

POSTULATES OF ACTION-REACTION

A lecture given on 11 January 1957

[Start of Lecture]

Thank you.

I want to talk to you about Newton's laws of motion. Isn't that an interesting subject?

Now, here we are, all gathered here together in high-school elementary physics, and about the second chapter of the book we have gotten as far as fulcrums and balances -- we've covered all that -- and we've gotten into Newton's laws of motion. And these are three in number: inertia, interaction and acceleration.

These are very interesting laws. You children should, of course, memorize these things and never thereafter question them!

Female voice: Okay.

Inertia: For every action, there is an equal and contrary reaction.

Interaction: That which goes forward tends to persist. (I'm not giving you these laws exact.)

Acceleration: When you kick something it keeps rolling.

Now, you must know these thoroughly, because I can think of no more limited lies than these.

Now, interaction: Equal and contrary reaction. Now, the equal and contrary reaction is very interesting. That means if you fan your fist in the air, at once somebody is going to fan his fist in the air at you. Now, I want you to note this carefully. Now, I want you to raise your hand and I want you to slap at something in the air. Go ahead, do so.

Female voice: It's like swatting flies.

Have you been slapped?

Audience voices: No. Yes.

Well, so much for that law.

All right. Now, inertia -- inertia: That thing which is in a state of rest, or in a state of uniform motion, will remain in a state of rest or uniform motion unless acted upon by an exterior source. Got that?

Audience voices: Mm-hm. Yeah.

Hm?

All right, now we're going to have you act upon you from an exterior source. Got that? Hm? Got that real good? Hm?

All right. Now, push your body. Are you still sitting there? Well, that's the end of that.

Get the phraseology of these (quote) „laws“ (unquote). It infers that no matter what force acts on something, it then and thereafter does not remain in a state of rest, or does remain in a state of uniform acceleration.

In other words, it doesn't tell you the magnitude of force necessary to disturb this condition of inertia or disturb this condition of uniform motion. That is not stressed. Therefore the law is practically valueless.

Now let's take this law of interaction: For every action there is an equal and contrary reaction. It's only true on forces of comparable magnitude; it's only true on forces of comparable magnitude.

That is to say, the moment that you introduce this idiocy, which every high-school student has introduced, you'll see the fallacy in interaction. When you stamp against the surface of Earth, Earth stamps against you with the same force.

Take the mass which you represent and the mass which Earth represents, and you'll see at once that this is just a figment of imagination -- that Earth stamps back at you, see? You know factually that you've stamped on Earth. That's about all that went on there, see?

So when we get a force of noncomparable magnitude, or incomparable magnitude, the law of interaction is not true. It's not factual.

If you stamp against somebody's foot, it happens at times that he then stamps against your foot. Got the idea? Or if you were sitting opposite somebody and you kicked him, you would then feel a reaction to that kick as though he had to some slight degree reacted against you, even though he hadn't moved. This would only really apply in the finite latitude of the weight and mass of a foot, the amount of force. You got the idea?

You could, then, have a foot against a foot or a photon against a photon. But that light up there is pounding against that wall with photons, it says. Now, that means that the light must be pounded against by the photons to the degree that it is pound-

ing the wall with photons. I mean, if we don't analyze these laws much, much further and be far, far more critical -- in other words, we take them in this narrow latitude of „for every action there is an equal and contrary reaction.“ Can you see the wall over there?

Audience voices: Uh-huh.

Well, all right, that means some photons must be going astray. And you say this is all accounted for in Newton's work. Is it? I never saw it accounted for.

In order to have a bunch of aberrated universes which will persist in some aberrated way, in some aberrated direction, you have to set up some law of this character and get everybody to agree to it, even when it isn't true, in order to go on and keep the thing persisting. Only lies of this character have persistence. Do you understand me? You get a persistence, then, by introducing some sort of an incorrect arbitrary.

You say, „For every action there is an equal and contrary reaction.“ Good! Interaction takes place. Then you don't say „... amongst forces of comparable magnitude.“ You don't say all sorts of things that you could say. You have to clarify that. It in itself, without modification, is not true. You have to go further (you understand?) to clarify it, and you get a sufficient complexity that the complexity itself is doubtful.

But when you set up a postulate of this character, you do get a belief on the part of everybody that it does take place. And you get an overt act-motivator sequence. For every action there is an equal and contrary reaction: If you slug Joe, Joe's going to slug you. You mustn't hit anybody because you'll be hit. You got the idea? Now, that is the mechanics of it.

Now, when we're talking about an overt act-motivator sequence, we are not talking about the eight-dynamic situation which I talked to you about the other day. See? We're talking about a different thing; we're talking about mechanical action.

