

SACREDNESS OF CASES – DETERMINISM

A lecture given on
5 April 1962

Thank you.

And now we come to the crux of the situation – you. Why is your case sacred?

This is a lecture of April the 5th, AD 12, Special Briefing Course, Saint Hill. A very late spring. But if you will notice we have some gorse or whatever it is, from Scotland, blooming And we have a whole slew of daffodils. Brave flower. Spring won't take forever. And neither will our new quarters.

I was out slopping around amongst the plumbing out there today and find out the contractors have come out of hibernation. Awfully nice of them.

Well, let's get down to the meat of the situation tonight, and let's find out why your case is sacred.

Well, why is it? Just contemplate that for the moment. Why is your case sacred? If it is. If it is.

Sacredity raises its ugly head. Sacred equals don't attack equals preserve equals protect equals survive. And now at last we understand the theetie-weetie case. If you notice, everything to a theetie-weetie case is sacred.

All right. Now, let's just add up that case – not to throw dirty names here or anything – but let's just add up that case.

Those equations which you just took down in your notes – you also ought to hear that, you know. You also ought to hear that, hear what I just said, too.

If you'll look that over, just let's add up this case where everything is sacred. Mustn't attack it, mustn't be attacked, must protect, must preserve, must survive, and there's a final equals – equals no results in processing

And frankly that is the only reason that anyone ever has, for a no result in processing. That is the secret of this universe. The secret of this universe is that it is a sacred universe and

shouldn't be attacked. And this puts every poor thetan that comes into it on a shouldn't-attack which puts attack on, of course, automatic. So it's the universe of automatic attack.

Now, there are two states of mind – three, really. There's the state of mind of pan-determinism, of where one can see or fight or control or anything else on his own choice on either side of the situation. Pan-determinism – either side of the question, either side of the situation.

I know it used to disgust my fellow writers. I took politics – politics to me are something on the order of jokes that you read in joke books, you know. Like Pat and Mike joke books or something like that. Or minstrel joke books.

And I could never really take this sort of thing seriously. After you've gotten too familiar with something and been mixed up in it often enough, you see – after that you get very familiar with it, you see?

And you'd have a bunch of fellows holding out violently, you see, for one side of the political picture, you see? And another bunch of fellows holding out violently for the other side of the political picture. And I would sit there and be violently, you see, on the side of the first blokes and then about halfway through the evening or a half a pint of rum later, something like that, why, I would become violently in favor of the former opposition, you see. It really upset everybody, you see?

Well, the symptom of this was – it didn't make this much difference. I'd just as soon have fought on either side of it as long as it was a good fight. But you see, these poor fellows were fettered. And they were hostile to this point of view because they were fettered. Because group A – the first group, violently “in favor of,” you see – their principles were sacred, you see? And group B – violently opposed to them – their principles were sacred, you see? And so it was a matter of die or else, you see. I mean, this wasn't any thought of any change here or shift. And for somebody to come along as cavalierly as this and argue on both sides of the political situation, you see, with this much wild abandon, was a shock to one and all because neither side was sacred to me.

You see, politics is, at best, shifts and mechanisms of control, you see? And it's somehow the shadier side of control, if you want to really get down to brass tacks. But this – this is generally the attitude of this universe on the subject of pan-determinism, so pan-determinism gets into bad repute.

I think I've joked about the denouement of this particular bunch of fellows. I remember one time there was a socialist and there was a communist and there was a democrat and there was a fascist, and boy, they were having a ball, you know, and each one was taking his sides, and so forth. And finally I got them to argue on one thing. Got to argue in the direction of just one item and they finally came up and approached this item and they all agreed that there was

only one government that was a workable government and to which each one of them could wholeheartedly subscribe, and that was a benevolent monarchy.

So after we'd approached this by very gradient scales and very small steps, and they found themselves, who had been at each other's throats on this particular subject, you see – they found out they were all royalists. That's what I told them. See, I just dropped a bomb in the midst. “Well,” I said, “I'm in the middle of a bunch of royalists and I myself am not a royalist, so that's that.” Disgusted with all of them. This is a terrible thing to do to people. But they'd actually all agreed on this subject.

