road.

We get the Chinese attitude toward transport, which is one of the more interesting things. You could send a brand-new Ford or Chevrolet bus or something to China; in a very short space of time it would be baling wire alone that was holding it together. And then they'd lose the baling wire. And their main anxiety, however, if anybody was being anxious about holding it together at all, would be patching up baling wire, not trying to hold together the car. Those cars just go to pieces! You never saw the like of it. They shed fenders and all the knobs disappear on their panels. That's about the first thing you see go. And then there's the little nuts and bolts and odds and ends, they just disappear, they just disintegrate. This is the same as a terminal shedding electronic particles. Somebody isn't holding it together. Somebody relaxes his grip just enough to let it discharge, you see.

But this is not anybody determining that the grip is relaxed; this is just a relaxed grip. And when somebody gets ahold of this vehicle, it trickles apart and falls apart, see? Nobody determines it. There just isn't even any awareness that anybody ought to hold one together in the Atomic Energy Commission. They have no awareness that they're supposed to hold together atomic energy.

The reason why they keep blowing it up and blowing up the Pacific and the United States's Southwest is simply because they know they can't hold it together, and they want to get it into a safe place where it will blow up. They're not testing anything. They just know inevitably it's going to go boom! and they just want it to be in a safe place when it does.

If you told a nuclear physicist -- or if you asked a nuclear physicist, what plutonium was supposed to do or uranium was supposed to do, his total answer would be in terms of flow. It's not supposed to do that at all. It's not supposed to flow; it's supposed to stay together. You get this? See, it's a miscomprehension of terminals.

Now, to get power to react in some other direction it is only necessary to controlledly relax your grip a little bit, and it flows. You see that?

Your ability to exert power, then, stems first and foremost from your ability to hold a terminal together. And for it to deliver an interchange, it is then only necessary for you to relax your grip a little bit and then close your grip again when you don't want it to interchange again. You get the idea? In other words, you relax a little bit. When you stop it, you hold on again.

You don't stand behind it beating it to make it flow. That's a total no-responsibility for holding it together in the first place.

Power derives from the ability to assemble and unite, and then permitting a controlled communication to exude from what you've united. You have power. That is power.

Power does not stem from a bunch of wiggle-wiggles that run off something that you found somewhere. You went out and you found a rock. You didn't make the rock. You didn't have anything to do with the rock. You're not holding the rock together. And you beat on it a little bit so that sparks will fly off of it, and you have flint and steel, and you get a fire and so forth.

How low can you get? You mean the thetans of that day couldn't blow on some tinder and have it light? No, they couldn't, because they didn't have the power of holding the tinder together. You take something you've already found and then you let the chips fly. Only you don't let the chips fly, you just try to catch the chips that are flying. You're really in the basement now.

How would you like to chop wood on the basis of, you stand back away from the woodpile and wait for the kindling to drop into the basket? Well, that's what they're trying to do in nuclear physics. They stand away from the piles and catch the stuff that flies off of them, and then they try to do something with that.

A country possessed of atomic power would be the most powerless country on Earth. It would be the weakest, the most disintegrated, the most incapable in the terms of uniting its people. And that would really be it. Be incapable of uniting its people. It would be incapable of holding itself together. And what's the first symptom that we see? Decentralization of government bureaus, see -- Q and Q.

What's the answer? Well, you disintegrate. Why is that the answer? Well, it's the best thing to do. „*Every man for himself*,“ they say. Now, this is not a criticism of government; I'm merely using an example that you are all familiar with, just in order to show you what's happening here.

Probably, if you explained this to some of the boys that had to do with government right now, they might actually be able to get their wits around it (with a lot of processing) to a point where they'd say „*Here! Here! Here! We can't let this government go to pieces just because somebody found that a rock would leak.*“ They would actually get the idea, the order of magnitude, how stupid it is.

Your preclear is actually not as good as he can talk, flow, spit or do anything else. He's as good as he can hold himself together and relax to permit a flow. The flow will take place against other terminals. And that is about the lowest safe level that you could call sane. The fellow who just talks because he doesn't know -- he's just standing there and somebody else comes up and he just starts talking. And he doesn't start himself talking, he doesn't think of what he's going to talk about and he doesn't really reply to what is asked. You get the idea?

You've seen such people. You walk up to them; they start talking, not about anything. It's very disconcerting to people -- this is so prevalent -- to walk up to somebody who doesn't talk. That's because all the people we know who don't talk aren't alive enough to do so. There are very few people around, if any, that are on the other kick that existed once upon a time, see -- the „*strong silent man.*“ I never saw such torrents flow out of people in my life as I've seen flow out of some of these strong, silent men. See?

