

**INTERNATIONAL
CONGRESS OF
DIANETICISTS AND
SCIENTOLOGISTS**

Black/White Version (suitable for print) (BW, Black/White)
Compiled 6. February 2010

a) Table of Contents, in Checkcheet order:

1.	THE HISTORY AND DEVELOPMENT OF DIANETICS AND SCIENTOLOGY	1
2.	THE ELEMENTS OF THE PROBLEM.....	15
3.	PROCESSING AND ITS GOALS.....	31
4.	THE MOST FAVORABLE PROCESS.....	47
5.	SOP 8: STEPS VI AND VII	63
6.	SOP 8: STEPS IV AND V	79
7.	SOP 8: STEPS I, II AND III	93
8.	SOP 8: SHORT 8.....	111
9.	SIX STEPS TO BETTER BEINGNESS.....	127
10.	THE USES AND FUTURE OF SCIENTOLOGY	143
11.	PROCESSES FOR ROUGH CASES.....	157
12.	QUESTION AND ANSWER PERIOD, PART I.....	173
13.	QUESTION AND ANSWER PERIOD, PART II.....	189

b) Table of Contents, in chronological order:

1.	53-09-30	THE ELEMENTS OF THE PROBLEM.....	15
2.	53-09-30	THE HISTORY AND DEVELOPMENT OF DIANETICS AND SCIENTOLOGY	1
3.	53-10-01	PROCESSING AND ITS GOALS.....	31
4.	53-10-01	SOP 8: STEPS IV AND V	79
5.	53-10-01	SOP 8: STEPS VI AND VII	63
6.	53-10-01	THE MOST FAVORABLE PROCESS.....	47
7.	53-10-02	SOP 8: SHORT 8.....	111
8.	53-10-02	SOP 8: STEPS I, II AND III	93
9.	53-10-03	PROCESSES FOR ROUGH CASES.....	157
10.	53-10-03	SIX STEPS TO BETTER BEINGNESS.....	127
11.	53-10-04	QUESTION AND ANSWER PERIOD, PART I.....	173
12.	53-10-04	QUESTION AND ANSWER PERIOD, PART II.....	189
13.	53-11-03	THE USES AND FUTURE OF SCIENTOLOGY	143

c) Table of Contents, in alphabetical order:

1. PROCESSES FOR ROUGH CASES.....	157
2. PROCESSING AND ITS GOALS.....	31
3. QUESTION AND ANSWER PERIOD, PART I.....	173
4. QUESTION AND ANSWER PERIOD, PART II.....	189
5. SIX STEPS TO BETTER BEINGNESS.....	127
6. SOP 8: SHORT 8.....	111
7. SOP 8: STEPS I, II AND III.....	93
8. SOP 8: STEPS IV AND V.....	79
9. SOP 8: STEPS VI AND VII.....	63
10. THE ELEMENTS OF THE PROBLEM.....	15
11. THE HISTORY AND DEVELOPMENT OF DIANETICS AND SCIENTOLOGY.....	1
12. THE MOST FAVORABLE PROCESS.....	47
13. THE USES AND FUTURE OF SCIENTOLOGY.....	143

THE HISTORY AND DEVELOPMENT OF DIANETICS AND SCIENTOLOGY

A lecture given on 30 September 1953
by L. Ron Hubbard

61 MINUTES

Thank you.

And hello, all of you. I'm very happy to see you here.

I want to welcome you to Philadelphia and the First International Congress of Dianetists and Scientologists and hope that I'll be able to talk to most of you personally. And I hope during this series of lectures that you will be able to see very clearly intensely usable technology. And I hope that in the seminars and the Group Processing you will be able to see yourself that these technologies work.

All we're interested in here in this congress, really our first, foremost thing, is to put into your hands a simplicity with which you can achieve maximal effect And if I can succeed here and if your group leaders can

succeed in clarifying this material for you, I'll be very happy. If it does something for you personally, I'll be very happy about that I see the past extremely well exemplified here, that all has not been lost in the last three years. I look around and I see former wrecks able to sit in a chair. And I have made in the last half an hour or so at least three errors in identifying people. Thought one girl was one old lady's daughter; it turned out to be the old lady herself. Yeah, so that's very, very gratifying.

The first lecture of this series is called „The History and Development of Dianetics and Scientology.“

I actually shouldn't have to go into this very deeply with very many of those present But I'll skim lightly over the cataclysmic and sad events of the past in order to bring us up to present time. I might even unstick one or two on the time track. And I hope in this very short introduction that I might possibly demonstrate that the changes which have taken place did have some reason and purpose.

I know that there is doubt in some minds. They think that one does this sort of thing – keeps changing techniques – solely to escape the entrapment of an old reality. And whereas that's very laudable, I'm not that afraid of theta traps.

So, in the history and in the development of, one can say now, this science, a great many changes have been very, very necessary. You know, it's quite remarkable to sit in the ivory tower of a person who was trained as a scientist and who had sunk to the very, very lowest state of being a fiction writer and to find that his skill in both led toward one conclusion, and that was that people didn't know quite all there was to know about the human mind. Now, that was a remarkable conclusion to reach, because we are assured on every front that this has all been solved in, I think, 1786 by a fellow by the name of Heimstätter or something of the sort, who invented Dianetics at that time. (And for those who haven't gotten their sense of humor yet...) You know, I'd think this was a British audience here, the lag on the thing, but maybe I've got to readjust to American humor.

Anyway, somebody – some laughable character – not too long ago, put out a long writing on the history of Dianetics, whereby it was concluded that it was all invented in 1786, except none of it had been thought up then. It had – thought up by me later, but it had all been done in 1786 or something of this sort. And I was very interested in this, because I went and tried to find the book and the Library of Congress doesn't know of it But it was a good try.

The whole time track is saturated with this sort of thing, so we'll pass over – pass over lightly on this.

I came out of an ivory tower, I will say, which was very happy with the pure knowledge of a coil, the pure knowledge of Ohm's law. Ohm's law is beautiful, you know. And you look at these things that nobody has to think about them, you don't have to argue about them at all, they work. And out of the somewhat detached studio where you sat down and you wrote, „*Bow wow*, barked Bill's pistol and another redskin bit the dust, which he chewed reflectively,“ and you sold this at some remarkable number of cents per word, for years. And I moved out into what I laughingly thought at the time was the American scene and which turned out to be a Roman arena. (The blood of Christians is still all over it; they've never thrown sand over it They've still got some of the bodies hung up on crosses around in the society. It's really dreadful.)