There's only one thing wrong with a benevolent monarchy. You cannot choose its succession. So apparently every other form of politics is based on the inability to choose a successor. So we then have to – we have to . . . See, all these forms of politics are based on the inability to choose a successor. Hasn't anything to do with the kind of action you take during the political action, you see. You see that? I mean the present time of politics is of no concern, then. You have to have these other shifts and dodges because of the successor, see. You don't have to... Apparently any one of these forms of politics – fascism, communism, socialism, anything it doesn't matter what – are only necessary because you cannot guarantee that a good successor will follow a benevolent monarch. So they're all out of present time, aren't they? They're all somewhere up into the future or something So this becomes very amusing. You can go on this way but people don't approve of this. People frown on this. It's pan-determinism of one kind or another. You base it on this particular basis. A benevolent monarchy, of course, they could count on its being pan-determined. It would take up the right or the wrong or the basis of – you know, a good monarch, you know. He'd take up the justice of the situation, the points of the situation. But they could never guarantee that if he died they would get another one. So they have to become socialists or communists or fascists or something else, you see?

You see, all the – the only thing that afflicted the entirety of the Roman Empire was stability of government. The types of governments which they had could not guarantee that you wouldn't have choice of successor by civil war. So therefore they were in a terrible mess. So all of the ensuing fifteen hundred – or, I guess, about thirteen hundred years of monarchies by succession by birth, you know, princes and divine rights of kings, all came out of the failure of the republic called Rome, you see? So they found out they couldn't have a republic because they couldn't guarantee a successor, so then we had divine rights of kings and had it genetically.

Now, you and I know that if any thetan can pick up any body, that would be the total apathy of successiveness, wouldn't it. Yeah. The genetic entity is going to succeed to the rule every time. And this is practically what happened. He will have an awful lot of trouble. Every

time you get into pandeterminism all kinds of conflicts arise as to how are you going to continue pan-determinism, you see? And people don't. They slop off into self-determinism.

They go for “for and agin.” They get into this self-determined attitude, and that's your second state of mind. It's a state of mind of “pro me.” And then you'll have vast philosophies growing up of the virtue of selfishness. “Well, whatever you choose, why, you'd better think of number one first,” see. And you get a vast activity going on the subject of how self is all-important – by which they mean self-determined action is all-important. And this carries with it another thing: that other-determined action is bad. See, that's the other side of the situation.

Now we have enemies. And now in any given group, why, about the most that you could be would be 50, 60, 70 percent of it, you see, because you could never be the whole group. You've dwindled in size or force, you might say.

And now there's a third state. When people get into this state they're nuts, to be technical. I was roused up the other day about somebody in New Jersey was cursing me for using a very bad technical approach, you see, and using technical words, and so forth.

Isn't it funny? The last person that did that violently was also from New Jersey. You know, I think it must be in their drinking water. So I'm being careful tonight to being very, very technical. Anyway, a fellow who is in a other-determined frame of mind can be counted on as to be very technical; to agree with this New Jersey thing – nuts.

This person is only always for the other guy and never for himself. You start an argument in this person's vicinity and they get reasonable with you. They'll always be reasonable.

You say, “Well, those damned psychiatrists shouldn't ought to use 220 volts as their only procedure.”

“Well, I think they are perfectly good-intentioned men,” and so forth.

Now, you make the mistake of believing you are talking to somebody who is pro-psychiatric. And you're not. You're talking to somebody who is simply other-determined. And someday you should try this little excursion: As you talk to them and find out that every time you attack something they defend it in some way on the fact that it must be all right and it must be good and it must be – you know, there must be some *reason* for it, you see, just attack something else at random. Attack the sellers of apples at Times Square or something of the sort. And then you'll find they will immediately tell you, “Well, those fellows have to give money to the police, and they, you know, and to keep their license. And that is why they charge what they do for apples at Times Square,” and so on. And then just choose your next tactic. Attack the Society for the Dissemination of Cats.

And say, “Well, they shouldn't disseminate all those cats,” and so forth.

And they'll say, "Well, they probably have a good reason for disseminating these cats."

And you'll begin to wake up after a while that this person is really not *for* anything for himself. He's only for those things which are agin. And if you say agin to him, he has to be *for*. Now, this one escapes your view. This one is a hard one to see because it's already entered into the lower-scale mockery of pan-determinism. You see, you're already just now entering into the lower-scale mockery. That's just the way it looks, however. This person is *not* pan-determined. This person is *never* self-determined. Now that's – that's what you fail to see as you speak with this person. This person is *never* self-determined. This person is *always* other-determined .