They see fit to relax for a moment, you see; they just let it go. They talk -- sparks fly. Then they don't. Get the idea?

The first thing you have to be able to do, however, is at least contribute to an isness. In order to do that at all, you have to be able to contribute to an isness. It's not enough just to have a body. You have to be able to contribute to a body. You have to be able to control a body. You have to be able to hold a body together. And if you can do all that, then it's easy to make a body communicate, because you don't make it communicate at all; you just relax for a moment. And you say, *„Let's see, what did I want to say?“* Or you know what you want to say, just very directly, and you just relax, and the body says it. Got it?

You want to hit somebody in the jaw, you just let go of your fist. That's not putting anything on total automatic. That is merely taking advantage of your own postulates which wind up with that. And your own postulates wind up with the fact that you want to have some space and you want to have some isness in the space -- the isness of space occupied by the isness of terminals -- and you want to have a game. So if you want to have all these things, why, that is a game and it's some interest and life will go on and it's all fascinating and... You've got to be able to assist in the creation of it. You've got to assist in the control of it. Otherwise, you don't have a game. You have a slave master.

Most people finally result in this equation: they think, *„To have a game it is necessary -- absolutely necessary -- that I create it, and I am the only one who runs it.“* That's not then a game. It wipes itself out as a game for that person at once, because there's no second terminal; there's no opponent; there's nothing, see?

And he says, *„I've got to be captain of the team, and I've got to be on top, and I've got to be the only one, the only one, the only one.“* There's no game. You see why? He's got to be. He's got to have something. He has to acquire it from some other source. He doesn't assume the responsibilities of its existence at all. He pegs in from some other quarter to pick it up in some fashion. He doesn't contribute to this game. He finds the game. He then has to hog it -- his effort to control it on a lower harmonic -- and of course, he doesn't have any game in the final analysis. He never contributes to it. In order to keep a game running you got to keep it fed! You'd be amazed at the amount of shovel work you have to do to the furnaces of a game, you might say. You got to hold them together and let them discharge a little bit, and hold them together some more, and let them discharge a little bit more over here. *„All right, now team, we're goin' out there. We're goin' to... You take the ball out. Who's goin' to carry the ball this time? Oh, you are. All right, that's fine. Now, you're goin' to take the ball out.“* *„When the formation breaks up, you throw the ball“* is the usual thing.

In other words, when we disintegrate, we interchange. Got the idea? You follow this through, and you will find, quite amazingly, that it takes an enormous amount of contribution, an enormous amount of teamwork, you might say, an enormous amount of unitingness, togetherness and so forth, and control and sentience as to *„when do we let go a little bit in order to seize it up again?“* And all the time everyone is contributing to this

game. It's being totally contributed to. It's being totally created all the way along the line. Otherwise, there's no game there.

Anybody who's dependent on a game to be in existence, who then comes into the game, has the game, only is controlled after that by the game. In other words, he's simply absorbed by the game. He himself never exerts anything or contributes anything to the game. You get the idea? That is the essence of a no-game condition on the lower harmonics: One is contributed to totally, one was created utterly, and one has no monitoring effect over what flows out or flows in. And of course, one is totally obedient to the laws of reaction. After that, one only reacts -- unknowing games conditions.

You know a game is going on. You go over and join it. You contribute to it. You control it to some degree, at least by your opinion. You're all right. Nothing wrong with a game like that at all. You can't get in trouble.

But a game that you never contribute to, a game that you merely become the effect of, a game where you never express your opinion: it's not a game. You're a checker on a playing board. You're a piece. And after a while you become a broken piece. You see why? You're not holding the terminal together, you see? You're not relaxing it at this point or that point to let it flow. You're exerting no control over it in any way, shape or form.

If you can get the idea that something has to exist before something reacts, then reactivity will never bother you. It'll never bother anybody. Something has to exist before something reacts. And if your interest in what form the reaction takes, takes your attention entirely off of what was created, you're dead.

If you are interested in guns only because of bullets -- get that as a interesting point. Do you know that many people are interested in guns and have nothing to do with bullets. Hm? Can you see that -- that you could be interested in a gun and have nothing to do with the bullets? There are people around like that; they collect guns. But there are other people who design guns. And they design these guns to fire and to do this and that, but their fun comes in holding the gun together and in not shooting it.