But anyway, here was Dianetics. Done in an ivory tower and applied without ever naming it, to an enormous number of people, actually, by myself and codified, as far as I could tell, so that it was perfectly understandable. I understood it People got well and this was fine, and so I didn't think there was any more to it than that

I wasn't calling it a science at the time. It didn't have a name yet I had to cook up the name one – late one Saturday night when somebody kept insisting it was a science and if it was a science it had its name. So I sat back and I thought real hard, and I remembered something about Greek and I remembered that „*Dia*, that's 'through' – 'through,' *dia*. And that's through, through – yeah, that's right 'through mind.' That's all there is to it“ „Dianetics,“ I said, „is the name of this science. And you've heard of it of course.“ He, of course, said he had, being from Bell Labs, not from RCA Victor.

And we moved into the sphere of telling people about it instead of working with it. And the next thing that happened was a publisher said, „If you will say that everybody can do it, why, I'll publish a book on it, and this will be a very interesting book and probably sell five or six thousand copies.“ And I was very happy about this, because I was getting tired at that time of explaining it I thought if I only had a book, you see, I could just say, „Well, here's a copy,“ you know? And go off fishing or something.

Well, it didn't quite work out that way. The plans of Homo sapiens and rodents aft gang agley. And as a result, people kept buying this book. And the publisher didn't want them to buy the book. Every time they bought a copy of the book his interest in the publishing house sunk terribly, because he was trying to buy the publishing house, you see, and the publishing house was getting wealthy on this book. And this made him very angry with me, and so on.

Everybody got mad at everybody. This is a love-hate universe, you see. You start out by loving everybody and end up by hating everybody. That's the frame – cycle. And by the time you hate everybody, that's good and solid and that's MEST and you're matter then. So anyway, it ran the cycle as far as the book was concerned.

But very shortly after all this happened, a bunch of people came to me and they said, „Let's have a big organization that can take care of all the servicing that's going on.“

So I said, „Fine.“ Big organization, that sounded good to me. And I said, „Let's have a big organization.“ So they had a big organization. You've been recovering from it ever since. Well...

Anyway (he said with no responsibility for anything that's gone on), the whole past has actually been a social experiment by which one tried to find out the channel and the level of understanding and the optimum technique for the use of Homo sapiens. How many people are there in the British Empire? I know quite a few people in the British Empire, too. There is a country over there named Great Britain, and you add that to the hundred and fifty million in America, and that's actually about the number of people that were involved in this thing. Because the strange part of it is, is everybody was reading the wrong things about it there for a little while about three years ago.

And the best, the very best magazine – I mean, the magazi..., your magazines that are just the soul of truth (I don't want you to get the wrong idea about these magazines). *Time* magazine has never, in its entire career, uttered a single colored truth. Never a single truth of any kind has ever been published by that magazine. Anyway, I was counting up the columns one day which they had invested in the subject of Dianetics, and I was somewhat thunderstruck to find out that for the same period it was more than they had invested in the private life of the president. That was very interesting to me. You would be amazed if you went back through all the copies of old magazines how much space has been devoted to Dianetics. It's fabulous.

Now, the social experiment was what was important, and the effort to keep going with investigation and keep learning from what was happening. Many times people have turned to me and accused me, very bluntly, of simply letting a thing run off the wheels, just go off the edge of the road just to see what was going to happen. And I looked at these people thunder-

struck; I was hurt I said, „How could you possibly think such a thing about me?“ But it was true. And so, a great deal was learned.

What does it take to make Homo sapiens come upscale? Well, you first have to find out where he is. And you know that I didn't know that till a few months ago. Fantastic! With all of the tremendous certainty I pack into a paragraph, I didn't know a few salient points.

I invented a technique known as Acceptance Level Processing; it is a variation of Expanded GITA. One can take this technique, and using brackets, which is to say, have the pre-clear mock up for himself, have another mock up for himself and others mock up for others what is acceptable. You will find out that that which is acceptable, which the person desires will, when mocked up, even on an occluded case, go into the bank with a crash. It's as though one had a vacuum cleaner working in the pre-clear. And when you give him something that is really acceptable to him, it simply disappears by collapsing into the bank with great speed. And you can establish by this exactly what the acceptance level is of a pre-clear.

Now, the acceptance level of the society at large was also under study. There are eight dynamics. And the society at large had a tremendous lot to be known about it. It was wonderful how little actually was known about the society at large.

You have people like Warner Brothers or the *Saturday Evening Post* who would give anything, including their grandmother's false teeth, to know what the acceptance level of the public is. Because if they knew the acceptance level of the public or if they knew that the acceptance level could be established, they could then fill that need, and filling that need they could then reap a fortune.

Hollywood today is falling flat financially because it doesn't know that acceptance level. The amount of advertising has dwindled in the *Saturday Evening Post* simply because it, again, does not know that acceptance level. These magazines, these movies are shooting all over the sky in some sort of an effort, some sort of a rule of the thumb to establish it.

William Randolph Hearst went way upstairs and caught the upper fringe of the American public acceptance level. Back in 1897 or something like that he sent a photographer to Cuba, and the photographer sent – to get pictures of the war. And the photographer said, „Why, there's no war down here.“ And Hearst sent him a very angry cable and said, „You get the pictures, I'll get you the war.“ And he did: 1898, Spanish-American War.

Now, today you can go out here on the corner and find the upper fringe of acceptance level in the lesser yellow journals. Fantastic. The acceptance level isn't where those people think it is at all. You've got to go down to the five-mile deep and then take a submarine lower to find the public – snap (*snap*) – acceptance level of fact.

As soon as you know this principle, by the way, anything that is a problem to you about another person – parents, anything like that – ceases to be a problem. With the data which had been assembled and with the material which was to hand in Dianetics and Scientology one could then very easily integrate what is the acceptance level of a large public, as well as the acceptance level of an individual.

Now, to give you some sort of an idea of an insight and what this suddenly does to an individual: what is the acceptance level of a psychiatrist? You see, it immediately reveals it-

self. You would take a psychiatrist, if you were to ask him to mock up acceptable people, he would mock up the people he is treating. Then do you expect this man immediately afterwards to bring these people to another level which is not acceptable to him? No. It's too much to ask of the man to shift his acceptance level in actual play. That's a shuddering sort of a fact.