These people, peculiarly, get into politics. It's a lower-scale mockery. Peculiarly. And it would just drive you stark staring mad if you were running a country and you had these people on your military and economic staffs, and so forth, because every time you said something was against the country, they'd have something reasonable to say about it. And they would give this vast example of being impartial people. But they are *not* impartial people. They're only for what is agin. You see that?

All right. Now, of course, we go down into the lower, lower harmonics, and we get, of course, these things repeated over and over again. But it's pan-determinism, self-determinism and other-determinism. Those are the three grades as you go down. And it usually escapes your view. Only thing new to you about this would be – probably would be the fact that other-determinism – a person who is totally other-determined – escapes your view because he looks reasonable and he looks pan-determined and he looks like he has good sense. It always sounds like he has good sense, you know.

You say, "Well, these fortunetellers shouldn't manipulate the stock market the way they do."

"Well, they probably have a – you see, they probably have some sincerity and some faith in what they're saying, and they have to live too, you know. And . . ."

You see, the question you never follow up. You just keep – you keep talking about fortunetellers to this person or something of the sort. So you never discover this other point. The person is not for himself.

Now, in processing, that is the first level of case that is really going to give you trouble. You can be sure that case is going to give you trouble, because if you prove to him utterly he ought to run out certain engrams to benefit himself, he won't. You got it? He's not for himself, ever. You run into all sorts of things.

All cases, you understand, at various parts of the track, get stuck in these various phases. I mean, any of you at some part of the track have been looped up at one or another of these points. Even me, you see. Even thee. See, at some time or another.

You know, you really got caved in. You went through two wars and an economic collapse and came out at the other end and found out you were sweeping out latrines as your highest dedication of life. And that the medicos have kept the body going and the only original part of the body which you have left is the left shoulder. And the rest of it's all artificial and yet you can't escape from it and you can't get away from it, and so on. You get lowtoned. You get low-toned about this time.

And you're liable at that time to have found yourself very reasonable about the enemy. And what went along with this is you were agin you. You see, that's very easy because you looked around in the present time environment and found everybody was against you. And if everybody was against you, why, then you must be against you, too. Otherwise, you'd be out of agreement with the whole universe, wouldn't you.

So a person trying to stay in agreement with the whole universe will sooner or later at some phase of his track become momentarily or otherwise other-determined. You see? It's a defeated proposition whereby he goes into agreement with the fact that he ought to be defeated.

Periods of illness best demonstrate this – people who are ill or chronically ill. You'll see most people who are under heavy attack or who have been heavily attacked or carrying a very large level of responsibility will occasionally flick in and out of this state. And of course, that makes almost any political leader on this planet or in this universe – almost any political leader is liable to get into this state. And the next thing you know, he will only sign a reasonable treaty which is favorable to the enemy and never favorable to his own country. And he will not sign a treaty which is favorable to his own country and will only sign a treaty that is favorable to the enemy.

And you wonder how come, after these wars, you get such fouled-up, mucked-up treaties of peace. Well, you got weary leaders who have gone totally other-determined. See, they look at all the overts they've racked up during a war, you see. And they finally get to the point where the enemy should be saved and they should be defeated.

Now, you can be in this frame of mind on certain subjects without being generally or broadly. So a person on any given subject – that is not as a general mental attitude but as a specific mental attitude on any subject – is pandetermined, self-determined or other-determined.

And only in those areas where the person is furiously other-determined will you find a consistent and continuing somatic. That's the point of otherdeterminism – where the

individual is assisting the attack on self. Of course, he's the only one there that can make the somatic, don't you see.

So now, what I'm talking about wasn't as scarce as you thought. Now, when we get to the point where the *whole* individual and the *whole* situation and the *whole* attitude is pan-determined, self-determined or other-determined, of course, we have states of sanity. These are the states of sanity.

Everybody, you see, on any given subject – well, there's people here that are pan-determined on the subject of women and there are people here who are self-determined on the subject of women and there are people here who are other-determined on the subject of women, see? Take any subject and you'll find a variety of generalized attitudes.

Now, when you find a terminal by 3D Criss Cross, that terminal will be, if pan-determined, undiscoverable because it will never have hung up. Self-determined – somewhat troublesome. And it'll be part of the Goals Problem Mass. Other-determined – it'll damn near whip you in trying to audit it if you really don't have the locks spotted and the right keys to open those doors. Because every time you hit it the pc attacks himself. See? You could never help the pc in the vicinity of this other-determined valence.

