

COMMUNICATION: A GRADIENT ON DUPLICATION

A lecture given on
15 December 1964

Aw, you just set out to please me, that's all. And just for fun, I am pleased. What—what's the date?

Audience: December 15th.

December the 15th, AD 14, AD 14 is fading away.

Today I had nothing to talk to you about at all. I just wanted to come out and see you. It's a fact. It's a fact. Been a lot of things happen, but I forgot my notes and bulletins and, laid out Level 0, laid out Level 0. We've now got Level 0 laid out and Level I laid out and we know the substances and the materials exist for II, III, IV and VI. They also exist for V but we're not teaching them.

I should probably introduce a little piece of news here. HAS has become an Academy course with a very strict curriculum as per HCOB, I think, 8 December. Now, that is good news because it gives a sliding scale of courses. But it also shoves the PE Course back down below 0 which is all right because it is usually taught at that temperature anyway. But it leaves the old PE just the same sort of mess—around PE it always was, and it probably needs some improvement and I've got a new design for the thing such as a written book that I've already talked to you about and so forth, and I will still go ahead and put that out.

One of the main reasons why the HAS became an Academy course was demand from minutes of national committees that were appointed to decide on pricing, all of which have now met and pricing is all finalized and no shocking new figures emerged.

A lot of things happened that would be of considerable interest to the franchise auditors. The main advance along this course line was brought about by the fact that in the US and some other places, they've apparently had a considerable amount of success in having a low—price Academy course which was the HQS, don't you see, and then bringing people on up into the upper course from there. Well now, the HQS is really just the old—time HPA. What actually happened—you can't teach an old—time HPA, you see, dirt cheap and still have it a quality course because you've got to have some Instructors and you've got to have some people paying attention to this thing. So it can't be just thrown away, otherwise you're going to ruin every auditor you've got, you see. So HQS, being the old—time Academy course of HCA/HPA, now when we move these on up the line, you'll remember that in an HPA/HCA you had yourself an awful time with Axioms and things of that character. All those

odd bits and pieces that everybody forgot until the last moment and gave you as extra reading and all those catastrophic occurrences and so forth, well, I just took up the whole kit and caboodle of those and shoved them into HAS so they're studied all by themselves. Do you see? So, HQS is a little bit of auditing, listen—style, with certain definite and finite results and it's all this odd bit theory work and so forth. It actually, done all by itself without the pressure of other things, is a fairly easy hill to climb; but what you found it a hard hill to climb is you had to sandwich it in amongst everything else.

Most Scientologists, when you get right down to it, have trouble with just that little section and area—just Axioms, and definitions and vocabulary and little things like that—and they miss something back there somewhere, so I'm just making it easier to grasp at that level.

But they wanted a course that somebody could buy a book and then they'd come in, you see, and have a course that didn't kill them that they could sell for a lower amount of money and so on, so the HAS course was all that was left to give them. And so there it was and that isn't terribly dear to teach and if it's taught pretty well, why, people come along very well; but that still puts PE still there and puts it below there and although I don't think Central Orgs will really go on teaching a lot of PE, PE is then relegated to a field, franchise—type course. And I'm still going ahead and write the book for it and that sort of thing, if I get around to it. We seem to be going downhill, not uphill, you see; but that's because things are so well trimmed up on the upper realm of this activity.

When you went all the way to the top, you see, why, then it was very easy to see what lay between it and the bottom. Now, the funny—the very funny thing, you stand down in the valley and you can't see the mountains for the trees and there's barns in the road and everything, and you don't get a very good view and you might think you're in the middle of a desert and you're not, don't you see. You might think you're in the middle of Maine and you're in Wisconsin, you know. But you get up to the top of the hill, why, you can take a look back across the countryside and see where all the little ripples and barns and trees and everything else are and that's essentially what has happened here.

And it's pretty easy to say where an auditor has to go and what his road has to be in order to make it through to the top, and I've just been dropping things like mad that are nonessential to that particular progress. But at the same time there's a danger in dropping too much and you get too much dropped out of the lineup and you leave some gap that somebody will fall into, so it's—hence the Gradation program is fixed up so that won't happen.

Now, some of you are going out of here and you're going to say to yourself, “Well now, I'm going to just do myself up royally and what I'm going to do is I'm going to get a lot of people and run them on R6 and I'm going to get them right up there, see, and boy, they're really going to sail.” And you're going to get one of these people by the scruff of the neck, you know, raw meat, and you're going to sit them down in the chair and you're going to say, “All right now, let's start on the first end word and that's absence and—and . . . “ which it is. And you're going to look at the meter and it's just going to sit there. And you'll chant this end word—I'll have a pity on your colds and sneezes and I wont chant it at you—but you'll chant it at this pc, see, and you'll say, “Blank, blank, and *wha, wha, wha,*” and your meter just sits

there and so forth and you're going to say, "What are you thinking about—what are you thinking about?" in desperation, you know.

And the pc is going to say, "Well, I wasn't, you know. I seldom do." And then you're going to find out that he has a perfectly open mind about it and perfectly willing to sit there while you work.

After you have done this a few times, why, you will say, "What did Ron say about a gradient for pcs?" And then you'll get sensible and you'll start them right in at the bottom and roll them on up toward the top because there's a certain number of things which a humanoid is going to have to be able to do to make it. And there are certain things which humanoids can't do very well, and until you get them so that they can make an orderly forward progress over these particular barriers and bumps, why, you're not going to be able to do anything with R6.

Now, you see you yourself as you get up toward the top of the barrel, and you've been through lots of processing and so on, you forget how much auditing you've had, and you tend to discount it, you know, and so forth, and you make an immediate comparison between yourself and this guy who is walking down the street bumping into the trees and fire hydrants, you know. And you say, "Well, I—all I have to do is take him from where I am, see, on up," only he's not where you are, you see, and that is the basic error.

So we want to get him up the line. You can rather rapidly. We're not talking about hundreds of thousands of hours, but it'll vary from case to case of course, because the various cases are in worse shape than others and this variability will pronounce itself and stick its neck out at the least expected intervals. For instance, you're going to find out as you are processing along, you're going to find this dear, nice old lady and you—snap, see, nothing to it, and you run your communication processes and mmmm—runs fair, gets a little tone arm action, and you jump her up along the line, you get her into duplication, well, it's fair but it's not too good, and then you get her into PTPs which is situated there at Level II and you find out she doesn't have any present time problems and got everything all solved, and you'll be starting to get a little bit desperate about this time—you suddenly realize this case has gone no place. And then you suddenly find you had the continuing overt case. You've got the one that almost has to be manhandled, you know. She's got it all solved because all she does is cut somebody's throat anytime she has a present time problem or something like this, you see.