Now, if you can – you can establish this for any profession or any entertainment with great ease. If the result is shocking to you and if man's mental anatomy is then lying before you in its somewhat impure state, why, blame me. Everybody does. All right.

During this period a social experiment was conducted in one of the smaller cities of the country in one of the smaller states of the country; place named Los Angeles. And Los Angeles, California, had in it, at one time, a Foundation. The Foundation was almost broke because it simply couldn't get itself together or pulled together in any way. And I gave the Foundation its head completely, and turned it into a socialist cooperative experiment and watched what happened. And learned by looking at that group of people what happens in cooperative experiments and what people will be subjected to.

It is a very conceited thing for a man to suddenly say to himself, „Why, I can forecast exactly what the reactions of everything and everybody will be before I have ever seen those reactions.“ That was the sort of conceit I was operating in, in 1949. I'm not operating in that conceit today; I've seen what can happen.

You have to look. Does you a great deal of good. When you're walking across the street you – if you want to stay alive, if you're amongst that small minority – look at the traffic lights and you'll find out whether or not they're green or red. Elementary step, isn't it?

But you could sit in the hotel lobby and say to yourself, „Now, when I go out across the street there will probably be a short in the main switchboard of the police department, in such a way that there will be no traffic lights, so they will all jam red, and I will go out of the lobby and walk across the street and I won't have to look at the traffic lights.“ It's always a good thing, in this universe, to look at something. Well, I've had three years of looking. In those three years I have seen techniques which were pretty good techniques – a lot of them – misused, abused, turned wrong side to, misunderstood, shaken up, re-explained. I've also seen them used very expertly. But in those three years, until a few months ago, there was no technique that one could say, without much doubt in his own mind, „If this technique is put into the hands of an individual, it does not and will not carry with it a great deal of damage if misused, and will, if used properly, do about all the good that can be done in this universe.“

The technique is one thing in its theory. It is another thing when I apply it. It is another thing when it's taught and an auditor applies it And it's quite another thing what happens to it when it gets to the fifth-, sixth-stage and way out into the public It's important to know that, you see. A technique itself does an evolution by being handed on from person to person. And you have to go out there to the fifth-, sixth-, eighth-, fifteenth-stage and look at the technique after it arrived there – not to suddenly make up your own reality about it, but to look at it for what it is, what's it being used for and what's it doing in people's hands. And when you look at that you'll go back immediately and sit down in your office and say, „Let's see, let's have a considerably different technique about this. Ahem.“

It's very wonderful that these techniques have produced in the hands of people who are quite sincere, very excellent results. It's also quite remarkable how far they have often gone off the track. But today, we can sum up the whole of processing in a sentence: Don't think, look! That's Scientology. That's all there is to it Don't think, look.

You think that's simple? Well, girl delivered little Diana to us while we were down in Spain. And perhaps she was a little tired or something, but I kept asking her – trying to find out a couple of very salient points, and she never answered the question asked – very remarkable degree. You say, „Weather?“ And she would say, „Well, historically speaking...“

That's what? That's just not looking. They get to a point where they not only don't dare look, but they don't dare think about what's to be thought about They can't communicate about what's being communicated about And that is just the lower stage of „Don't look,“ you see?

„Don't look,“ then, becomes a gradient scale of „First – think about it first, and then look.“ That's why you have roadmaps. They tell you all about it before you get there. That's the trouble with the whole – trouble with an occluded case: he has to know before he goes; he has to know, think about it before he can be and he's so busy thinking about being that he never is. It's simplicity itself. You see this?

So we move out a little bit deeper into this problem and we find out that he isn't just thinking before he goes. He's setting up the problem before he thinks about it Oh, this is really getting interesting. We're into the field of science now. You set up the problem before you think about it and then you accumulate data, which preferably is not related to it And if you accumulate enough of this data and you put it on enough pieces of paper in enough files, it'll impress somebody. Science. Now, that's a little bit hard on science. Science was struggling along without a lot of things, but it could have looked. All right.

Now, we get the person who is worried about having to set up the problem before they think about it. Now, we're getting toward normal now. And then we have the person who, of course, doesn't dare worry. He doesn't dare worry, because if he worried he'd have to set up the problem and if he set up the problem, then he'd think about it, you see. And then if he thought about it hard enough he might look. So you go out here in the street and you see people walking up and down the street, they've got big thick glasses on. That's to help them look. And you ask people, „What are those glasses for?“ And they will say, „For looking, of course.“ That's just it; they expect the glasses to do all the looking. Back of the glasses they have a pair of eyes, which do the looking through the glasses for the person. In other words, let's get this removed as many times as we can get it removed so we don't have to look.

Now, we say what about feeling? If looking is so important, what about feeling? Well, I'm afraid you're dealing with the same thing. Feeling is condensed looking. If you just shorten up the time span of a glance, you will get waves jamming up dose enough together to produce feeling. Looking produces a sensation. If you can't get a sensation by looking at some of the girls that you see on the streets here in Philadelphia or who are right here in this congress, I feel for you. I'll give you the address of a good auditor.

Now, see how far we have gone in the history and development of Scientology. See where we've gone exactly; we've gone that same track. Went way back in the past. Example

of Sigmund Freud: Fool around with a person's past long enough and he'll get into present. There's some truth in that If you wipe out enough past, he hasn't got any past to think about; and that was Dianetics.

Now, we had there a workable therapy. It is a therapy which is fully as workable as... Well, I know this; I don't think a therapy can be worked out about the past that we haven't beaten around one way or the other. I set it up all one day on symbolic logic and worked out the equations of all possible therapies, and then just started dealing them off the top of the deck – not the bottom of the deck as some auditors think I do – but deal them off the top of the deck to a number of auditors. Sure, they're all workable. Some things are much hotter than others, some things are much cooler. But the point is that therapies which wipe out the past ended with Dianetics.

I don't think anybody here will disagree with me when I say that Dianetics does quite a piece of work in the matter of Lock Scanning, running engrams, processing out efforts. The bulk of the cases to which it's addressed, something will happen to that case to improve it, because of this alteration of the energy pattern of the past That's Dianetics.