And if you are educated to believe that you will get socked in the teeth every time you sock Joe in the teeth, you will always get somatics when you think nasty thoughts about Joe. You got the idea? And it's a terrific control mechanism. It's one of the most wonderful control mechanisms I ever heard of Now we have „do unto others,“ in its mechanical sense. „We mustn't offend, because we will be offended.“

It is true (remember, I told you the other day) if you have subscribed to the agreements on all the eight dynamics and you agreed to be part of all these eight dynamics - get this now, you've got that solid set of agreements and now you elect yourself out, you deny your own postulate and agreement, don't you? See, you said, „I've agreed to be part of eight dynamics. Now they've elected me out.“ You've got some kind of a nonsense now where this Newton's law of interaction can take place: For every action there's an equal and contrary reaction.

„Oh,“ but you say, „that's just mechanics.“ No it isn't. There isn't a single mechanical law anyplace that does not have its fundamental in postulates. There is a set of postulates that makes sodium chloride. There's a set of postulates and interactions amongst postulates which make paste. Got the idea? The action and behavior of paste is trace-

able to a certain number of postulates, which undone, undo the paste! Got the idea? These are the intentions and the considerations which underlie any piece Of MEST, any element, any anything. They're all monitored by postulates and intentions, considerations and modifications.

Well, if somebody wants these walls to interact -- so that if the wall puts eight pounds of pressure against a brick, the brick will put eight pounds of pressure against the wall -- he's just saying that he wants the wall to sit there, and it's a very complicated way of saying it. Just a complicated way of saying that we want the wall to stay there.

The postulate „the wall will now sit here“ is quite adequate. You don't have to go into this nonsense of Newton's law of interaction. But Newton's law of interaction is believed, and Newton did single out of the available postulates something that is widely prevalent in MEST. He did single something out that is believed about MEST. And I'm afraid it's believed just that sloppily -- for every action there's an equal and contrary reaction.

It does belong in the pattern of human behavior, because you're living with something that you believe has this basic law in it, and your ability to see it carries, on your part, a duplication of it. So in the field of mechanics, you believe that if you hit Joe, you'll get hit. We get courts of justice trying to dramatize this: You kill a man, you'll have to be killed.

Holy cats! The society has just been made poorer by the death of one man. Why are we going to make it poorer by the death of two? Well, that's to restrain other people. Oh, is it? We've just set the example up from on high of a man being killed. We've made everybody read it in the newspapers; we've gotten it around real good. Well, that'll kill other men, that's for sure. Up to a certain point it is possibly restrictive to hang murderers, but beyond that point it's an invitation to kill.

Automobile drivers are very often victimized (most often victimized) by the highway departments of various states, who do all sorts of odd things.

One of the things they do is to let loose on the highways every nut who comes in who can remember for ten minutes some laws, write them down, and go.

The people who have accidents cannot obey laws and cannot take directions. What is the sense of posting speed-limit signs? What's the sense of posting warning signs, painting roads, or anything else?

In other words, that is being done because there are accidents. But the accidents are caused by people who cannot follow directions. So it means that the 90 percent of the drivers who can follow directions then are following directions, and are becoming dependent upon these methods of directing traffic, and so are made victims. Why? Because they think that the remaining ten out of a hundred will stop at the stop sign, and they don't look! (Believe me, I look at stop signs.) That is the one thing that a very aberrated person will go through. Get the idea?

Now, tonight I saw a fellow do an interesting thing. He was entering from a crossroad. He turned on his turn signal to turn to the right. I was entering from a crossroad

just opposite this main artery. In other words, he was entering the main artery, I was entering the main artery, and we were more or less face to face, with the main artery between us. You see?

He turns on his turn signal to turn to the right. I wait for him to go. The traffic is totally clear. He can turn on to the road now. He doesn't move. He sits there! The traffic thickens up, he moves forward a couple of feet -- gets his fender out across the main artery so that cars start swerving to avoid him. When it thinned down a little bit more and again was clear, I went and he went, too! Only I fooled him. I went faster than he could. I fouled him up.

You know what was the matter with that fellow? He saw another car doing the same thing exactly -- it was going to turn in exactly the same direction he was going to turn -- and he was actually waiting on the other car to act so that he could respond. „For every action there will be an equal and contrary reaction.“

We're looking at communication duplication, don't you see? He saw a car sitting there; if the car turned, he turned. And, by golly, he did it! The one thing he should never have done.

In the first place, it was easier for him to turn because he didn't have to go across any lines of traffic; he just had to go into one, but I had to go across a line of traffic. See? But he waited for me to go before he went.