You see what happens? Instantly, the pc is the loser. You find this, the pc's the loser. It's the winner.

So you find people – I mean, don't shudder at this because it applies to me, thee, everybody, and so forth – but you find people are most likely to get hung up and seize onto and keep and perpetuate valences which are totally against their best interests. They're other-determined valences. You see that?

They may look like terminals, and it may be all fine, but you'll find it's very difficult to move the person out of the track. Why is it difficult to move the person out of the track?

Because every time you hit them, they survive, the pc doesn't. So you see, you have at that instant of that section of the track, you see, that you hit this in an auditing session... We're not talking about what went on that gave us this mechanic, we're talking about in the session. You hit this thing – “Bulldozer,” see. All right. Bulldozer – terminal. You hit bulldozer. Bulldozer must survive, and it's all for bulldozer, and it must not be for pc, even though the bulldozer is the pc's terminal. We can call it that. But nevertheless, it's one of these other-determined valences, see.

So, my golly, the pc will just sit there and do everything he can possibly do to preserve that terminal. Bulldozer. You see, he'll build it up, and he'll fix it up, and he'll try to achieve its goals, and he'll follow its postulates. And wow, you know, there it goes. And you try to run this out, and at this instant of track when you find the pc, the pc is zero.

See, the pc has no force in this whatsoever. But bulldozer will attack the pc. So if bulldozer will attack the pc, why, he'll just keep attacking himself. And you'll find him trying to run this. The pc will do weird things. They get themselves all kinds of PTPs between sessions.

And they get themselves all mucked up, and they're having chronic present time – or present time problem of long duration maritally. And during the session, why, they'll go out and phone the marital partner two thousand miles away, you see, to – and start a hell of a fight. And it looks to you like they just got restimulated and they're just . . . No, no, no, no. See, they're in the middle of this terminal and this terminal makes a backfire against them, you see. And they'll just keep on making the terminal backfire against them, see. It's the darnedest thing you ever saw.

And yet the pc may hit one of these that's sufficiently strong to make him look totally pan-determined on the same basis I was just describing to you. Pc will get very reasonable about everything They get very reasonable about this terminal, see. They get very reasonable.

They say, “Well, that's not a bad thing. That's really a good thing, and so forth.” And well, a vestal virgin collector or something like this on the whole track, you see. And they'll say, “Well, that's very reasonable. And that's a lovely terminal. And I had a lot of fun doing that.” And they go on, “And it's a perfectly nice terminal. And isn't that fine?”

And you get whipped in about this. And you say, “Well, that terminal isn't very important, you see. It must be something else because the pc says so.” No, that isn't true at all. That's the terminal that defeats the pc. He's not pan-determined about that terminal at all. He's being totally other-determined about the terminal.

The terminal is all. The pc is nothing That's all it adds up to. Well, if it just stopped there, you'd be able to run it out easily. You'd be able to run it out very, very easily. But it doesn't stop there. You get into that area, the terminal attacks the pc. It's not just nothing It's less than nothing.

So you have this funny thing of man, the object and picture of man, trying to destroy himself. You have all of these odd phenomena that you continuously encounter of the self-destructive aspects and impulses of man.

You have a bunch of politicians sitting around a peace table, and they rig it all up so they're going to have another war in twenty-one years, see. Good heavens! I mean, why, the idiots, you know.

And you say, “Well, why did they do that?” Well, why did they do that? They were being very other-determined. That's all. And each one of those politicians was sitting there trying to figure it out so he and his country would be defeated.

Every once in a while in administrative activities, some staff member will blink and his jaw will drop. I will give him a piece of paper to sign – that somebody should sign, you see? Something's giving us trouble someplace or another. Something's going over the hills and far away, and give him a piece of paper to sign. I always take this chance because there's a possibility it'll happen, you see. And as a matter of fact, it's quite – the odds are in favor that it will work out this way, because this person is already doing something very destructive in attacking Scientology or something of the sort, and so forth.

So you sign up a confession you know, or sign up a note or sign up a document – write up, rather – document taking full responsibilities for this or that or the other thing. Just a suicidal legal document, you know. I'll write it up and give it to the attorney and . . . I don't give these to attorneys anymore. The attorney will sit there, and he'll be very other-determined about the whole thing, you know. How nobody would sign this and very unreasonable. It'd be very unfair to the person who's signing. Well, they're being very unfair to us, why not be unfair to them?