We had to move out from that, however, because the answer is not contained therein. The answer is in a field above the echelon of modern scientific definition as it existed in 1950. One had to go ahead and find out a very, very great deal about this thing with which we were dealing, which was life in a universe consisting of space, time, energy, matter. And we found out that just by taking the pattern of life's behavior in this universe and by tracing that very carefully we could find out what life was trying to do in the universe. And if we found out what it was trying to do and how it was doing it, we would, of course, obtain from that a process which would be intensely workable and which could get out to fifteenth-hand without going too far wrong.

How could it get to fifteenth-hand without going too far wrong? Well, it's because the vectors of existence would be so consistent with the processing itself that life itself would hold the process true to itself. You enlist for a „police force“ on the process, in other words, the whole of beingness.

In 1950 – I was running across some old tapes and notes, said, „The closer we can approximate the function and action of the mind with the process itself, the better the process will be.“ It was a good forecast because that's what we've done. Now we find out even more intimately what life is trying to do, and we know and have workability that we did not possess before. Very well.

The history of Dianetics and Scientology, because history books stress organizations, is conceived by many to be the history of organizations. Other people who are individual-conscious conceive it to be, maybe, the history of a man. And neither one of these things is correct This isn't a history of me. I have nothing to do with this as far as a life cycle is concerned, because this would have eventually happened somewhere. I don't know, maybe I made it happen a couple of months earlier.

But the point is, sooner or later life itself would have gotten fed up with this deterioration in this universe and would have made a wild line rush to come up. Sooner or later this inevitably would happen. And as I say, maybe I've just speeded it up a little bit. Very well.

The line rush has been made. This does not say that there is not a future of development, but it does say that we can sure be awfully comfortable about what's been dropped. There's an enormous number of things left to know, and none of them with any great high priority. We can know these things a long time in the future and we'll still be all right. Because what we've come up to is a process which itself delivers into the hands of the person processed a knowingness about existence. And so we don't have to teach what existence is; this person comes to know what existence is.

If you process somebody – if somebody wants to do some research, the best way to do some research is just get processed and get processed more and more and more and more and more, and you can really process out to the thin wavy nothingness with great ease in one direction – that's the direction of thinking about it. Now, you can probably process out to the point where you can throw lightning bolts around. I don't know, I haven't seen any lightning bolts lately and I myself am rather lazy about lightning bolts; they're so easy to manufacture from the public service company.

But you can go into the direction of how do you make matter and what's its composite, or in the direction of how do you think about it, with great ease in processing, either way, and answers start turning out faster than a public stenographer could possibly take them down. And any one of these answers would be really eye-openers to somebody operating without any knowledge of what we are doing here. If you suddenly walked in with a few paragraphs taken from some preclear concerning the formation of this or the formation of that, you would undoubtedly find somebody, whose science applied to that, very interested in it (I've had this experience several times lately.)

It's much better to have the formula of knowing how to know than it is to have the data which is to be known. I think you will agree with that. Well, that's the direction we've been going.

Now we've run a gradient scale from the past on up to the present. The whole past is very complex; the present is very complex. But in the midst of these complexities there were certain simplicities which, when known, delivered into a person's hands a great deal of information which he could use in the business of living.

The history and development of Dianetics and Scientology is a natural evolution. It is not an invention, it is not a creation; it is a natural evolution of at least some part of life getting very fed up with running the same cycle. And life sooner or later would have burst through with these things and delivered from some quarter or another, I think, almost identically the answers which I am giving. Because these answers are tremendously fundamental.

In the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* of, I think, the eleventh edition – certainly the thirteenth edition – you will find an article under the heading, „Time and Space.“ It's a beautiful article. It doesn't start with the words but it certainly starts with a feeling of no responsibility and ends with the final line of no responsibility concerning time and space or information therefore. It says, „Time and space are not a problem of science. They're a problem of psychology.“ No responsibility.

I'm rather interested, by the way, that they say that time and space is not a problem of science, that it's a problem of psychology. That's very beautifully stated, but the main point

here is that the thirteenth edition was saying, „We don't know a definition for time and space. Time and space are problems of psychology.“ Oh!

The last time I looked the people that were really using time and space were the physicists. And they couldn't move off of their left foot without knowing what space was. They just couldn't move so they haven't gone anyplace. They're around playing with popguns or something – atom bombs. They're fooling.

What's time? What's space? Everywhere you look, physics textbooks, anyplace else, it says, 'Time is change of position in space.' And „Space is associated with time.“ And „Energy is the change of a particle in space.“ And 'Time is a manifestation of space and energy.' And „Matter is a manifestation of space and energy.“ And „Space is a manifestation of time and energy.“

Did you ever hear about the old – the snake, you know, that grabbed himself by the tail and ate himself up? Well, that's what happens in that definition. Yes indeed, it was a problem of psychology; I don't know who needed the psychologist.

Well, what were time and space? Well, if life didn't have a good statable definition for time and space which did not immediately reevaluate itself in two other definitions which evaluated themselves in the first definition... That's, by the way, no answer. If you did mathematics that way (the way they're often done), you would get the answer as just the answer, which would be the answer which you had already said you would get before you got the answer. So you would have the answer before you got the answer, and this would be useless to you. So they'd had to stay below that echelon and have been penalized rather heavily for it Because they didn't include, then, the mind into the field of science.

In past societies, as nearly as I can judge, when the mind has been included at all into the field of science it has been „How did one make a slave with less unit time per individual?“ That was the main idea. The emphasis was on training, discipline, punishment, and that of course was naturally a sort of a dwindling spiral. It would run itself out sooner or later.

Now, therefore we were dealing with restriction every time we dealt with the mind, and we got a closer and closer restriction of the mind and limitation of its liberty, limitation of general freedom, and so we got the cycle of the MEST universe. Uniformly got the cycle of the MEST universe, which is birth, growth, decay, death.

Even the Vedic knew that The Vedics were very, very naive people. They were very clever people, they were very young, they were enthusiastic, and they thought life was worth living! And they gave forth many formulas of this character. And one of those formulas is that cycle of creation-destruction. It's a very, very wise, usable thing.

But this sort of thing had never been integrated with modern science. If you said, „The Vedic people“ and tried to get into science on this phrase, somebody would have said to you, „Oh, you mean, oh, you're studying ethnology or anthropology?“ Something of the sort. And they wouldn't have admitted that you were studying science.

The evolution of a match as you strike it is just that: birth of the fire, growth of the fire, dwindling of the fire and vanishment of the fire. Everywhere you look in this universe you'll see that same cycle, same cycle. All right.