I imagined if I'd sat there for another ten minutes, this fellow still would have sat there. I sat there long enough to determine that this was what he was doing, since he was not moving in relationship to the existing traffic; he was only moving in relationship to a car which he saw in the same position his car was in. You get the idea? And when that car moved, he moved. That was the thing to do. He was doing an obsessive duplication.

Now, people who are driven by their automobiles, as all too many people are -- in these days of power brakes, automatic steering and automatic traffic lines and automatic traffic lights, and you follow the law and you're all right... Oh, the hell you are!

Perfectly wide-open road down a little bit later, and somebody was looking at the speed-limit signs. Speed-limit signs in that area say twenty-five miles an hour. It's the only express-highway strip anyplace with no houses anywhere around and no crossroads, see? And this person was obediently going at twenty-five miles an hour.

The person reached a very dangerous strip of road, which was all crossroads, and so forth. There were no longer any speed-limit signs, and he speeded up. He was following those signs.

Look-a-here: When they, in some states, pass a law saying they're going to put a cross wherever a person has been killed in an automotive accident, those crosses multiply within a few hundred yards. Every state that has adventured to do this so far has learned the same thing: When you put up a little cross that says, „Somebody was killed at this spot,“ somebody else gets himself killed at that spot.

What is the difference between that and the fellow who was waiting to enter the highway because I was waiting to enter the highway, and entered the highway when I entered the highway? It's just obsessive duplication. See that? So he sees a cross and he says, „An automobile accident occurred here.“ So he has an automobile accident. It comes down in a stupid way; a person's reaction after a while totally consists of „now I'm supposed to.“ You got that?

In other words, his thinkingness has now generated down to „now I'm supposed to.“ He himself doesn't do anything; he himself does what he's supposed to do, which is told him by some other agency. And that is what is meant by obsessive duplication: „Now I am supposed to.“

There's a whole race, I've always had a warm feeling for them: the Japanese people. Very fine people. It'll tie me in stitches every time I turn around, if I'm in Nagasaki or someplace, on this whole thing of obsessive duplication. Every once in a while, I'll let it go by just so far and then it gets funny to me.

I took a raincoat in one time to be copied. And there was a patch on its shoulder. And my new raincoat came in with a patch on its shoulder. I didn't get mad. I simply knew what the score was, and I simply shoved it back at them again and showed them that I wanted it without the patch. They thought that I was being idiosyncratic about it, and they thought, „Well, we can put up with this fellow. His Japanese is very poor; he must be ignorant.“ They made me an incorrect and improper raincoat, without a patch on its shoulder. That was their courtesy that permitted them to do that. It is a tremendously courteous people, but they do have an enormous streak of obsessive duplication.

Down in the Straits Settlements you see this very often. People are in a state of physical-body rapport with other people. In other words, they're really plowed in. They're smeared. They're crazy. They're in a mesmeric state. You'll see one of them coming down the street, and he'll be walking in some peculiar fashion. And you raise your hand and go this way to him, you know? He can't help himself. He must raise his hand and go this way. See?

You could do all sorts of things. After this was pointed out to me one time, I used to watch -- over in the native quarter there, of Singapore -- and see some of these people, and so on, just to find out how far they'd go. And they'd go the whole way. They'll do anything.

This is the principle of obsessive duplication -- „now I'm supposed to.“ They take their clue of what they're supposed to do from present time. But they are not able, of themselves, to initiate an action. They cannot themselves initiate an action.

Now, we're looking at the reactive bank doing an obsessive duplication.

And that is a reactive thing, and it is not necessary for a thetan to duplicate or not duplicate or even worry himself about it as long as he is analytically conscious and alive. You got that?

I mean, it isn't something somebody has to do or something somebody gradually gets down into. You get the idea? He just abandons an analytical approach to any given environment or situation, and after that we get obsessive duplication as one of the manifestations. All of his observation is reactive.

Some large percentage of every preclear you have is doing actions without originating them. He doesn't originate these actions. You got that? They originate. Get the difference here?

Now he, on the first dynamic, has got this one on the eighth dynamic: „Somebody built all this. Somebody is guiding all the actions I see. The little birds that go through the trees and the gophers that dig in the lawn -- somebody's guiding all that.“ Hey, what kind of a goat are we trying to make here? See?

In other words, we've got a total irresponsibility on the eighth dynamic. You get the idea? We have no responsibility for any part of any action anyplace: It's all being done. You got that?

A chemist, a physicist gets into this rather easily. He says, „When I mix up this guglubbuba with this gualuhluha then it does something.“ Got the idea? We've got a can of Wuff-Puff and we've got a can of Puff-Wuff, and when we intercan them, why, then it does something. Now, we wonder why these guys go batty. Why do they become totally irresponsible? Because that's a total irresponsibility on the sixth dynamic. Got that? It's all being done!