You could still be prepared, don't you see, to be tripped up on your forward progress because of course, the unsolvable case, unless you can get them aside and corral their mad impulses to commit overt or something of the sort, is this person who is just going to be solidly dramatizing some overt. You probably never looked at it this way but you realize that most solutions to problems of a desperate nature are overt. People solve their desperate problems with overt. And if you've got somebody who has a lot of problems, you have somebody who is committing a lot of overt. That's why that pair belongs so intimately together there at II. You're not going to find somebody who has no problems at all. You're going to find a gradient that goes from—well, he has problems, perfectly normal, yeah, he's got problems down to his problems are absolutely desperate, oooh, oh my God! Nobody had

problems like these, don't you see, down to no problems at all. See? They're going downhill. It's the reverse order to the way the guy goes uphill, too.

And in other words, the fellow who has no problems at all is the one you should be worried about, because this person's got it all solved. He solves it with this great big overt every morning, don't you see? Has a perfectly quiet house now. He hits the baby on the head every morning, you know. And you'll run into the—you'll run into the case—you'll run into the case that doesn't have anything to improve. You wonder if—after a while you get curious as an auditor as to why this person is sitting in the pc's chair. You look at these goals that are set and they all seem to just be nothing and nowhere, nothing important and so on. You'll say to the person, "Well, what—what—what happens? I mean, wh—wh—why—why do you want auditing? Is there anything about you that you're trying to improve or anything like that?" Even though that's IV, you see, your curiosity will get the best of you. And the person will tell you quite surprisingly—this case is not infrequent, these cases, I give you some—just a vague idea, maybe one in thirty or something like that, "No, I—as a matter of fact, I'm perfect." Well, why is he being audited? If he's perfect, well, how come? You see?

Well, of course he has never confronted any frailty. You have to handle that case very delicately because if that case—that case is on this borderline: If at any moment that case found he was doing something wrong, that would give him the last little push of personal degradation necessary to tip him right over the cliff. See? If this person is down to such a point on service facts and all the rest of it—down to such a point that if this person admitted that there was one tiny error that he committed in his life, it would finish him. And when you see these psychiatrists ranting and raving around trying to get somebody to admit that they're guilty or something like that, you realize that they're dealing almost exclusively with the insane case, who can't admit, whose insanity is an Affirmation of an error. In other words, they're confirming this error all the time.

You ever see a little kid do this, see? He's just busted a glass, you know, or he's busted a little piece of glass or something like this, and you say, "Johnny, you shouldn't bust that glass." And he busts another piece of glass, you know, and then he just goes on busting more and more glass and you just seem to have nothing but strewn glass all over the place and so forth. He's trying to assert that it's right to break glass, don't you see? He feels to himself that if he admitted it was wrong to break glass, and if he himself realized that he was doing something wrong he would be finished. That would be the final degradation and there he would be on his way south with no parachute, you see. And therefore, a murderer, a repetitive murderer or something like this—I was listening to a copper yesterday on the subject of murder and it was quite entertaining how they've got it figured out. Murder is a familial crime, and therefore is really not a crime and it doesn't belong with the rest of crime and is its own particular thing which is entirely different and that's why they're passing a law against hanging people for murder in England. Well, go ahead, you try to follow it through.

Well, of course, if you're following it through, you're making the same mistake that everybody else makes when he tries to follow a pattern of aberrated logic; you can't turn that many corners too quick—because it isn't that quick because it isn't logical. That's simple. And of course it's a noncomprehensible piece of balderdash into which somebody has argued

himself and so forth. In other words, we have a guardian of the law arguing that murder is somehow not much of a crime and is right. But this boy, himself, was not arguing from his viewpoint, he was arguing from the Parliamentary viewpoint. He said this is what they think. And of course, he receives his reports all the time explaining what they think and so forth and so he's probably quite authoritative on the line. I thought that was very interesting—that murder is not a crime. It's usually a familial affair, and I don't know where they got their statistics. There're a lot of murder statistics they don't have, such as the fact that only 3 percent of the murders committed are ever proven guilty—anyone ever proven guilty is something like 3 percent. And I have even seen a figure adventured of what percentage of murders were detected. Now, that's just about the most adventurous figure to release I have ever heard of Imagine somebody releasing such a figure. What percentage of murders were detected!

Now, you get a society figuring that way, you get an individual figuring that way, see. And he's got it all figured out how something or other isn't a crime and yet it is a crime, and he does it and he gets the full recoil from it—all mental mechanisms are operating—and yet at the same time, he's got this thing totally suppressed because it's all right to do this, don't you see? It's all right to do this except it kills him to do it, don't you see. It's all mixed up one way or the other. You're going to be sitting there as an auditor looking at a case that's this snarled up along some particular line and you'll probably say, "Why didn't I take up some other line of activity," after a while of this because it can get very, very confusing. If you didn't have a pattern with which to track this case up along the line to sufficient responsibility to improve or any one of the cases I have mentioned—if you didn't have a series of steps to walk up, why, you'd just never get these cases up and that would be the end of that.

Now, the only trouble you've had as an auditor is actually not walking cases up those steps. When you didn't, when you—when you grabbed the guy on the fourth step when he was on the first step, then the pc was not on the same step you were on and therefore, you and the pc were in disagreement. His state of case and your estimate of the case were in conflict, and therefore to get any gain for that pc became impossible and you began to think that it was all unreal and auditing didn't work or something was weird was going on. Yes, the type of auditing you were doing, the type of approach you had to that case, yes, absolutely correct, wouldn't work.

It would work on the ease later, after the case had been pulled up to step three, but at the time that you were doing it on the case, then it's perfectly true to say that auditing wouldn't work on that ease if auditing means exactly what you were doing with the case. If the case isn't advancing, auditing isn't working. So the problem of how to make auditing work is the discovery of an orderly, generalized step that can be taken with any case that will bring them up to the next step where a generalized step can be taken with the case, don't you see. Look at the—look at the brain strain this saves you. After all, you don't want to strain your brains too much, because they ought to be—ought to be preserved carefully. A psychologist and So forth has got to have something to work with. And the strain which you would get into in this case is very horrible. Just "What do I do now?" you say, you know,

“What—what do I do now?” You see, very desperate. Case isn’t advancing and that sort of thing.

Well, what I’ve tried to do is give you a series of generalized steps that if you can get this case over this hurdle at this particular time—if you can get the case over the hurdle, why, then you can now approach the case with this next activity which will get the ease over that hurdle and now you’ve got the case there, and now you can get him over the next one without in actual fact costing you too much particularization.