Life, sooner or later, would have gotten dose enough to the bottom of the cycle to make an explosion on the subject of knowledge itself. And evidently did.

The funny part of it is, is – by the way – I never went into this cycle for the reasons that turned out. In other words, I never started to study this because I thought that the world was in terrible shape. I started to study it because it seemed to be awfully neglected.

I remember the first time I considered it was neglect – it was the field of aesthetics that interested me, not the field of the mind. I remember going into the English department of a university where I was unfortunately incarcerated at the time (as so many of you have been in universities) and I said, „I’ve just discovered something very interesting, that Japanese poetry and English poetry register with more or less the same pattern on a Koenig photometer.“ (Very crude device. Today we have oscilloscopes, and so on, which do much better work.) The old Koenig photometer consisted of four mirrors which rotated and showed you the pattern of the variation of a gas flame as you spoke against a diaphragm. Very, very old device.

And you got, more or less, the same tape for all kinds of poetry. This told you that there was something about language and rhythm which was recognized by every mind, no matter where or how trained. It told you that you might find that to be the case. That was science tying in with the mind, the aesthetic of the mind.

And the English department, they looked at me blankly. And they said, „Yes, we can see these two tapes are alike. What did you say these are two tapes of? Of what?“

I said, „It’s a device they have over in the physics department...“

„Oh, you’re from the physics department What are you doing over here in the English department? The physics department...“

That was my introduction to specialization. I found out that you weren’t supposed to think about things in another department when you were working in one department, no matter what you found out You got this beautiful picture of the snake devouring himself by his own tail.

Well, we have – the whole field of the mind having – has been shunted, sent over this way, sent over that way. It’s been sent... (I don’t want anybody to laugh here because these microphones are sensitive, both are very sensitive and a blast of laughter might hurt Mike’s ears here. So let’s be careful on this one.) They turned the field of the mind over to medicine. You see? And medicine, naturally, realized their responsibility for the field of something which in the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* says is the basic fundamental of physics. But medicine has never pretended to be a science, except when Morris Fishbein writes. (Morris Fishbein. He’s a little known character of the dinosaur area – tyrannosaurus rex species.) Anyway, they turned the mind over, then, when medicine wouldn’t have anything to do with it – the medical doctor, he kind of ran.

Sigmund Freud came up and said, „The mind belongs to medicine first“ And the doctors sure fixed him, if you want to read his history. And medicine eventually sort of took a little fragment of it and then they sort of handed it back, and they gave it over to a specialized field which is called psychiatry. And the psychiatrist, he had it for a little while, he had a little

corner of it. He could see it was obvious to him that an insane person jerked. (This, I believe, was his single contribution to the field.) And the surgeon.

Over in Bavaria there was a blacksmith – you think I’m being disassociating here when I talk this way – but over in Bavaria there was a blacksmith. He was an idiot. Idiot blacksmith over in Bavaria. And he was standing in front of a forge one day, and the forge blew up and a crowbar went through his head, entering in one temple and going out the other temple. And this was written up in a journal (probably the *American Weekly*, published by Hearst – where they get most of their ideas in medicine and surgery). It was written up as having happened in Bavaria. (I think – you know, they always see ghosts and have strange things happen, and so form-it’s always in Bavaria. Probably you can’t get in there or the communication lines have been down there for so long nobody can challenge you.) But this crowbar blew through the blacksmith’s skull in Bavaria, and it was written up and it got into publications in the United States. And so they said, „We now have the answer to the human mind, which is the prefrontal lobotomy.“

I know that you, researching this, would have to really research it to find out, incredibly enough, that that is exactly what occurred. That story from Bavaria does not say that the idiot blacksmith became less of an idiot All it says is he lived. And this, as far as I can find out, is the entire background technology of the prefrontal lobotomy, the transorbital leuotomy and the other „delicate surgical operations which are engaged upon to make the sane of America more sane,“ according to psychiatry. Except practically all the patients either die or lie mo...

But it is the interest – it is the very interesting thing that it keeps people from jerking. They lie there like a piece of protoplasm afterwards and that’s that And so, it has been handed over to the field of the surgeon.

Everybody’s been playing this game so far of no responsibility, no responsibility, no responsibility on the field of the mind, until it might bring you to the somewhat dangerous and untenable conclusion that the society at large plays very hard at the game of no responsibility. It might be that the society doesn’t take good, solid responsibility for various things.

Well now, it was very unfortunate, it was very, very unfortunate that the psychiatrist turned it over to a machine. The machine was an electric shock machine. And the second they said an electric shock machine did something to the human mind, they turned it over to me. It was an electric machine, wasn’t it? Well, I have some training in electronics, and that’s that So you see, I inherited it.

Because we were the most advanced class, at that time, in electronics, which is to say higher level of electronics, which is nuclear fission – we called it atomic molecular phenomena in America – about the first class that was taught in this country. And everybody there, you see, the whole group really represented the higher level of electronics in the United States, and nobody there would take any responsibility for the mind or what it was doing except myself. So you see, I inherited it perfectly honestly. And I can show you its deed. Show you the deed of title and transfer, because the day I read, „The psychiatrist uses an electronic wave to do something to the human mind,“ I became very interested.

I said, „What do you know. The medical doctor, the psychiatrist can now tell me some things I want to know. I want to know what is the smallest wave possible?“ And of course, it is very easy to establish that the human mind has in it the smallest wave that we're going to find anyplace, because it can store such an enormous amount of data in such a little tiny place.

Therefore it must be stored in tiny, tiny wavelengths, smaller than we know about in electronics or nuclear physics. They must be much smaller, by the way, than the wavelengths of ultraviolet. Because, you see, just capacity; because you figure it out and you figure out that the human mind cannot store more memory than a person will need in three months. It can't store more than three months' worth of memory if the wave is as big as we have to have it in the field of nuclear physics. So this was beautiful to me. And I went immediately into the field of medicine to ask them, „What's the length of the wave?“

Now, it might sound funny to you, but do you know, I thought they'd tell me. And I was astounded to discover that the field of the human mind had been inherited by a machine and nobody else was taking responsibility for it And if you wanted to do anything for it at all, you would certainly have to move in and find out why electronics influenced the human mind.