Now, when he connects himself up with this, he'll get to a point where, when he sees an explosion, he thinks he should explode. Got that? When he sees that some chemical kills people, then he thinks he should kill people. See? Just total reaction -- obsessive duplication, totally reactive -- all originating out of „I have no responsibility for this and no hand in it.“

Well now, if he hadn't agreed that he had a hand in it, he then could not say as a second postulate, „I now have no hand in it“ and come to harm. He had to say, „I am doing it; I have a share in it“ before he could say, „I had no share in it“ and have that harm him. Get the idea? He has to make the first action as a contribution to then not contribute and have the noncontribution react harmfully against his ability to think and be. Follow this?

Now, he could come along and open a small beam at a universe and say, „You know, I didn't build that!“ Be perfectly true. If he could see it and he had just confronted it, it'd be perfectly true. He had a perception of it in some fashion, but he hadn't really built it. Got this? If we could accept that, then anything could happen. But it so happens that you can't see anything that you didn't help build.

Most people have this idea of this universe: Well, they sail along; they're doing all right -- through what space, we don't know! -- and across this space they saw this universe that somebody had built. They didn't have anything to do with it. Boy, they must have had this idea or implant three-quarters of the way up the track: „Where did this universe come from?“

I assure you that if they didn't have some hand in it, they couldn't perceive it. Because creativeness precedes perception. They at least had to have an agreement with the guy who built it. That's the least that could happen, see? They'd have to have an agreement with the fellow who did make the postulate; and they would have had to have agreed that it could continue to exist before it then would exist for them. See? They had to have a connection with this, and they had to share some responsibility for its existence before perception and experience could take place. And that you can count on!

Well, it's all very well for somebody to sit around and say, „Well, it's all bad, but there's nothing I can do about it. I didn't have anything to do with this, so it couldn't possibly affect me in any way.“ Boy, he's just asking for it! That's the little tremor that goes just before obsessive duplication, see? The next thing you know, if he's totally out of the thing, and he can know about it -- wow! He knows about it, but he's totally out of it. Now he says, „I have no control over it, whatsoever.“ Well, something is going to control something around there, and that situation is going to wind up controlling him, but thoroughly!

I'll give you an example. Let's take a government. Everybody gets together and they say, „We're going to form a government here, and the government is going to continue to the end of time. We'll set up this automatic piece of machinery here called the Magna Carta, and everything will continue, then, to the end of time on that automaticity. And, somehow or another, it'll all come out all right and nobody'll ever have to invest another single 'think' along the line anywhere.“ They should be surprised that it starts running off the wheels sometime along the line. People always point back to the fact that they had a hand in starting it. What'd they do? They got together and they started it, and then they say, „Now it's started. I don't have anything further to do with it.“ That would've wound them up in the soup at once.

But let's take a look at it over a couple of hundred years. They started it, and then they gradually back out of it, and they eventually don't even vote. It was already arranged that their vote should control that machine. And now they say, „I'm not going to vote anymore.“ Ah, well, naturally that government will start to tax them, kill them, shoot them. How could it do otherwise? Do you see? It's been set up, the person did contribute to it, the person did assist in the creation of it, and now the person says, „I have no responsibility in this at all.“ And that is the biggest lie that a person can say. See?

He looks at a wall and he says, „I have no responsibility for the existence of that wall. It was built by Jones and Company Contractors back in 1906, and I've never seen it before and I have nothing to do with it. Why shouldn't I write 'Kilroy was here' all over it?“ See? Get the idea? He just backed off.

Well now, he can back off so far that he can say, „It was all built by Yahweh.“ He doesn't explain how Yahweh built it, and then he could see it. He'll go further than that. He could say, „Yahweh built the wall and Yahweh made me. And we was all made in the same crucible, and therefore I am a wall and here I stand.“ What other conclusion could he be asked to reach? Duplication would inform him of that.

Most thetans who are having a rough time in the field of mysticism, or some other spiritual practice, believe that they themselves are bits of energy that radiate energy. Do you know that? I mean, they really believe this. They think of themselves as shedding light all the time. I know I get tired of shedding light myself. Something I turn on and off.

So, somebody mocks up a whole lot of people with circles around their heads to show that the good people always shed light. And you shed enough light, and you make enough light, and you contribute enough light or particles to a body, don't be surprised someday when you start to pull out of it that you can't. Because you're saying, „Look, I didn't make this thing and it's not mine. I'm now going to leave it.“ No, you contributed to it. You contributed markedly to those masses which now form the trap.