Now, there’s one exception to this—the *Book of Case Remedies* is the totality of one step in actual fact, the second level, which is devoted to overts and present time problems and at that level the individual, being in better communication with the auditor, being in better communication with life, then is able to face up to some of these actions and you can take these actions and solve little things like hidden standards and so forth.

But the trick is how do you get him up to being run on the *Book of Remedies*? I know there’s some of those remedies apply all the way south, but in general how do you get him up to being worked on the *Book of Remedies*. Well, that’s a totality of a level you might say. Well, fortunately there are things which a thetan can do which are above his bank. In other words, a thetan is always really senior to his bank. He always is.

There are certain things on which a thetan would become aberrated whether he had a bank or not. The presence of the bank makes it difficult if not impossible for him to recover in the absence of auditing. And if he didn’t have a bank he would come out of it eventually. Do you—do you understand? If he didn’t have any bank at all, he wouldn’t then go into a permanent spin on this particular subject but would come out of it later. In other words, he’d walk in and out of aberrated conditions. He wouldn’t just become more and more and more and more aberrated. He wouldn’t be in a dwindling spiral because the bank is designed to give the person a dwindling spiral.

Now, the design of the bank is what makes the dwindling spiral, but of course a thetan has to be capable of supporting a bank and giving himself a dwindling spiral, too, don’t you see? But at the same time he’s gotten this worked in so much that you can say it’s a designed dwindling spiral from which he cannot recover. And that was beyond his basic planning. But there are certain things—there are certain things which a thetan would become aberrated about whether they are in the bank or not.

Let’s take a thetan who isn’t aberrated and let’s examine now what would happen to this individual, what would happen to him if he didn’t have a designed reactive mind. Of course the reactive mind is a total design. Now, what would happen to him? What would he become aberrated on? Well, he could determine to become totally aberrated and go into a dwindling spiral and spin in. He could determine to do this and he probably could make this stick with a great deal of ramification and so forth, mostly because he has done so in the past. We know for sure that he has that skill. But when we look at how complex and how calculated it must be—when we look this over and know the amount of trouble that he had to go to in order to get himself into this and also realize that he could not possibly have realized

how much trouble he was getting into—otherwise he would not now be trying to get out of it. Follow me?

So, he's also then capable of a miscalculation. He's capable of a miscalculation of how much trouble he can get into. See? I think that's quite fascinating. That's obviously one of his basic talents of getting into more trouble than he can foresee. And we look over several of these points and we can trace out just paralleling what he has done, regardless of the particularities and peculiarities of his peculiar, particular bank—we see then that he is capable of having these things happen, not necessarily done to him. But he's capable of having these things happen to himself. He's also capable of making things happen to himself. He's capable of setting up time, but he's also capable of setting up masses that suspend in time as the GPM and that hang timelessly.

When I first figured that out, I figured it out a little bit in reverse. The masses that are hanging up endlessly in time are the masses that create time. I think that's marvelous. But anyhow, that's figured out both ways from the middle, you see. Now, therefore a thetan is capable of a certain amount of aberration. But it's very difficult for him to aberrate himself to such a degree that he can't recover. And the only way he succeeds in doing this is blocking out duplication. That's the only way he can totally booby trap himself on a dwindling spiral.

Now, that probably, you think, requires just a little bit of amplification, and yes, it certainly does because it was a considerable discovery when made. You can't brush it off lightly with a sentence. But it goes back into our Axioms on "as—isness." Those Axioms are all senior to the reactive bank. And it goes back to "as—isness" and of course, that which a thetan cannot as—is is going to endure. You get it? If he can't look it over and erase it by inspection, it's going to last forever. If he's totally unwilling to erase it, it would last forever; and also the only way he can erase it is by being willing to duplicate it. Do you follow? You have to make a perfect duplicate in the spot where it is. That's demonstrable. So, he has to be able to duplicate it.

In other words, you'll just get madder and madder and madder at somebody that you're unwilling to be like. Let's take it at that mild state. You're unwilling to be like this person so you're just going to be madder and madder and madder at this person, you see, and more and more stand—offish and this person will eventually disappear; but not because he's gone, but because you can't see him anymore. You follow that? In other words, erasure or knocking something out or making something cease to exist depends then on duplication—a willingness to duplicate it.

So a thetan can become unwilling to duplicate something and cause it to endure. And now we're dealing with native thetan ability. This he can do with malice aforethought, but apparently it's quite natural for the beast to do this. He's quite happy to do this. He likes to have things like bricks so all he's got to do to have a brick is say, "I'll never be a brick,"—there's bricks, do you see? He's got modus operandi by which he proceeds, do you see? You therefore have a universe.

Well, a thetan is nothing and he's unwilling to be something in terms of mass, so therefore of course, he then gets an endurance of masses. It's the trick by which he makes

mass endure. But he can be caught in this trick. And the way he caught himself—it took this amount of action to catch himself—is he made up a bank which told him what he should be willing to duplicate and what he shouldn't be willing to duplicate. And he made that bank up in two halves: He made it with the cowboys in the white hats, which he must be willing to duplicate; and the cowboys with the black hats that he must [not] be willing to duplicate. And therefore, you would find all the cowboys in the white hats duplicatable and thus disappearing, and all the cowboys in the black hats becoming more and more real and solid. And I frankly don't think a thetan ever figured this out at the beginning, because he's for sure going to go on a dwindling spiral, and it depends on this one factor of duplication.

Now, the gradient scale that leads to duplication is communication. Communication is a gradient scale toward duplication. I know you think it might work the other way to and sure it does, but you might not be willing to duplicate—well, let's say a bum on skid row, but you would say, "Here, my man, here's a quarter," or something like that, you see. You'd communicate to that degree.

In the process of communication you might also get over, without obsessively duplicating him, the obsession not to duplicate him. And so then feel perfectly comfortable about talking to a bum on skid row. Do you understand? You can talk to a bum on skid row without being afraid of becoming a bum on skid row. Well, that's done by communication. Not only do you knock out the nonduplication, see, by mere communication you not only knock out this ferocity of "don't ever be that," see, but also knock out the "don't ever be that," see. Both sides of that thing can get knocked out and you suddenly find yourself able to talk to bums on skid row without feeling like a bum. You follow this?