(Sigh!) That's a terrible thing to have happen to anybody. Very, very bad. Because you found out that although everybody looked very impressive and although they wore very nice clothes (tweeds usually) and they spoke with this greatest of impartiality about it all, they didn't know a damn thing.

It was wonderful to behold what was considered data. And it outraged anybody with a scientific training or a background to see what was „data,“ be called data. And ever since, I have been trying to demonstrate the fact that I was not wrong in trying to find out. So if you'll bear with me, why, I'll tell you in the rest of this series what's finally been discovered about the matter. It's all very simple.

But ragged as this dissertation may be on the history and development of the mind, it is not even vaguely as ragged as the work itself. For instance, the records I did keep were used to plug up rat holes or something – various people's – and I seldom accumulated large notebooks full of material, you know.

I was severely scolded, one day, by a scientist (excuse me, „scientist“ – psychologist) very, very sadly and seriously brought to task for not keeping records. And this fellow said he'd kept records. He showed me where he'd kept records on every electric shock case that had entered into the sanitarium, and he'd kept them for years. And there was the patient's name and there was the patient's address and there was the age of the patient, sex of the patient, the general measurements of the patient, how long the patient had been crazy, how many times he'd been put in the sanitarium and how many times he was shocked by an electric shock machine and what kind of a machine it was and exactly what the voltage was on the machine.

And I said, „Yes, you're saying you kept these records. Well, tell me, what did you do with these records and how did you add these records up?“

He said, „How did I what?“

„No,“ I said, „what was the purpose in keeping the records? What did you intend to find out? You know, find out from keeping the records.“

And he says, „What do you mean? Are you trying to come in here and tell me how to run my business?“

Well, his defense was not adequate. And I went so far as to take hold of these sheets of paper, and going over several of them I noticed that it referred to the admission-discharge records of the sanitarium. And I went and asked a girl if she would let me see these. And you know, I worked for about a half an hour until this fellow stopped me rather impatiently and says, „Well, I know what you’re saying there and what you’re finding out I did draw a conclusion from these. I remember now. Two or three years ago we drew a conclusion that a person who was shocked with an electric machine uniformly stayed in the sanitarium three weeks more than a person who was never shocked on an electric machine.“

I said, „Wait a minute now, you’ve given me a very wonderful conclusion. What conclusion did you draw from this: that electric shock was harmful to the human brain?“

He looked at me very blankly. And for the first time I realized this man did not know he was treating the human brain – or the human mind. This was a new thought to him. What he was doing was making records of things that were wheeled in on an operating table and put in a machine and you pulled the switch. And you made these proper records and you put them back in the files again. He was not treating the human mind. This did not occur to him.

You don’t believe that anybody could operate like that and remain that shallow. Well, I think they have to remain that shallow in the face of consistent and continual failure, to remain sane. They couldn’t immediately say to themselves, „We’re here to help people’s minds.“ If they said that to themselves and said, „That’s our goal,“ it would mean immediate failure, and man doesn’t like to fail So he says, „We’re scientists. We keep records. We have a sort of a sanitarium here; it’s a jail.

And when people are jerking, why, we bring them in and we cut a section of the brain or we give them a shock and what do you know, they don’t move afterwards. In fact, it is so successful that we usually have to send a trained nurse home with them at sixty dollars a week or thirty dollars a week in order to care for the body needs of the patient for the next twenty or thirty years.“ Pretty sad.

Well, the history and development of the human mind is a contest between mercy and brutality. Somebody comes along who is foolish enough to say that it is bad to abuse human beings, that things could be better, that we could do something. And he says this into the teeth of a stream which is sweeping away the years and the lives and the happiness of peoples by too many millions to count And of course, it’s quite a shock to suddenly start going up against that stream. This universe is rigged to follow that stream; it is explicitly designed as a trap which goes from the cycle of greatness to nothingness, which is exactly backwards to the direction life tries to go.

And that is the only way life itself can fight and contest this universe. It’s trying to turn the cycle around. And yet life itself becomes suborned and becomes so beaten that it starts going down the track, downstream, and every once in a while makes a faint effort or a

strong effort to turn around and go up what is upstream for this universe. Life at large has, evidently, an enormous urge toward cooperation, love, goodness, mercy, ethics, justice and other things which are pretty hard to find. It evidently has a large and inherent amount of these things.

Now, it comes up against a formation and a structure which says, „Force, viciousness, brutality, uncaringness, individuality in terms of heavy mass, empty space,“ and you get the contest. And part of life could be said to operate on a beaten level. It agrees that force, brutality, love, justice are bad things – that love and justice are bad things, that force and brutality are good things. It agrees on this. And agreeing, of course, just merely becomes a part of the universe.

And on the other hand, life fighting back up against this, trying to uphold a moral, ethical level has a pretty hard struggle. Because in a society which has already begun to believe that the machine is greater than the man, you have a society which has already decided that force, brutality, injustice, betrayal and hate are the best things to have around. It's already decided that.

Now, you turn around and tell this society about justice, and so forth. The society at large will agree with you. „These things are good,“ they will say, but they say to you, „are they attainable?“ And that is the main contest.

And that is the story and that is the history of Dianetics and Scientology. It is simply the history of life trying to turn around and go upstream again.

Let's take a break.

THE ELEMENTS OF THE PROBLEM

A lecture given on 30 September 53
by L. Ron Hubbard

65 MINUTES

All right

Want to talk about now, in the second lecture of this series, the elements of the problem, the problem itself and the number of things which were involved in the solution of the problem.

And this right at first glance might seem awfully dull material, but it nevertheless might give you some idea of what an individual was faced with in terms of no data.

The problem itself consisted of apparent discrepancies and continuous disappointments between the evident desire of life and the things which occurred to life in this universe. Wide discrepancy there: life says it is doing this and it's trying to do that and always winds up with the reverse. This makes a puzzle. It is what is commonly known as a paradox or an enigma. And this has been upsetting to living beings now for quite a while. Ever since people started a little bit down Tone Scale, they began to be concerned about this: that they hear on every hand that there should be ethics, that people should be honest, that man should love one another, that the society itself should be just and fair; and on every hand apparently this is not what is happening. One sees betrayal, dishonesty – many, many things – war, idiocies in general.

You go down to a court of law, you find there will be a number of individuals there, particularly in night court, or one of these quick court sessions and parked away in some corner of the town – nearly every town has such a court. Men are brought in there, they walk through, the judge says, „Guilty? Or not guilty?“

The fellow says, „Well, not guilty, Your Honor,“ the usual.