Well, now let's put it another way: You made a big mass of black stuff and threw it up in a piece of space, and by your postulate you said, „This will continue to exist from here on out.“

And then you went off and joined the French Foreign Space Opera or something. And you sailed around and got reborn as a farmer on Plocturus. And you eventually one day are busy farming, and there's a black pool of stuff, and you fall in it and you get drowned. You say, „Look how the gods have afflicted me.“ I wonder how the devil you got stuck in that black stuff, huh? Just how'd this happen?

How could you have sufficient affinity for the stuff to get stuck in it? Well, you either had to congratulate the fellow who made it and agree that he had made it -- you at least had to do that - - or you had to help him make it, or you had to mock it up yourself. You had to do one of these actions. See? Only then could you be trapped by it.

Now, let's look at this Newton's law of interaction. You have started a body in a direction. You've started a body in a direction and it hits a wall. And the wall says, „You are now started in another direction, son.“ It says, „Back up!“ Now just get the idea of you going into a wall and saying „Smack! Thud!“ You see that? You go into a wall -- thud!

You didn't decide to stop. The decision to stop was evidently made by the wall. How could that decision affect you unless, at sometime or another, you had decided that all walls would have the power to stop? But the lie which you tell is that the wall's power to stop you was no part of your doing. It becomes a misowned postulate and is the basic part of a trap. That is the basic postulate of a trap.

You say, „I have the power to enter, but only it has the power to kick me out.“ Got that? You say, „I have no power to move out of it; it's what moves me out.“ Well, that is an outrageous lie. If you hadn't granted it the power to kick you out, it wouldn't have the power to kick you out. You got the idea?

So it's merely the state of mind „it can kick me out“ that traps you. That is that. It gets this bad: we wait for a body to die before we exteriorize. People go around and face up to bullets and bombs just so that something will hit the body hard enough so that it will die, so that they'll be kicked out. They say, „I have no responsibility for the tra-

pability of this particular item. I'm not responsible for the ability of a wall to trap people. Wasn't me." See that?

It is an insanity. And if anything is an insanity, that is. The only way it could hold you would be by your consent, because it can't even experience you. Get the idea? I mean, it has no volition. The wall -- can't tell what time to kick you out -- to knock you backwards. It doesn't even know you're alive. And if it were alive, it couldn't sense or experience you, a thetan. So we hit it, and so on.

Now actually, there's this whole mechanism of stuck flows -- explains quite satisfactorily how one gets into a trap. But it's on a lower, mechanical basis. And on the primary and principal level that we're interested in, we're on the interested level of postulates. How did this come about, see? We have the mechanical aspects of it; you could read it in earlier works. How can I possibly have a bad sensation from hitting the wall? How is it possible for me to hit the wall hard enough to get a reaction from the wall? How could this be?

Well, the only way it could be: If you yourself were a contributor to the total existence of the wall, with all the postulates contained therein. You yourself had to have agreed to the existence and power of the wall, or to have postulated it in the first place, for it to have that power where you are concerned. Anything which has power over you, a thetan, or the things you own, must have been postulated by you or agreed to by you before the power is effective. And if you can see this universe, and if you can experience it, and if you can stub your toe on a stone, then it must follow that you had a hand in it.

You are not at this moment aware of sixteen other universes. They undoubtedly exist. How would you become aware of them? Oh, just get the idea that you are agreeing with somebody that they existed, and agree with somebody they existed, and you'll go slip, slop and boom! You can move people from one universe to another universe just with that mechanism. Ask them to get the idea of a universe. Then ask them to get the idea of somebody in the universe. Then get the idea of agreeing with that person that it exists.

Now, sometimes it doesn't work. Why? Your preclear simply mocks one up which is rather flimsy and has no solidity to it, and he doesn't connect. But every now and then, he can and does connect. And he has a ball. I mean, he'll go sliding out of this one into a solid other one. And he's not back on the track, because he is in a solid surrounding. His surroundings are quite as solid as the surroundings he's occupying while being audited.

You can get him into another universe and then exteriorize him from it two or three times, and he'll get the idea of contempt for this one. The only reason I know about that, by the way -- because it was a method of exteriorization at one time; exteriorization from two points or two universes.

The original version of it was „Mock up somebody five feet back of your head.“ (A body, you see?) „Now be in your body's body.“ „Now be in the other body.“ „Now

be in your body's body.“ „Be in the other body.“ „Now spot three spots in the other body.“ „Three spots in your body.“ „Three spots in the other body.“

And the next doggone thing you know, the guy is occupying his own mock-up three feet back of his present body's head, see? And this was to overcome the loss-of-mass factor which attends every exteriorization. And it does; it yanks people out if you do it well.