So, obviously then the thing in the bank which is the rough, rough, rough point is duplication, willingness to—unwillingness to. That's the rough point of the bank. And the gradient scale to that is communication because that's cause—distance—effect with duplication and intention. Now, because it's a broader formula, you can take part of that formula called communication and oddly enough by practicing it, knock the duplication factor back into some kind of shape. You might not knock it into a totality so the bum on skid row disappears simply because you're making a perfect duplicate where he is, because that's not part of the intention. Do you see? But you'll knock it out to a point of where whenever you even vaguely come near a bum on skid row you don't have to say to yourself, "Oh, I must never become a bum on skid row, I must never become a bum—*oooh*, I'm never, never, never..." See? By the process of communication with this bum, that "I must never," you see, gets knocked out and one no longer is upset about becoming him or not becoming him, do you see? And so therefore, he can talk to bums on skid row. That's it, blah.

Now, the fellow says, "I'm never going to be in an automobile accident," I'm telling you now why your assist works. We're right at that level of action, but it actually is a much more subtly pervasive process than we ever imagined. It goes all the way—such a thing as a Touch Assist or communication with the object and so forth, that's terrific stuff—very powerful and that doesn't always work because the guy doesn't always get flattened on it, you know. It might be a lot longer than you would ordinarily think in starting a process. You say, "Well, I'm going to audit him for fifteen minutes and his gout ought to disappear," you see.

Well, if you said, “I’m going to audit him for a hundred and fifty hours and his gout would disappear,” you might have made it, you see. And just how much does it take?

All right, we—let’s get this person and he says, “Ohh, I never want to be in an automobile accident. Ooooh! Horrible—blood all over the place,” you know. “Don’t want to be anywhere near an automobile accident.” Next thing you know, he’s driving down the road and the steering wheel just apparently all by itself turns around and runs him into a tree. Well, what has to happen in order for that to happen? He’s gotten to a point where he can’t duplicate a car, so therefore he can’t communicate to a car, so obviously he can’t control a car. So, we get, that which you resist you become. We could rephrase that. That’s perfectly true as it is, but we could also make a more fundamental observation of. that which we’re unwilling to duplicate will persist and eventually overwhelm.

And the road out is not to go around obsessively duplicating it as the young—young actor does. He says, “I’ve got to live all parts of life in order to be a good boy in life. I’ve got to be a good actor, I’ve got to live all parts . . .” You’ve seen artists go this route. “I’ve got to make a bum out of myself, let’s see, I’ve got it on my schedule here. I’ve got to become a pervert, a dope addict and so forth. . .” In other words, “I’ve got to live!” exclamation point, you see. “I’ve got to experience!” Well, I’ve already gone this whole study, I’ve looked this whole study over, gone right down the line on studying it very carefully and I find out that the single action of experience is nontherapeutic. That’s a fascinating thing. Experiencing something is not therapeutic.

There is something, however, which is and that’s communicating with it. Guy’s worried about becoming an alcoholic, he doesn’t have to drink and experience alcoholism to get himself out of it. No, he’ll more likely go the route and he’ll wind up down there with Alcoholics Anonymous, you know, embezzling their treasury or something. No, the thing to do—the thing to do if he’s got this and so forth, well, he actually could communicate in some fashion and with something with relationship to this subject and all of a sudden that duplication factor would click out. See, the refusal to duplicate would click out by the process of communicating. So, that opens the door to a lot of think, you see.

You can figure a case out here very nicely. You want to get a case over some kind of an obsession or something like that, well set this alcoholic down. Give him a bottle. Give him a glass. Now, what he mustn’t do is experience it, see. That’s what—that’s the only thing you as an auditor have got to make sure he doesn’t do. It’s nontherapeutic. But communication, yes, he’s got to communicate with it, and you just run Reach and Withdraw from the bottle, from the glass. Get photographs of alcoholics on skid row or something of the sort and have him reach and withdraw from the photographs. Anything you want to do, any way you could figure it out and the guy all of a sudden would not be able to become an alcoholic if he worked at it.

That’s what I mean by it’s very hard to hold a psychosis or neurosis in place. Well, that makes sense if you realize that the simple communication will unbalance it and knock it out. But what does it knock out? It knocks out the ferocity that one isn’t going to duplicate. The “Oh, my God, I would never be a psychiatrist. *No! Never, never, never* be a psychiatrist.

They're a bunch of dogs, bums." See? Watch it! There he is down there at the registrar's office at the local university signing himself up. "Well, I guess I'd better take this course. Next twelve years, I'll be studying away—I don't like it—don't seem to have any aptitude for it, but I gotta be it." Do you see what's happening.

It's very interesting. There's a very, very, very notable personality in the world today, a very notable, newly ushered upon the stage of politics and nations who has a 48—hour comm lag on won't—got to. Knowing that, you could destroy that man just like snapping your fingers. He's a near nut. He's only got a 48—hour comm lag between saying, "I will not under any *circumstances . . .*" to doing it. And he's got a tremendous number of these "I will not under any circumstances. . ." And if you very carefully examine the record, you'll find out that the comm lag is about averaging 48 hours. Sometimes it's more, sometimes it's less. I think that's fascinating. It's the wildest thing you ever saw—48—hour comm lag! Of course, forgive him, he knows not what he does and he's just a humanoid. But I don't think he should be that pig—brained. He never notices this about himself '*I will not under any circumstances increase the bank rate.*' "Increase the bank rate!" "*I wont have anything to do with the multilateral force.*" "US we're with you."

Why can you detect it on this man? If you followed it very closely and you knew these mechanisms, how could you detect it? Well, he just happens to be in the public presence. He just happens to be a humanoid and he's so much in the public presence and he happens at the moment to be in a lot of trouble that it would take a superman to figure out. You'd have to be at least Level 0 to figure him out. He's spectacular, you see, merely because the spotlight's on him. How many people are like this? See, he's not single and solitary and alone.

So you have to watch this very carefully and wherever you see these, "I will not" and "They shall not" and you see that bird up in that pulpit, you know, and boy, he's talking about *hellfire* and damnation. He's talking about sin and he talking about, *whoooooo*. Watch him, brother, watch him. Don't be caught alone in that vestry, you girls. Or you boys. He's agin it and he's saying at that moment, "I refuse to duplicate it." He's immediately forecasting this: That he's not going to observe it or its consequences in a very short space of time. It's going to sort of cease to exist. It's "Where was it? Why was I so angry about it yesterday? I'm it!" Don't you see? It's horrible to behold.

I didn't mean to enter English politics that violently, but I don't think that I have entered it any more briefly than he has. I usually abstain from politics, and he should have. But there's what you tune your observation up to. I've shown it to you out in the public sphere. You can watch this. It would be a good stunt to go back and look in the papers of just the last few weeks and find the "I will nots," followed by the more or less, 48—hour lag. Fascinating! Well, you look at your pcs.