It's quite interesting. We say this individual is a great gun crank, but he never has anything to do, really, with going out on the range or firing guns or anything of the sort. He keeps overhauling this gun, and he shines them up and polishes them and puts them in the case, and that sort of thing. He's a gun collector. We could say all sort of things about him. But the funny part of it is, he's really not up for criticism.

The people who take the worst care of guns -- as witness the army regulations concerning them -- are members of armed forces which fire them all the time. Boy, they have to have people in there with whips to make those people take care of guns. For instance, a marine, I think he used to get fined ten dollars for just dropping a gun. They have to inspect those guns all the time, and so forth.

Well, a gun collector's guns are never inspected by anybody but his guests, who have no authority over him. He just shows them some guns. Isn't that funny? I mean, he goes no further than this. All right.

So we must see, then, that from isness we go into an action -- which would be a game action of one kind or another -- and then this goes into a very hectic sort of a game action, and the action intensifies with interchange until we've got a reactivity. Got that? A reactivity occurs.

The fellow never did clamp the terminal up again or hold on to the terminal hard and not let it flow at any given time. His interest was in not creating a terminal and then controlling that terminal. His interest was in creating a terminal, perhaps, or a created terminal, and ever after that only getting the most possible flow out of the terminal. And we get such manifestations in the physical universe as batteries; they run down. Bodies run down. People get tired. You see? They never create that terminal; they're just marching it around. They never stop it from reacting.

It's very seldom you've seen somebody in the middle of a conversation suddenly shut up -- unless he's been offended or something of the sort; a lot of cause, stimulus-response, and so forth -- the fellow just stops talking.

And yet friends, who are very good friends with one another, very often do this. People who understand each other well very often do this. They're talking ecstatically about something or another and all of a sudden one of them shuts up; and the other talks for a while, does something else. Doesn't even worry him. You ever see that take place? That's pretty high ARC.

The way to get back in the game again is to re-create the isness or at least recontribute to it. See? The Scale of Havingness goes Create, Contribute to, Confront, Have, Substitute, Waste.

Now, we're talking up here in techniques up in these upper ranges. So we get this technique „*Make it a little more solid.*“ Don't make the invisible particles a little more solid, if you please. Do you see this now? You make it a little more solid.

So it doesn't matter if the bank put up the mock-up, if the preclear at least makes it a little more solid. It doesn't matter who he stole the body off, from. It doesn't matter where he got the body, as long as he contributes to the body a bit -- not under duress, but on his own choice contributes to that body a bit. He makes it a little more solid. And wherever we talk about this Create or Have you always have this little point: „*Make it a little more solid.*“

And the solution to what I've been talking about here for an hour is just that: „*Make it a little more solid.*“ Contribute to the extant terminal. At least contribute to it.

And the only cases you're going to have any difficulty with can't make anything even a little more solid. But there are ways to go into that. But we're not particularly interested in those cases at this moment. The only thing we're really interested in at this moment is just this contribute to-create.

If he can't create a terminal whole cloth, as in a mock-up or Creative Processing, you can always have him contribute to it. By doing what? By mocking up some particles and throwing at it? No, that's particles, see? That's a different subject. He's got to

make it itself a little more solid. And when he does that he's contributed to it, and it puts him up into a knowing game condition with relationship to it.

Now, what I've just told you is one of the most fantastic things that has happened in Scientology for a long while. Big news! I've told you why it works. There may be other explanations. There may be better explanations. But I tell you that it works.

Now, if you run into a case that can't make it a little more solid or can't comprehend solidity, then you will have to run him on a gradient scale -- which I will talk about in the next lecture -- which gets him up to a point where he can.

But what are you trying to achieve? Havingness? Getting more mass? No. What are you trying to achieve? Are you trying to achieve so that it gives him dominance or command or something? No, you're not trying to achieve that at all.

All you're trying to do is put him at the contribute level of the game at least. Boot him upstairs quick, and you'll find out that it has to do a great deal with havingness, mostly because it's merely on that scale. It permits him to confront, it permits him to do all sorts of things. Why? You are running it high scale.

I've concentrated on low-scale processes so very long that a lot of cases are around now that are bogged at a middle range. Got that?

Well, „*Make it more solid*“ and the allied techniques to this, the Creative Processes connected with it, creativeness in [at] large, and so forth, are the answers to this. And the best of these answers is just this one: „*Make it a little more solid.*“ And that gives you back the terminal which always gives you back the game the terminal authored.

Thank you.

Thank you.

[End of Lecture]