Well, this was extended on to exteriorization, not only from a body, but from a universe. Well, how would you exteriorize somebody from a universe? Well, do other universes exist? And this method of agreeing that one existed -- just sitting there and dopping around, and finally getting the idea of agreeing with somebody that this universe exists -- every once in a while, if you fish around and do that, the guy will go slurp! into some other universe, nice as you please. That universe is totally solid; you get him to observe it completely. Now exteriorize him from it. Now put him back into it again. Now get him out of it. Now put him into it. Now get him out of it. Now put him into it. Now get him out of it. Now put him into it. Now get him out of it.

Now, how about this universe? He can get out of this universe. That's your next step; he becomes convinced.

That is not good enough as a process to use in any highly advertised capacity, because I have found that auditors do some fishing. See, they fish around, no more than that, and get discouraged. Then they figure out some other theory, you see -- that the guy must be mocking one up, or something of the sort -- and leave it. Get what they do? They just say, „Well, we didn't connect and that's that.“

Actually, it's pretty simple. You just get the guy to think of somebody in another universe, and then get the idea of agreeing with that person that that universe is visible. And if that is not successful, you simply wipe it out, get him oriented in this universe and do it all over again. See? And somewhere along the line, why, you'll practice exteriorization from universes. So, there is a way of getting out of a universe.

But let's examine how you get into one. You expect, after a while, that it's the universe that is going to kick you out; you're never going to have the power to leave the universe.

Now, this technique which I've just told you about is subservient to that fixation. It thinks you need a trick to get out of something. Why? Why do you need a trick? Because it should kick you out! This universe should boot you out!

I'll give you an example of that: Get an idea over here (just look at the wall in front of you there) -- get an idea of you hitting the wall. Got that?

Now get an idea of the wall hitting you. You got that?

All right, now get an idea of you hitting the wall.

Now, get an idea of the wall hitting you.

You got that? You got that? Do that rather well, huh?

All right, now we're going to have another one. Get an idea of you, on your own decision, walking up to the wall. Got that?

Now have the wall get the idea that it's going to shove you back.

All right, now let's do that again. You get the idea of, on your decision, walking up to the wall, and the wall getting the idea that it's going to shove you back. Got that?

Audience voices: Um-hm. Yeah.

All right, now just right here and now, look at that wall. Do you think it's capable of actually shoving you anywhere?

Male voice: No.

Well, where'd this other idea come from that you wait for it to push you every time you run into it?

How can it stop you? It would have to get the idea of shoving you back in order to stop you. That right? Well, where'd that idea come from? Where'd it come from?

Boy, that must be an automaticity that goes back to Adam and Eve, if they ever existed. Got the idea?

All right, now that's the way a trap operates. Supposing the wall never got the idea of shoving you back.

Now let's do that one. Now, you go and walk up to the wall, and then get the wall just totally null on the idea of stopping you and shoving you back. Well, can you get the idea of you now standing in front of the wall, waiting for it to shove you back? Can you get that idea? Can you get it well enough to realize that it's the sensation of being trapped?

Just get an idea of you standing right there in front of the wall, waiting for the wall to shove you out. Got it?

All right, now can you get the idea of -- sitting right where you are -- can you get the idea of waiting for your head to kick you out? Try it. Right now. Just sit there and wait for your head to kick you out. You waiting for your head to kick you out?

Audience voices: Um-hm. Yeah.

Huh!

All right. Now, that isn't the case with a lot of you here; you are not necessarily doing that. If you were reactively being audited, and you were just being totally reactive in being audited, the preclear would be doing this. Now, do this now.

Wait for the auditor (an imaginary auditor somewhere around you) to kick you out.

Go on, wait for an imaginary auditor somewhere around you to kick you out. Got that? Got that? Huh?

That is the frame of mind -- that exact frame of mind is the unknowing frame of mind of every preclear you have difficulty with. He's waiting for you to make the wall postulate. He's waiting for you to kick him out.

Therefore, you can always boot somebody out of his head if you insist on it. You got that? But you actually have to practically knock him over between the ears in some cases. You see, you practically have to take a club to him in some cases. But the funny part of it is, you could. You actually could.

You could walk up to a person who was under ether and you could say, „Get out of your head. Go to Arcturus. Don't ever come back.“ He'd die right there on the operating table.

That is the basic mechanism which is used in this universe when exteriorization is employed politically -- in any way. That is the exact mechanism. They knock somebody around, get him fixed attention and then boot him out. In other words, they substitute for the second postulate, boot him out and send him on his way. And the fellow has no choice but to go. He is therefore and thereon and thereafter under orders from that particular source.