Now, a registrar is probably used to this mechanism, probably has never figured it out—the guy who comes in and says, "I will never under any circumstances ever be processed by this organization because you've got nothing but bums, tramps and boobs for auditors and you people are terrible and you're awful," and so forth, and then the following week have him come in and sign up. And I'm sure that registrars have noticed that, but it happened every now

and then. All you had to do is make the guy a little more vehement and it would happen the next day, not next week! Do you follow this? Which he is—of course, by doing such a thing would make a bit of a mess for a staff auditor. It isn't really very orthodox selling.

But here's—here's the point: It's this duplication factor that is the bug in the ease and the reactive bank says that 50 percent of existence must be shunned. There's some communication mentioned in it but it's mostly just, "not have nothing whatsoever to do with it nohow." And the other 50 percent is "love it," "gotta be it," "cherish it," so, of course, the universe will eventually become the 50 percent you mustn't have anything to do with and then would become quite unreal and would be all around you. And that practically is the only secret there is of life.

If you feel you have to experience something in order to prove that you can duplicate it, of course, you're really not going on any gradient that anybody can attack and you simply collapse terminals with it—bang! Don't you see? "Well all right I've often said, 'I was never going to be operated on,' but they say the operation is necessary—all right, cut my guts out." See! See, that's sort of communicating without communicating, you know. That's not communicating—so how are you going to hold anything off if you can't communicate with it? And the things which bother you in your bank as you wake up in the dark and miserable hours with the wind howling outside, is something you mustn't be or have anything to do with. And of course, if it's something you mustn't be and have anything to do with, of course, what is there up there that keeps it from falling in on you? What's going to hold it out there? There isn't anything there to hold it. It's like trying to hold a small boat away from the side of a ship with no boathook. You say, "Well, I must never use a boathook and I must never touch a rope." Why is it that every wave that comes along smashes the cutter against the side of the ship? "I must never use a boathook. I must never use a rope." *Smash!* "Ohhhh, I don't know how to get out of this problem. Mustn't ever use a life preserver either because I would be communicating with that ship. Well, how do I solve it then?" Well, of course, there is no way to solve it then because you have already said that the two or three available solutions mustn't be employed. It's like saying to somebody, "It's perfectly all right for you to work with mathematics so long as you never use arithmetic or formulas." He might work with mathematics without arithmetic, but you certainly couldn't work with it without formulas. Well, let's throw away arithmetic and formulas and then set ourselves the problem of working now with mathematics. Well, it can't be done.

Let's say, "Well, I've got to gain weight, but I mustn't have anything to do with any food or use any other means of adding mass to the body. Why don't I gain weight?" You see, it's as silly as this. It has to be that kind of idiocy and that is the basic idiocy of a thetan. He's laid out a bank 50 percent of which says he mustn't duplicate it. The other 50 percent, that's fine to duplicate it if he can get there. Yes, but if he can duplicate the 50 percent of it, it's not very aberrative is it. And furthermore it will tend to weaken as time goes on and be less and less forbidding. Ah, then that remains the only part of the bank which is really tough even though the good cowboys in the white hats are all there, too—cowboys in the white hats are missing their hats and pistols and chaps and left feet, you know, by this time. No those—those

cowboys in the black hats are getting bigger and bigger and bigger and tougher and tougher and tougher and tougher and there's nothing to hold them off with—nonduplication.

Communication—communication, therefore, is the key which unlocks duplication. Duplication itself as a practice is a very steep gradient as you've found it from time to time, that also has some workability. You practically can't do any duplication on somebody without having something happen to his case. He doesn't even respond or cognite or anything else but maybe—but something happens. Now duplication could also have a scale. It's almost impossible to divorce duplication, unless we say experience, from communication. You could be inside of something experiencing it without communicating with it, pulling in all different—trying not to communicate with it while experiencing it, you get the idea. But you could just have a pc lay down a piece of chalk as a duplicative action, and eventually he'd get the idea he was doing that. The funny part of it is it's liable to be totally over his head the whole way. But still something happened to him by reason of doing that, do you understand? Might be not detectable—be detectable by him nor immediately detectable by you, but something would happen.

You—there are gradients then in the field of duplication itself I don't want to tell you there are not because there are gradients. There's duplicating something a little and duplicating something a lot, you know. There's making drawings on a piece of paper to represent something. If you want to make a little kid come up the line, use drawing—not hobby therapy now, don't everybody misinterpret this—it's not what they do, it's what accidentally happens sometime in hobby therapy that makes it suddenly get a gain and they look at these isolated unexplained gains and then they haven't bothered to find out what in hobby therapy—drawing or weaving or basket making or something like that or modeling—what in that, you see, gives us a resurgence. Nobody ever bothered to investigate it. They just said, “Well, you—we've got it all explained, it keeps the guy out of mischief,” something like that, some brushoff. But there was something there. Those hobby therapies which work are those hobby therapies which serve as duplication exercises, only they must be pretty remote.

If we took a little boy who was having a hard time in school and simply had him draw for us and explain what he was drawing—don't even—you understand—don't even tell him what to draw, see. Say, “Draw something and tell me what it is.” This is the game, you see? “Draw something, tell me what it is. Draw something, tell me what it is.” Let him draw something else. He starts to come right on up scale. He'll eventually bother you to death. Every evening, why, he comes in and he wants to draw you something to tell you what it is. Well, that is an effort, see, to remotely duplicate something and all you have to do is encourage this effort. I don't care how sloppily you do it or not.

Now, of course, you could directionalize what he was supposed to draw. You see that—we're getting steeper, see, that's steeper up, a little—little bit higher. “Now, let's see. Draw what you don't like about school.” Got the idea? Ah, it's good and steep. But the funny part of it is he would eventually come up to being able to do that, see. “Now, let's make a school in three dimensions,” see, duplication as such, see. Well, of course, the end product is, “All right, take a glance at school. As—is it. Thank you very much.” Wouldn't be appreciated by the state, but it would be by the politicians who make their votes through contractors. The

point here is that you could follow along a line of duplication. It wouldn't necessarily be fruitful because it would be too difficult here and there to assess where the gradients were; but it would not be—it's not a barred route, you see. It's a perfectly acceptable route. It's just that to take somebody all the way along this particular line, he's liable to fall over these too—steep—a gradient here or there and interrupt his forward progress—bang! You know, and then he doesn't want anything to do with that and he doesn't want anything to do with you and he doesn't want anything to do with drawing, don't you see, because he'll come off of it awfully quick because it's already steep. In other words, he could have a failure on it that would throw him all the way back.