„Well, look guilty to me.“ *Pam.* „Thirty dollars, thirty days. If you don't have thirty dollars, thirty days.“

And the fellow says, „But I have a wife. And I couldn't afford an attorney.“

„Well, haven't any time for trial by jury here. I mean, that's...“

You think this doesn't happen because it says in all the history books and storybooks and things like that that this sort of thing doesn't happen.

People are picked up by the police on the streets and they are arrested solely because they don't have a dollar in their pocket or they're not nicely dressed or they're loitering or something of the sort And they go to court, and because they are dressed the way they are,

and because they don't act the way they do and so forth, the next thing you know, they find themselves in jail Just like that That's not justice, that is adjudicating the Tightness and wrongness of a person in direct ratio to his buying power. Why, it doesn't seem to have too much to do with it, but it's the only rule that has been found workable, evidently, in courts of law. And you'll see it there directly – if you cared to go down at this moment to the courts here, the night courts here, you would see this going on, and you would sit there horrified.

You would say, „This couldn't possibly happen in a just society. Just because this fellow isn't well dressed, he's in jail.“ And yet that's the only conclusion that you can draw.

He can't hire an attorney, he can't pay anybody anything; there's no trial by jury for him.

The thing down there in Washington called the Bill of Rights – we all agree to that Bill of Rights; we think that's wonderful. And the president of the United States a few years ago dared forward himself into great unpopularity by advocating that it be *enforced fat* a change. That's a fact. Why, you had states of the Union saying they were going to secede – just oh, wonderful. We were going to enforce the Bill of Rights, and yet that Bill of Rights isn't as complete, if you thought it over, as you would like to see it.

That Bill of Rights should have two other clauses in it one, a man has a right to his own sanity and, two, a man has a right to his own life. And that, in its narrowest sense, should be in the Bill of Rights. I don't mean any of the philosophic meanderings which could go on from those two things, but just those two things: a man has a right to his own sanity; a man has a right to live and not be killed.

And yet a fellow walks down here to a hospital the other day – a young man, he's in good health, but occasionally he has bad headaches. They took him and said, „Well, the thing for you, so-and-so and so-and-so. Oh, I guess, oh, go to Room 13,“ and so on. They turned him in and put him on an operating table and says, „We're going to adjust something in your head.“ And he said he didn't want this. And he says, „Well, the doctor says you've got to have this.“ And he said he didn't want it. So they gave him a shot of morphine and wheeled him down to the operating room and killed him dead with a transorbital leukotomy, because he had a headache.

There's no data on record anyplace – nowhere, nowhere is there any data on record that a transorbital leukotomy, a prefrontal lobotomy has cured a headache. It's cured a man's life, it's cured him of living, it's cured him of moving, but it hasn't cured a headache the way we understand curing a headache, which is to say, making somebody feel good and not have a headache after they've had a headache.

Today I was informed of this – a very reliable authority – by a medical doctor that I asked to investigate this matter. I spent a great deal of money, by the way, in the last three years getting the records straight There's a lot of things on record; we can hazard a lot of guesses.

I had a research chemist review – also had, by the way, a degree in English – review the records of electric shocks, transorbital lobotomies and other psychiatric treatments. Review the hospital records and the journal records and nothing else, and without an opinion –

the hospital records and the journal records – and compile them to find out if medicine was saying what it knew. And it was saying it every time: that a person is at the complete mercy in this society of mental treatment for political reasons. Fascinating, isn't it?

Reminds me of an officer – all due respect to the United States Navy. I like the United States Navy. I was a navy junior myself, been in the navy. A good organization, a good outfit, best navy in the world, but it's a navy.

The United States Navy had a little – well, they had an accident, a small accident called Pearl Harbor a few years ago. And there was a commanding officer with a brilliant combat record in World War I; excellent condition this officer was in; beautiful fellow. He was out of port at the time Pearl Harbor happened, and for six months he'd been saying, „The increased signs of Japanese military activity in the Pacific demonstrate that we had better be extremely alert.“ Nobody was alert So he went out and got alert. And he was smart enough not to be in that harbor.

So he sailed back in, and he went up to headquarters and he said, „My God! What have you done?“ „Now,“ he said, „let's patch this up right away and let's get the squadron I have here alert We'll get those aircraft carriers, and we'll at least repair it to that degree, because you people have made a terrible mess of things.“

You know what they did to that officer? It wasn't Monday morning after December the seventh when that man was in a hospital room, under detention as a dangerous psychotic, and was shipped to Saint Elizabeth and retained there until it wasn't likely that he would give any story to the press.

I know that man. I've been down there several times around Saint Elizabeth's, and it's interesting the use which is occasionally made of insanity. All you have to say about a man in the society is, „He's crazy!“ Everybody says, „Well, then, the guy isn't talking right.“

Of course, an awful lot of – there's enough truth in this, you see; there's an awful lot of crazy people that do say very crazy things. But a man has a right to his own sanity.

A Korean veteran married a little high-school kid. She didn't know anything; the psychiatrist says to her, „Now, your husband needs electric shocks, and you've got to okay it“

And she says, „Is that best? Will that cure him?“

„Oh, yes, yes, yes. Always cures them, cures them. Now you just sign on the dotted line. And if you don't sign and if you don't give us permission to give him electric shocks, we'll kick him out of the hospital.“ She signed and he died.

He didn't have the right to say whether or not he was going to get an electric shock or not.

Does this picture – and of course, I'm emphasizing the mind rather than wide, broad injustices – does this picture agree then with what you commonly suppose to be healing? Well, just in that little field it doesn't agree. Well, in the broad field it doesn't agree either.

A man is a good fellow; he works all his life, he tries to help people, he does this, he does that, and sure enough, why, at the last minute somebody picks up a club from behind and

fixes his clock for him but good. The universe demonstrates a discrepancy: what it says it is doing is opposed to what it is evidently doing.

Now, what we consider a downscale operation is where these condemned activities on the whole, in a society, occupy greater number of incidents than the activities which we supposedly uphold. And when a society cracks across that 50 percent barrier it starts down very rapidly, and this we know as a dwindling spiral.

Yes, the first thing we face is that life is evidently not doing what it says it's doing in this universe. It says it's doing one thing, it's evidently doing something else. It's at least doing something else a lot of the time. When a doctor of medicine considers killing as good as curing, this is real weird, isn't it?