Do you know that you can call back, to any dead body, the thetan departed from it? This is something fascinating. And there's many a Scientologist here and there around the world -- but much more so in Europe and North Africa than here -- who has just stood a small community, you see, right on its ear with this particular one.

A guy is hit in the street accident, he's lying there, he's not breathing. The doctor says, „Cover him up.“ The Scientologist says to the guy, „What the hell's the matter with you! Pick that mock-up up!“

See? Get the idea? The fellow says, „Oh, wait a minute. I don't have permission to depart.“

He thought the body had said, „You can leave.“ The blow was sufficiently forceful that he believed, now, he had been given orders to leave. And so he died. That's why people die.

That's why one person with the same injuries will linger on for years, and another person with the same injury will die instantly. It's the idea each one of them has, different gradient of the idea, that they have had permission to leave. Something else has made the postulate they can go.

Sometimes when people are talking directly to you -- they're talking to you -- and they have said what they were going to say, and so forth, it's a funny thing that they will say it all over again and all over again and all over again. And you feel victimized. Why should you feel victimized? They are simply waiting for you to say, „You can go now.“ And you say that, and they leave quite happily. Sometimes it gives them a bit of a somatic. But in most cases, they don't notice that you have done anything impolite. They don't even notice you've said it. You got this? Now, this is a very fascinating mechanism which I am talking to you about here.

I'll give you a very fast review of this. We start out, went down into the laws of motion. It's gone that far, this same thing I'm talking about. They're waiting for the counter-postulate. They hit something, they wait for it to say something, they wait for it to hit. You get the idea? And then that becomes mechanics, becomes physics, and so forth. It's just a piece of nonsense. Doesn't have to be at all.

Now, we come upscale, above that, and we get such a thing as the Overt act-motivator sequence: When one starts to do something, then he expects it'll be done to him.

All right, now let's come upstairs. A little higher than that we get the eight dynamics. See, that's bigger than overt-act- motivator sequence -- the eight dynamics. We have decided to be part of, or we have postulated those into existence. They are postulated by an individual; the individual now becomes a part of a great many things. He's joined up, you understand? And then he assumes that he has been kicked out, and he agrees to leave while it still lives. And he goes right on down the Tone Scale. He gets this irresponsibility. He gets all kinds of things that we see as neurotic tendencies; we see it as bad judgment.

One of the commonest manifestations is the fellow doesn't believe he has anyplace to light. Did you ever have the sensation of -- you were being hurried, and you couldn't wait long enough to do any one part of the job well enough to make sure that it was really done? You got that? No one part of a great many details could be done thoroughly, because you didn't have enough time -- let's say that, see? Enough time. That's „unable to light.“

Right along with that goes this other one (and this is very prevalent in the dynamics): „There isn't anyplace where I could sit down. There isn't anyplace where I could light.“ See? „No place I could light. There's nothing I could sit on. There's no place in the world where, if I sat down, I would then be undisturbed. I would be driven off from any position which I sought to occupy!“ You got that?

There is no real difference between that and „I cannot thoroughly complete this action, because I will be driven off before the action is complete; therefore, I'll have to be rather careful to leave some part of the action incomplete.“ See? „I can't assert myself, or confront or stay there long enough, because I don't have any right there.“

Look, if you're aware of a there, your right extends usually to having made it. That's how much right you have to stay there! And that comes from this idea that „I can decide to go forward but they will decide to push me back.“ You see? „I can join, but they will kick me out. I can get into a body, but I'll have to wait for it to kick the bucket in order to boot me out again.“ You got the idea?

In other words, „I have total power of choice on joining, agreeing, postulating, going forward, being connected with; but I have no power of choice on things disconnecting, kicking me out, throwing me out, and so forth.“ You get the idea? So that Separateness works on some preclears and doesn't work on others. On some preclears it merely runs out an automaticity; on others it convinces them they're kicked out now.

The two types of processing, by the way, are: running something in and running something out. You can actually do either one. And sometimes you're intending to do one and the other happens, which is about the only randomness there is in modern auditing. You say, „I want this fellow to postulate that he is free until he's free.“ See? You're running something in. „I want him to postulate he's a good guy until he's a good guy.“

Now, Rising Scale Processing is running something in. You go from the bottom to the top. You get him to change his mind, change his mind, change his mind, change his mind. You're running something in then, see?