Now, you could, however, approach the whole thing the whole way on the single factor of communication that wouldn't be a steep gradient. In fact, it would be so unsteep that occasionally you'd wonder if he was getting anyplace, but he would be getting someplace. Now, communication as a word is in the reactive bank, to make my earlier point. It's part of the reactive bank, but that is not what makes it therapeutic or not therapeutic. That it also is part of the reactive bank has no bearing on it because in the reactive bank it has equal value with a tremendous number of other things.

But in actual fact, a native thetan has this as one of the top points of his makeup. See, it doesn't matter that a lot of the things which you have in Scientology are in the bank. They are *also* in the bank and with what glee your pc will suddenly discover some end word like “communication” or “music” or something, see. He'll say, “Oh, wow, is that why?” and so forth, and clear up on the situation and everything will be fine, you see, and they'll feel much better—or “understanding,” you see. “Gawd, that's obviously. . .” All these various—these things are in the bank, but they also come under the heading of something that would get wrong with a thetan whether he had a bank or not. They could get right with him; they could get wrong with him. Do you understand? So, if you took his whole bank away he could still get into a mess, but the difference is unless he had created a brand—new bank and had weighted it in some peculiar way and had gone around and then forgotten what he was doing some other way and then pretended he was somebody else, you see, messed himself up. He just had to work on it for weeks, months, years, not unconsciously you know, but knowingly. “Now, let's see, I am going to wreck myself Now, let's see, how do I go about this?” No, if he wasn't that interested, having now experienced being wrecked, I don't think he'd be that enthusiastic.

Now, as he comes along this line then, he's going to—in the process of livingness, he's going to hit some slump spots, see? He's going to hit some dips. And those will be centered around communication and duplication, making things, unmaking things, you see, persistence, any value that time might be, you see, any value there is to experience on a track. See. He'll do all these things anyhow. He'll make up pictures of things and unmake them and so on. And he'll go in and out and upside down and around and coast along in life in other words. But he's going to have a certain aberratable pattern that isn't particularized or planned anyway. He'll be able to go out here one day and he's looking at something and he says, “Oh,” he says, “what a beautiful—what a beautiful red flower that is down on that planet there. Isn't that a beautiful red flower.” And he looks a little bit closer and it's a burning

school and all the kids are burning alive in it. “Oh,” he says, “that sort of thing shouldn’t go on.” Well, of course, he’s denied himself and denied his observation, hasn’t he? And he says that sort of thing shouldn’t have gone on, don’t you see. He may make a hobby of it for awhile, going around fireproofing schools or something you know. And everybody—all his friends think he’s a little rocky, you know. They think, “Er—what—er dududu, instead of him sitting around here playing *yup—yup* with us, he’s around fireproofing schools. Gone.” But he’ll get tired of the game and he looks over this span of time he’s been fireproofing schools and he goes back and he sights this lock originally and he decides it’s not very important and the whole thing as—ises and doesn’t stay suspended in time and that’s the end of that aberration. And that’s all the processing it would have. It would have to be locked into an endless amount of time on the track which would have to be pushed into a tremendous amount of reactive bank, you see, for him to be in a state where he couldn’t approach it and as—is it.

Now therefore, you do have however, certain factors with which you are working in a person regardless of what is in restimulation and regardless of what the experiential track of that person has been. It’s been my job to isolate what those were, so then you’d get a uniform case advance. communication—that is one of your first and foremost leaders. Marvelous! Because it knocks out refusals to duplicate. If you ran it long enough and put down all the pc’s thoughts and cognitions, you would find a great many of them add up to refusals to duplicate. In other words, that’s what’s running off the case. His cognitions consist of, “You know I said—just said I would never be a fireman, now, I wonder why,” you know. If you—if he was running and you had a record of everything he thought, these nonduplication decisions would go off along with his communication actions.

Now, how is it that you can take somebody then who can’t drive a car and you ask him to touch the fenders and touch the wheel and touch the top of the car and touch the back end of the car, you see, and touch the pedals and touch the motor and touch the switches and touch the knobs and touch the seat and touch the wheel and you go on and work on it. The trouble with you is you don’t give it enough seniority as a process so you’re liable not to do it long enough, don’t you see. Or not liable to do it often enough or liable not to do it in regular session or something of the sort—scant it, you see. And then marvel of marvels, we find this guy really, my, he’s quite a rocket jockey, he couldn’t drive and now, man, can he drive, you know. If you carried it out to its fullest extent because you would have knocked out his unwillingnesses to have been wrecked or his unwillingnesses to be carried or some such unwillingness would have gotten knocked out in the process of your Reach and Withdraw. See. That’s why you take a pc and run him for a little while and on 8—C, something like this. It’s—well, obviously that’s very steep because you’re asking him to communicate with MEST and that is the one thing he will not be. See. He won’t be—really doesn’t want to be solid, so you’re making him communicate with a solid and MEST and he doesn’t want anything to do with that; and he doesn’t want to duplicate anyhow and the commands are duplicative. So between those two it really catches him in a cross—fire and it makes quite a process and that’s why you get such results with it when it’s run with some intelligence.

Now, therefore—therefore, communication is the keynote of a case and it’s what you monitor a case by and it’s what you try to solve first, not only with regard to levels but at the

beginning of every session. You've got to realize that just because you've got the guy past Level 0, you haven't gotten rid of his reactive bank. No, it is still sitting there, man. And you haven't gotten rid of his peculiarities as a native thetan and you never will, which is the fact that he can communicate and he can create and he can do these sort of things. He has certain abilities, don't you see? And he also has the ability to say he won't duplicate things.

And so, just because you got him by Level 0 is no reason why this problem ceases. You very often at Level IV will find yourself sitting down at the beginning of session with a pc who is out of communication with you and with the universe and with the room and with the meter and everything else and you just can't get any place. You say, "He was perfectly all right yesterday, now, what the dickens is this all about?" Well, a clever auditor always reestablishes the pc's communication where it ought to be before he does and goes on with something else.

I see a pc sitting there in a sort of an abstracted cross-eyed fashion and I don't go on running yesterday's representation. I want to know why this pc is not in communication. That is my burning question and that is what I set out to solve. And I solve it on the basis of just finding out what's going on. Now, we can call this, he's got a PTP, you see, he's committed an overt, he's got a withhold from me, he's done this. We know these key points. But notice that these are all points—an overt is a—usually a regretted communication. A PTP is a partial and thereafter refused communication. He communicated a little bit and then he found out he couldn't go on any further; he couldn't get a solution to this thing, don't you see. So much so that if you ask somebody who has a present time problem, "Well, what communications are incomplete with regard to this problem?" and he says, "*Brrrrmp, brrump, brrump*" and it won't even register on the meter. Well, it's very magical. See, communication is woof and warp of this PT problem. A withhold is of course just an unwillingness to communicate. Now communicating with an unwillingness to communicate, if half done, creates a problem so you get a missed withhold. You see, you partially communicated with an unwillingness to communicate without carrying it all the way through and of course you found yourself having a little bit of trouble here, which you in this case brought out, but you get the person's withhold and you do these various things, you straighten these cases out. You find out there's something—now let's get a broader look.