But the attorney couldn't possibly figure out this because it'd ruin all attorneying if this principle were broadly known. About eighty percent of their cases would just go *pfffft*. And you set it down in front of the person, and you say, “Sign it.”

And the person reads it over. “I hereby guarantee to pay \$1,750,000 damages and fully and freely confess that I burned the house down and . . .” – anything.

“Sign it!”

“Is that satisfactory?”

I don't know what the percentage is, but it's a very high percentage that whenever I've done that, the other person signs.

I only have trouble with our own attorneys. They're always trying to make a fight out of it, see. And they'll win the other person's case for them if you don't watch them. So you try to bypass them. Because the truth of the matter is that somebody who's so nonsurvival as to try some stupid, silly attack against us somehow or another, can usually be counted upon to be sufficiently nonsurvival they will also commit suicide from a legal viewpoint. And they do. It's amazing.

In other words, about sixty, seventy percent of the cases perhaps, that walk into court down here, the litigants involved, if either one of the litigants made up a document saying, “Well, I..” and you know, just made it terrible . . . You know, there's a 50-pound debt involved and if he'd – if somebody would just write up a judgment for 200 pounds at compound interest (you know, 50 pounds and a 150-pounds damages) and then with compound interest, and then a jail penalty or something in it, you see, and draw it all up in this totally vicious document, you see, and just give it to the other person to sign; the other person

– oh, yes, yes, they'd sign it. They know. They appreciate it because it's agin them. That's where they belong.

You see, the world operates on the basis that everybody defends himself and that everybody is on the kick of self-preservation. And this is not so. The people who are causing trouble in this world are not on a kick of selfpreservation. They're on a kick of succumb. And our biggest trouble is they look to an auditor, or they look to an organization, or they look to me, to be an executioner.

And we only get in serious trouble when we refuse to fill the role. That is quite amazing. You'll see this work out in your own activities, I am sure.

I think you – some of you have seen it work out in organizations and so on. But you're trying to be reasonable. This guy walks up and he says, “The organization is no good, and everybody in it ought to be killed and so forth. And you're in bad, you're bad people,” or saying something like this. Or he's going all around the neighborhood . . . He's usually not anything direct like that. He's usually going around the neighborhood saying, “That's really a communist organization,” you see, to all the shopkeepers or something like that.

And right away all your legal advice says you sue him for slander. No, you present him with a confession and an award of damages for having slandered. And just draw it up in a legal form and give it to him and he'll sign it, and you'll execute in court. And that's all there is to it. You don't sue him.

The guy has only one enemy. See, himself, exclusively. He just has one enemy. And he'll go on and fight until he finds a satisfactory succumb. You try to make a bargain with this fellow. You keep saying, “Well, all right. You pay \$200.” And your ordinary bargaining is, “All right. And you – all right. Well, you won't pay \$200? All right. Pay \$150. Oh, well, all right. You won't pay \$150, pay \$100.” See, you're trying to make a deal, see. Ah, that's the wrong direction.

You say to this person, “\$200.”

The person, “Oh, no, no, no.”

And you say, “Well, \$250? \$300?” You finally get it up to \$790, and that's how much he thinks he ought to cut his throat for. And he signs at that point.

This principle of other-determinism – I'm not driving it home to you as though we operate this way exclusively, and so forth. But if some guy goes on a psychotic spin and starts attacking the organizations or something of the sort, which happens rarely enough, our legal advice is normally and generally 100 percent wrong, because it's operating on the basis that those people are being self-determined. And if those other people that are attacking you are being other-determined, then they will not settle any reasonable deal that gives them a benefit.

You have to make a deal which is murderous to them. You just keep worsening the deal you make, you see, and they'll eventually square it up. That's how legal matters get hung up. Because this third state of mind is the one that gets in everybody's road – other-determined frame of mind, whether on a subject or as a general mental attitude. And that's the one that gets in your road in processing

You, the auditor, try to get easier and easier processes, less and less condemnatory, less and less damaging, lighter and lighter, lighter and lighter Prepcheck questions, trying to go through an area of other-determinism on the pc. And you'll find out, quite ordinarily, that when you start going in the lighter and lighter direction, you'll be less and less successful.