Well, the other type of auditing is running something out. Now, Substitution is part of running something out. We get him to substitute things for what he has. In other words, that's Havingness. That's Trio, so on. We get him to substitute things for the things he's holding on to, and he'll let go of the things he's holding on to and hold on to other things. You get the idea? Well, that's running something out. We get him to say something over and over. The earliest, crudest version of this is repeater technique: „I'm a boy. I'm a boy. I'm a boy. I'm a boy. I'm a boy,“ see? He's running something out. He's running a phrase out of the bank.

Now, an auditor can run things in and run things out. Whichever one he does, does not change this basic thing of „I make the entering postulate and they make the leaving postulate.“ See?

Now, regardless of what you do with this combination (which is the anatomy of traps) -- regardless of what you do with it -- whether you run in the ability to join or run out the ability to join, or what you do with it, the mechanism itself will have to be understood by you so that you can see what's happening.

The preclear is waiting there with you as the auditor to kick him out. And all of a sudden, one day he blows the session. But he thought you'd given him permission to leave. He said, „Now he's been mean enough, nasty enough and stupid enough that he's now given me enough overt acts so that he's booted me out of the session and I leave.“ Got the idea? You don't do anything to some preclears, they assume this and they get up and yabble-yabble at you, or say nothing and walk out the door. See, that's blowing a session. They are making you responsible for the postulate to leave. Got that?

Now, that's you exteriorizing somebody. You can exteriorize almost anybody. It just depends on how positive you want to be with your command and what state you want to put them into. You could always exteriorize any person anywhere if you were willing to use any means whatsoever to render them in any way necessary to accomplish it. You got this?

All you'd have to do, whatever you did, is you'd have to arrange what you did so that it would be convincing to them that they had been given the orders to leave; see, now that they're convinced.

Now, the people you exteriorize easily, oddly enough, are people who are quite rational about this. They exteriorize rather easily. See? They're very rational. You say to

them, „Three feet back of your head.“ They say, „That's a good idea,“ and they aren't influenced by these other mechanisms, and they get three feet back of their head, see? They say, „Ha, what do you -- ha- ha-ha. What do you know? Ha!“

Now, there's another class of preclear that at once goes three feet back of his head, and that's the class who has eye flutter, anaten, total reaction, wide-open case, facsimiles all perfect but each one weighs a thousand pounds and he can do nothing with them. Got that? And you tell this fellow, „Well,“ (you say very authoritatively), you say, „Well, be three feet back of your head, I guess.“ And this guy goes clear past Arc-turus. See? He does a bunk. Got that?

He couldn't stay in if you intimated he was to get out. You got that? He himself couldn't make enough postulate to stay in his head to overcome a slight idea on your part that he might someday leave. And these people are always trying to run.

Now, some people are stuck in their heads and they make the body run away. You say, „Be three feet back of your head“ and they will leave the auditing session. The body walks up and leaves the auditing session. You got the idea? This is about the only thing they can do. They've been given some understanding that they should depart, and they Hobson-Jobson this around until they shove; but they take the body with them. You get all these various manifestations.

The one thing that all thetans are worried about is being told to get out. They're all worried about being told to get out. Someday somebody might tell them to leave. What form this would take might be horrible. They've been told to leave.

Some high muckie-muck someplace or another has gotten the idea that he should overthrow a political situation in Yahsarabia. And so he grabs ahold of this little girl and he says, „Hocus-pocus- cadunkas, you are now in the head of Queen Wunkus. You will now become a prostitute and disgrace the king,“ and that will be that. And the political situation would take place just like that! This is an easy one to do.

You could get ahold of some kid and say, „You will now occupy the beingness of Khrushchev,“ see? Give him no power of choice over this, and actually force him to make Khrushchev run off a cliff or something, see? This is old-time magic I'm talking about now. It's very easy; a Scientologist can do this. It's for the birds! But it is a game that has been played.

Now, do you understand this action and reaction? Hm? Do you understand about how that influences the trap? Hm? Do you understand this trapping mechanism of this?

You can always use your power of choice to go in, but you can never use your power of choice to get out. See? You get how that would be? You created the thing, and then you say, „I'm not any longer responsible for it.“

Now do you understand the dynamics, and how a person would feel kicked out of life if he had postulated and agreed to all the dynamics, and then had said he had no part in them? You got the idea? You got the idea of just the second-postulate nature of this situation? Hm?

It makes a lie. See? The fellow said one thing, now he says another thing. It's a broken contract. It's a lie. He said, „I'm going to be with this body forever.“ Sixty years later, he shoves off. So he feels bad about the death. See? He's been overcome and overwhelmed. His postulates have been overridden. How to get rid of this is something else. How to handle it is something else. But to handle it at all, you'd better understand it. You got it? Thank you.

[End of Lecture]