They've got a PTP because they were unwilling to duplicate something. So you could run it this way: "Well, who'd you meet since I audited you last you didn't like?" or "What situation occurred that you didn't want anything to do with?" This would be very un—ungradient, but it's with a thud, you see. "Who'd you run into you wouldn't duplicate for nothing." And you're liable to get right back in the teeth from the pc, "My old man, I got a letter from him and *errrrrrrr*." Boy, that was fast but also very ungradient because he's quite—being quite misemotional about it so you must have approached it too rapidly to get it to blow easily because he's experiencing something; you want him to communicate with something.

So if you're too clever for your own britches, this sort of thing can happen. You can throw the pc into it with no gradient of communication with it. That's about the only mistake that an auditor can make—throw somebody into his bank. Now, how does he go about that?

He just finds a no—duplication decision, and no gradient of communication with that and *poweee* the guy interiorizes into that very point and you occasionally, you—as an auditor you’ve probably seen this happen. And it may have happened to you. You all of a sudden were saying, “I don’t know if we should continue this list. Something tells me that we are off on the wrong steer here . . .” *Bow!* There you went. The auditor asked that one more question, “Well, just give me a few more before we end it off,” you know or something—something happened there, you see. *You found yourself* in communication *with something which you figured you better not communicate with any further* and then there was a bit of an insistence, a persuasion and of course, with modern processes this is all very *easy—bluhh*, in he went, head over heels into the asphalt, nothing showing but wing—foot on his heels and he isn’t flying! That’s—that was the end of him and he bails out gradually and you straighten him out gradually and somebody runs overts off against that particular auditor because, of course, that mechanism works out too. If he got an overt then he had to have it, didn’t he, from somebody, so he’s got his motivator. It’s all very complex, what happens is—but in actual fact is—it was just too steep a duplication when a nonduplication decision existed.

All of that is complicated by the fact that there is a reactive bank and you can throw him, also, into the GPMs and end words of duplication and communication and also they have their negatives. All of which is very interesting because you could not only—he’s not only natively aberrated—aberratable in this way, but there’s also a whole, great, big, man—sized bank that’s got those very words to booby—trap him in. So that if he ran for a while any pc that’s run on “*What would you be willing to communicate with?*” has run through some portion of the reactive bank. It hasn’t killed him, but there it is. He would inevitably go into some quarter of the reactive bank. All of which I find very interesting because as long as we process this ... At first I looked at it with considerable horror. I said, “Oh, no! Oh, my God! We’ve been running people up against the reactive bank.” Yeah, in some instances many—some of the words we’ve used have had to do with the reactive bank; but on the other side of the picture, a further study on the thing would have delineated which of these words were also capable of becoming aberrated, bank or no bank. And it happens that communication and duplication are there.

Now, therefore, as you look over the scene of auditing a pc, you’ve got a destimulative factor. You’re putting him more thoroughly in communication with his bank without throwing him into it. In other words, he communicates it without experiencing it. Sometime if you run a pc through an end word or into a new series, let’s say it was—let’s say it was “roofs,” in view of the fact that isn’t in the bank, and he instantly arched himself on a 45 degree angle and lay out flat and a pattern of shingles appeared on his back, you could assume that he was dramatizing the end word. And you could also assume instantly that there hadn’t been enough of a communication gradient there.

In other words, if you skipped the communication, you’re going to get the obsessive duplication—Crack! Crack! Don’t you see. If you don’t sneak up on it with some comm, why, it’ll experience and that’s when a pc dramatizes in session or dramatizes in life and so forth, immediately after being audited. It isn’t necessarily true the auditing threw him into that particular dramatization, because he might have been doing it for a long time; but as a general

thing if he ran into a dramatization he ordinarily didn't do, then what happened was: is without a gradient, without—without sneaking up on it with some communication, the auditor simply had picked him up, threw him around in a couple of circles and threw him straight into the bank, thud! And there he was. You see?

Now, you could—you could develop a process that would do this to a pc and it's a very, very good thing to know that a process could exist that would do this to a pc because it puts it in your hands as something that doesn't happen accidentally. For instance, the Egyptian had the right idea with doctors. Any doctor had the right to cure or kill, see, because they were going to run both sides of the bank, you see. It isn't that you should run people in this particular direction, but you should know the process that would. And you've had one process for a very, very long time—"What wouldn't you mind going out of ARC with?" And that—the pc will run that and so forth. Now, the other process, the most direct one—the most direct one is, "What don't you like?" "Good. Duplicate it." Well, that'd be good. That'd work on some pcs. Also, oddly enough, it would work therapeutically on some pcs.

"All right. Now, what have you decided not to be in life? All right, thank you very much. All right, I notice, however, that although you have decided not to be an entomologist you have a couple of hairs that you grow up here as antennae." That would do it too, you see. Prove to the guy conclusively that he is now duplicating something he said he would never duplicate. Be another process—you have to be careful of some of these Scientology process—approaches to that because you see that really isn't a Scientology approach—that'd be a psychiatric approach. "You say you never wanted to be a bug, what are you doing with antennae?" You know. I mean that'd ...

The Scientology approaches are hard to think of because they might work. See, you might get an as—is, such as—such as this: "All right. Decide not to duplicate anything. Thank you very much. Decide not to duplicate anything. Thank you very much. Decide not to duplicate anything. Thank you very much." It'd spin some people and put some people in their banks and make them dramatize like crazy but at the same time on some others it just might as—is a bunch of decisions not to duplicate and the guy would get well, so that wouldn't be a safe process for psychiatry. You get the idea?

Then demanding that the pc experience, or demanding that he decide not to duplicate, such as scolding punishment—all that comes under the same heading you see, "You mustn't do that again," you know, "Don't duplicate it"—it's synonymous. All of that dramatization would occur. In other words, if you—if you forced a fellow by scolding and so on, to promise he would never under any circumstances something or other, something or other, something or other, why then you are actually running a nonduplication on him, you see. So, the less an auditor evaluates for the pc and so forth, why, that's pretty bad. Funny part of it is an auditor sometimes has to do this. "You just take one more drink while I'm processing you, buster, I'm going to bust your skull. Is that understood?" Well, he isn't being very original because if the pc is sinning by drinking before every session, you know you're not going to get anyplace with the pc and we know the pc must have been a souse anyhow and that he must have been told ten thousand times this, so if you tell him one more time, what does it matter? Do you follow? But it's still heading him in the direction of nonduplication.