I have watched you on Prepchecking get lighter and lighter and feather touched and more feather touched and so forth. Less and less arduous Prepcheck questions, you see. You drift off of the violence of them.

Always go the opposite direction. This type of Prepcheck question doesn't work, well, we toughen it up and toughen it up and toughen it up and toughen it up and toughen it up, and *finally* we get the one that the pc is sure will make them lose adequately, to go through one of these other-determined valences. And they'll buy that one. You'll get tone arm action and everything else.

It's a sort of a bloody-minded frame of mind if you don't mind x saying so. You would just – you would be very interested how this works out. I don't mean that you have to shout at him louder and louder. That isn't what I'm saying. What you do is, you just give him rougher and rougher questions. Not lighter and lighter and easier and easier questions. Our ordinary summation of it would be that we'd make the questions lighter and lighter. And that isn't really the way it works when we're trying to push through this area.

I must tell you this because you'll be pushing pcs through other-determined valences rather consistently when you're running 3D Criss Cross, you see.

They've got an other-determined valence. You found it. It's in full view. And on that valence they will only buy suicidal-type processes. Quite fascinating. They will only do suicidal things in processing. Quite interesting.

I don't mean that they're trying to kill themselves, but they'll only buy things that look like they could have a good chance of knocking them off.

You tell them, “Well, this is terrible. This is an awful process. And I hate to have to run it on you because it is just too murderous.”

“Oh, well, all right.”

And they run like a dream, see.

And you say, “Now, we're having difficulty here. Therefore, we're going to have a very – we're going to do a very light process.” Bog. See? It doesn't fit the same frame of mind.

Pc has – well, let's see, “What have you – what have you done wrong? What do you consider you've done wrong? Well, you've . . .”

Pc tells you, “I occasionally look at people.”

And you don't get any tone arm motion at looking at people, so I ought to – just liable to go off into a spatter of question marks if I'm not getting anyplace with it. Just trying to set up a Zero question of some kind or another.

“Well, what do you do? Do you ever throw rocks at people? Throw rocks through windshields? Kick people? Stab people? Drag people down back alleys and slip a knife into them? Take them into basements and torture them to death? Some sort of a thing for which the police would arrest you instantly and come streaming in the door this moment? If the police did come streaming in the door at this moment, what would they be here to arrest you for?” And all of a sudden, they'll give you their – the chain.

Either on the basis of a protest, “Well, it's not that bad. It's just coercing women. I – it's – heh-heh. That's all I've done.” See, or something like that. It's either – it's a little less than what you said – you've exaggerated it and made it too much – or it's gotten awful enough and dangerous enough that it is self-destructive enough from their point of view that they will own up to it.

And then you have to operate all the time on half-truth, untruth. Every few questions, get that half-truth, untruth rudiment straight, because a person going in this state will overstate the case and try to destroy themselves.

I was giving a demonstration here one night when you saw somebody doing this when we were pushing him through a certain zone and area. And all of a sudden he was trying to make things blow, he said, remember, by admitting to more things or making it worse, making it sound worse, remember?

We were pushing through a certain valence zone or item attitude, see – you don't mind my mention of that? – a certain zone of thinkingness, you see. And it was actually an other-determined zone of thinkingness. And frankly, there isn't much profit in processing anything else, because self-determinism isn't particularly batty. And pan-determinism certainly isn't batty.

So this relegates you, really, to the processing of other-determined attitudes. Selfdestructive attitudes. It's the only thing that's giving the pc any trouble. That's what he's doing to himself. He's trying to destroy himself. And you're trying to help him out, to get him through an area where he's trying to destroy himself. And you're trying to help him through

this area where he is trying to destroy himself. And frankly it takes a bit of auditing. Because the pc will take almost anything you try to do for him and convert it into a motivator.

You say, “Well, good chap, take a moment's rest. End of session.” This is a screaming ARC break. Well, know what you're looking at. You ran into a zone of other-determinism.

Well, what is this other-determinism? Let's be very precise. I've shown you its application in processing. Now, let's take up this original proposition here again.

Well, other-determinism is a successful sacredity. It's a, “Shouldn't ought to attack.” And the person has finally agreed 100 percent that that valence or identity is something that shouldn't be attacked. And the common denominator, therefore, of other-determined valences from beginning to end, are valences with this conviction of, “Shouldn't attack.” They're sacred. They must be preserved.