Perhaps the problem would get so much in your road that you decide without any further gradient to process that thing which is getting in your road as an auditor, when it's that magnitude and that messed up. Sometimes you win at this and this makes you stupidly brave. The next time you don't win. You get some guy that can't talk to you as an auditor and you force him to run some way—up process—”All right, let's make a list of the bad habits you've got. Now, we're going to get you over these bad habits because they're getting in the road of my auditing you.” They'd get in the road, that's for sure.

So the solvent of nonduplication is communication. And therefore, as you're bringing a pc on up the scale you are on very, very safe ground if you improve his ability to communicate with you, with his environment. You could even go on a little shallower gradient. You could say communicate with you, with the auditing room, with his current environment in life, communicate with his bank, communicate with people, their activities. You could figure out an expanding line of communication which would all carry with it a certain unwillingness to duplicate, you see, and wash it out as you went. Therefore, he'd become more relaxed. He'd become less and less nervous and he would of course be easier and easier to audit, wouldn't he? And you'd eventually bring him up to a point of communication where he was frankly doing quite all right and then you could run something toward his bank.

But do you understand the reason you couldn't run him all the way through Clear to OT with such processes of merely increasing his communication, even though it is the top solvent that sits above a bank, is because of the complexity of the bank itself He's sooner or later going to run into some fringe or corner of this bank and you're going to have to pay some attention to that bank. You are going to have to pay some attention to his peculiarities. You're going to have to pay some attention to his physical peculiarities as his—in healing. You're going to have some—to pay some attention to clearing him up—certain buttons that he's got in wild restimulation. Of course, that first goes along the line of a service fac. He's got something there that he just wouldn't get rid of, man, that's too good. The way to make mama guilty is to have these splitting headaches. That'll fix her for rapping him on the head with a thimble when he was two.

Anyway, he's got some of these things that have reversed and so they've got survival values you—in other words, these are bank considerations. And the bank is taken apart by you knowing what the bank is all about and walking the guy into portions of it that can be as—ised.

But your auditing in general is not all addressed to bank. You are not just auditing the pc versus his bank, because there's a wide, wide world out there and that is surrounded by a wide, wide universe and there're an awful lot of other beings in it who are perfectly willing to surround themselves and everybody else. And there are a tremendous number of banks walking around that are in collision. And when you get all this added up, you see that your pc is actually piloting his way through a trap to get out of the trap of his own bank. See, in other words, you've already got him in an environment which is sort of a trap environment, do you see. He can walk out of the session—after you've given him this session he can just go out

and walk out the door and run into his *bête noire* to end all *bêtes noires*, black dog, black beast all over his back, you see.

“Oh, Johnny, I was looking for you. Here’s a telegram from your ex—wife. You’ve been arrested in Wyoming for not paying alimony. They’ve got a warrant out for you, rather, I think it says . . . “

This is shoveled off on a guy who is already half—way through a service fac. Well now, if the coincidence is too deadly for words, it’ll be a service fac, “How to make women wrong and self right.” And this sort of thing will get all confused and messed up because in actuality there’s more than one bank that he’s up against. He’s up against his own bank. That’s for sure. And he wouldn’t be having trouble with these other banks if he wasn’t mixed up with his own bank. That’s for sure. But at the same time that he is getting extricated from his own bank, he is also mixed up with all these other banks. Joe, Pete, Bill and the rest of them, and he’s mixed up with all these round objects that go around these flaming round objects called suns and planets, and he’s tripping across an awful lot of space and stardust, you know. He’s still eating, remember. He can get a piece of bad fish that’ll throw him for an awful loop. Fish decided that it was a crime to eat all those herrings so it decided to make people sick.

The upshot of the situation, then, is that your piloting of the pc through his bank also involves piloting him through his contacts with all these other banks. So, therefore, you have to make a fast gain on the pc which is still sufficiently gradient for the pc to know that he is gaining; and this has to be done so that when you’ve got hold of him and are auditing him, you can make enough gain so that what will hit him immediately afterwards, and so forth, won’t make enough of an impression on him to bar out his being audited the next session. Do you follow? Very nice adjudication. Fortunately you don’t have to worry—worry too much because it’s built into the subject. But all these are the considerations of the subject itself and a gradient and how you bring a pc on forward and so on.

You’ve got all these things that are possibilities of strewn wreckage. You’ve got a pc, he’s already walking too steep a gradient just breathing. Hey, somebody’s asking him to breathe, see, hummm. Sounds pretty grim. And your best processing for the guy might be just to let him rest. “Why don’t you go out to a farm in the country someplace and get a room and sit down for a month or two and not communicate with anybody.” Well, you say, well, that’s a noncommunication. Well, yes, that’s right. That’s a noncommunication but I haven’t really told you that a noncommunication was that aberrative.

I’d say a soldier standing up being shot would be much better off without that communication. And if life—if life looked to this individual like a series of shell splinters flying through the air, and if you said, “Well, why don’t you crawl in a foxhole for a while, Joe?” I think—I think he’d be better off for crawling in a foxhole. Do you understand? So that you say, “Well then, there’s too much of that. The fellow’s now gone the other way and he is now withdrawn from life and he’s this and he’s that.” No! I would not advise him as the medico advises him. “What you want to do now is retire and take a rest because you shouldn’t be in active life.” No, you’re telling him something entirely different. “Why don’t you catch

your breath for a short time and sort of get unspun with the quietness of the countryside and so forth and then thee and me will have at this thing hammer and tongs and we will clear it up and get you back into the realm of the living.” You see, it’d have to be that kind of a plan. But I would never advise the pc to experience life. “Now, what you want to do, Mr. Jones, is make up your mind that there are no spiders on your wall in your office. And just go to work and that’s the best that you should do. Just go to work and sit there and do your job and grit your teeth and pretty soon you will get used to it. I think that’s the best thing for you to do, Mr. Jones.”

Forty—eight hours later, of course, they’re issuing him a ticket at the local spinbin, you see, for one padded cell. That was the thing he couldn’t duplicate anymore. He couldn’t even duplicate the idea of being there.

So, it’s all a question of gradients, all a question of communication. It’s all a question of how fast can you bring this fellow up. And if you find some guy who’s awful slow to bring up, why, don’t blame yourself He’s had plenty of time to do himself in and some people have simply done a better job of it than others.

Thank you.