Now, if you stop and do this mental exercise here for a minute or two – let's just think of this as a mental exercise – if you want to be perfectly safe in this society, what would you be? Let's think it over for a moment. If you want to be perfectly safe in this society, what would you be?

All right. Have you done that?

Audience: Yes.

All right. You have a sacred item. And if you look a little bit further, the item you just thought up, to some zone or area, is sacred to something Do you add that up? That make sense? See, that's how that first equation I gave you in this lecture works out.

Mustn't be attacked. Of course, that becomes a formidable other-determinism. It inevitably and always becomes an other-determinism and never becomes a self-determinism. Figure that one out.

How could it be a self-determinism? Try to figure out how it could be a self-determinism.

All right. Take this item that you might or might not have, but probably did, think of, you wanted to be. All right. Is that you? Is that really you? It isn't, so therefore it's an other-determinism, isn't it?

Now, you see what 3D Criss Cross is barreling at. To some degree then, *all* items in 3D Criss Cross are other-determinisms. Therefore, the Goals Problem Mass itself is an other-determinism and therefore is seeking to destroy the person who has it.

Sacredity. I think it's very amusing, if you like to laugh at funerals. I do myself. I do. The last funeral I saw in Kansas, I was perfectly willing. A dead wagon went by, you know, and it was one of these hearses, you know, with the great big plate glass side windows, you

know. You could see the coffin in there. Flowers all over it. And here came limousines after it, you know, one after the other, after the other, after the other. More and more limousines. And there were people crying and people sobbing in these limousines.

And when the dead wagon – the first one, came by, you see, the hearse came by, why, I pulled off to the side of the road, naturally, and I took off my hat. And all this was just automatic, you know, took off my hat. I sat there and watched this thing go by. And car by car my risibility started getting the better of me, you know. I thought here's this bird, he kicked off, you know, and they shoved this body full of embalming juice, and this bird is sailing around here someplace or another. He probably already picked up somebody in a maternity ward or something of the sort, and he's long gone, you know, and here's these birds left with this piece of MEST, you know. And they're crying and sobbing, you know, and they're filling it full of flowers and embalming fluid, and going to take it out to the graveyard and erect some stone over the top of it, you know. And . . . oh, what a ball, you know.

Car by car, the unreality of these people and their attitude and what they believed, and what I myself knew for a fact, you see, were so far apart that I'm afraid that by the time the last funeral car had passed, I was just doubled up with laughter. I just can't take funerals very seriously. I'm sorry. It's too silly.

I don't think there is a funeral anyplace around now, except maybe Ireland, where they have any thought for the guy. I think in Ireland they still throw the window up hastily so he can get out. I think they still do that in Ireland. But I don't know any other part of the world where they do that.

In China they're on a reverse. They have all kinds of firecrackers and pennants and sort of thing to drive off evil spirits. Start thinking that one over. I haven't been able to take funerals very seriously since that time. You would get the picture better if you really understood the seriousness of a funeral in the Bible Belt. Man, it is the most serious activity I have ever engaged upon in my life.

Sacredity. But what an interesting trap. You know, you're not supposed to speak evil of the dead? Did you ever hear that one? Oh? We're not supposed to as-is any dead? We're not supposed to attack any dead? Oh? What's that going to leave us with? Now where are we going to wind up? A bank stacked up with dead. You're not supposed to be mean to the sick. Oh, come off of it now.

If we're never mean to the sick and we're not supposed to communicate with the sick, we're going to wind up sick, man. Because we've set up a sickness sacredity.

You're not supposed to be mean to old people. Well, we got a new sacredity. There's a grand new way on how you get lots of old people in the bank, you see. And spirits and ghosts and that sort of thing, they're all bad. But there's a lot of saints around that you're supposed to

be able to talk to, but you mustn't ever be mean to. You mustn't ever say anything bad about. And you must be reverent toward. Well, that sure sets up an awful lot of interesting attitudes and sidepanels on the subject of spirits, doesn't it. Otherdetermined spirits so that a thetan can't even be himself anymore. He's going to – he's going to be an other-determined thetan. You know, that's getting – that's really getting someplace now.

And then we have the big thetan idea. The big thetan theory. And you're supposed to talk to him, but you can't talk to him, but he won't hear you because he punishes you, because you mustn't say anything bad to him, because if you do talk to him, well, you can't talk to him, and you're totally at his mercy. And then they wonder why they have people around in spinbins saying they're God after having set up the mechanism overtly and directly.

Well I don't say there is or isn't a big thetan. I'm sure you were pretty big at one time or another. There may still be some around that are pretty big. Maybe you're still that big, you know. Who knows? Hasn't anything to do with size anyhow.

And then we get – we get all sorts of these things, so these valences look very peculiar, but now what are valences made of? What are valences made of? Well, that's another story. And let it be enough to say that wherever you set up a sacredity, you set up a shouldn't-attack, and you also tend to set up a shouldn't-really-look-at, shouldn't-really-communicate-at – conditional communication, and so forth. And the rougher this gets, the more the other-determinedness gets in the item.

So it goes in direct proportion, that the *less you* should communicate *with* and the more *conditional* the communication, don't you see, why, the more other-determinism will result from the item.

And you can take any 3D Criss Cross item and simply analyze it on the basis of how should or shouldn't, or could or couldn't one attack it, and establish its level of sacredity.

And the most sacred item in the lot is going to give the pc – that is, the most sacred item in the lot *to* the pc is going to give the pc the most trouble in the bank. There you have a direct index, then, of how to select out a 3D Criss Cross item.

If you were to have twenty lines – this is a lot – with twenty oppters or forty items in all, and were to combine these things up into various packages and inspect them all and discuss them all with the pc from a viewpoint of how sacred each one was, at that point where the pc takes on a totally benign look, you can absolutely count that at that point you have hit your highest level of other-determinism and your most self-destructive point of the bank. The least the person should attack this thing, why, the most destructive this thing will be to his own self-determinism, don't you see? Because this thing is an overwhelm. We look at it as an overwhelm angle. The thing must intentionally be overwhelmed, you understand? It must have an overwhelmingness to the pc.

It's level of sacredity, in other words, see, attackability of this thing, the deification of mother and all of this kind of thing that you'll run into – there are all kinds of things, you see, on the backtrack. And at different periods they've had different values. So taking these things into account, you would have to shake the thing out; but you do have a direct index: that thing which would be the most sacred, the least attackable.

And also it must carry this condition: the least actual guaranteed communication with, you know, insecurity of communication must also have this point involved. And reach, of course, that's the least havingness, the least havingness, you see, the most uncertain communicatingness, the greatest level of sacredness, the most overwhelming aspect of, combined up into threat from – how dangerous is this thing to the individual? This also must be taken into consideration very definitely.

At first glance, you'd say well, it's anybody's friend, and therefore “friendship” would be the greatest enemy. No, that I'm afraid is not the case. You see what it is? Oh, yeah, you don't want to knock your friends off, that's for sure. But you can talk to your friends. So that rules that out. And your friends aren't trying to overwhelm you all the time. So that rules that out, see. Sacredity – up-on-the-pedestaledness. That sort of thing.

Now, that gives you the key to the Goals Problem Mass. Some of you hearing this are liable to think, “Well, it's only sacred items like gods and spirits and that sort of thing” oh, no, no, no, no, no.

Individuals worship in the most peculiar places. I am, of course, not unaware of this mechanism. And have never been totally unaware of this mechanism. That's why I make sure that you don't run up a bunch of O/W with regard to me and set it up so that you can communicate, you see, at the same time. So we don't want to get an overwhelm situation going, here. We set that up, but nevertheless some people are always – are going to come up straightaway, “Well, it must be Ron, you see.”

They do. I watch these analyses every once in a while. The guy to whom they could communicate the most easily, you see, and who would help them the most – that's *safe* to have as an overwhelm, you see. That's very safe to have as an overwhelm. See, it isn't a real overwhelm at all. Oh, no, no. This one, the person is *it* while *it* destroys *him*. Follow that? That's a lot further. That's several mile posts or light-years down the line from what I just said. You got it?

The person *is* it. He doesn't exist in this area. That beingness *is him*, and that beingness *is all*. And there ain't no “him” there. And every time “him” there starts to emerge in the slightest degree of self-determinism, he gets slapped back. That's the mechanism of the somatic and that is all a somatic is there doing. It slaps the guy back every time he puts his head up.

Now, you'll find the basic element in the bank which is the most sacred, you will find the pc being it and in that condition, and so you could separate this out rather easily. Follow me? Horrifying vista I have opened for you, haven't I?

Audience: Yes.

Horrifying. Absolutely horrifying.

Good enough. Well, take a ten-minute break and think it over.