Somebody goes to a place which advertisedly helps people and gets his spine broken or is disabled completely. And he doesn't have anything to say about whether or not it's going to happen to him. Big discrepancy.

In the matter of the state, people are continually, over and over, betrayed by governments. Over and over. This is the oldest story in Latin America which can be told. The government rides in on a great rosy mist of „Everything is going to be better,“ and as soon as it is there, immediately turns on the people and enslaves them to an even greater extent than the last government. That is the usual cycle.

Then there's something wrong, if this happens over and over and over.

Yes, there's something wrong all right, but one had to look pretty deep to find out what was wrong.

It sounds funny, possibly might not meet your eye instantly, but (this is a horrible thing to tell an audience), but a thing, a being or an entity which is immortal and which cannot do anything but survive is made to fight like mad because it is afraid it can't.

It is *utterly impossible* for a thetan to do *anything* but survive. And so we have to add some duress to it As soon as you recognize that, the problem will fall apart in your hands.

Survive as the basic drive of existence answers up all necessary qualifications for Homo sapiens. It describes what he's doing. What he's doing can immediately be reduced understandably to survive. Yes, he's trying to survive against the obstacles imposed upon him by the MEST universe. That's what he's trying to do, he thinks. But we look behind that scene, we get this discrepancy of he says he's trying to survive and then is succumbing all over the place.

Do you know that it's quite a trick for a person to walk across a street and not see the traffic light? That's quite a trick! A person has to work *awfully* hard to get hurt in this society. The whole society is rigged so that he can't get hurt. He can't get hurt You see that? You see what a dreadful conflict and what a logical mess this would make out of everything; trying to force, whip, beat, nag something into surviving when it can't do anything else. That is the terrible pity of it! That is the worst thing that could happen to anybody.

The Greeks had a play – I remember there's a young fellow, he wanted eternal life. Oh, he lived a thousand years, and one by one – and here he is beautiful, young, and he

watches all of his friends dying off and things change and he's dropping out of it and dropping out of it, and he can't die. Terrible. And of course, he finally winds up just begging the gods and sacrificing everything and anything just to die.

If that were written in this society at this time, the end of it would be that – the final solution was that he couldn't die. And it would end on that solemn note of apathy.

But that's what's happening. Everyone is hiding this fact. But one can survive at different levels; one can live at different levels.

And when a society becomes entirely too intense on the business of surviving, it gets very, very, very unhappy. It gets worse and worse and worse, and its level of survival, the interest in living decreases markedly. And in order to reach up to a goal where people can be a bit happier and a bit freer is the desirable goal, not just the goal of nuking somebody survive because he can't do anything else.

But you could evidently take somebody and with various duress make him insane. He wouldn't die, you understand. And that's the only non-survival thing that theta, life can do: go mad. It's the final answer: „You've made me mad. I'm insane now, I'm done. Stop punishing me.“

And insanity itself comes about when a person can't destroy himself in any other way; he has to become insane and unconscious and unknowing. And that, in a very small package, is insanity. That's the one thing that can happen to life. It's a dreadful thought, isn't it? There isn't any route up, but there's a route down.

A being that has been over a certain curve can come in, evidently, into a new life, according to para-Scientology, and for a short time on the hope that things are going to be all right, will carry on and survive and then fall off even much more rapidly again because things aren't He can't survive as Homo sapiens.

So you have this discrepancy of the basic knowledge which is hidden from everyone, even from himself, that he can't do anything but survive; he can't do anything but survive – because it's really too horrible to face. And he says he's got to survive as the answer. And these two facts do not equate, and they drive one into the franticness of delivering cruel punishments, injustice, betrayal, destruction, misery as a revolt against an untruth that one has to work very hard to survive when one can't really do anything else but survive. Do you see that clearly? It sounds like almost idiocy, and yet it explains so much.

By being a body, life can at least go through the motions of dying. Most societies will make this – when they really get downscale, they make this more and more beautiful. Lay out these corpses and so forth, and they burn candles and joss and they – the older the society gets, the more – till they finally even get noisy about it like the Chinese. Terrific ceremony.

I'm not asking you to buy immortality, but as you process a preclear, you cannot help but find out this terrible fact that this preclear is afraid of surviving, and he can't do anything else. And he's telling you the truth all the time in that his activities are motivated by survival. He's telling you the truth. And so you get these terrific discrepancies of „The way to survive is to succumb,“ „The way to succumb is to survive.“

So, you get Schopenhauer saying, „The way to handle life is to die.“ And so, we get Zeno back in Roman times in his *apatheia*, saying, „Why do anything about it because you can't do anything about it anyway. And that is why you shouldn't strive or try, because striving and trying is what they try to get you to do so as to prove to you that you can't do anything about it“ – *apatheia*¹.

Now, we have in all of the philosophies of the past the succumbers: „Let's all die. Please, please, please, let's die.“ And we have the survivors, who are saying, „Well, not only can we live, but we can live well and be happy about it“ And so these two philosophies immediately derive.

Unfortunately, the impossible philosophy is the succumb philosophy; that's an impossible philosophy of „Let's not live. Let's try to live low scale enough so that we can pretend we're dead even though we're still alive.“ It's really not workable although out through the society you will find it being attempted at every hand.

You go into a beer joint, and here in this beer joint you'll find fellows who have a very happy solution: They're just unconscious.

You go aboard a train... I don't know why this is, but almost every time I go on board a train or a boat, at least one passenger will say to me, „You know, they ought to have a capsule or something, and you take it as you get on the train and it wears off as you get off the train.“ And the last one was quite inventive and he said, „You ought to have a series of capsules which are issued with the ticket and measured according to the destination.“ The answer is, of course, to be unconscious and to not know that you're surviving.

Now, on the acceptance level on processing – is very interesting if you start on most preclears to feed them, in mock-up form in brackets, anesthetics, morphine, anything that will induce unconsciousness. It just seems that you just process and process and process and those quantities – you just can't get enough of them mocked up to satiate this craving.

The fellow, first he has to waste it, you see, because he can't have it, he knows he can't have it And you finally get him so that he actually can have things that make him unconscious, and then you get the Pacific Ocean all full of beer, and you get all the space between here and Arcturus completely full of phenobarbital, and he takes that, and the bank is just insatiable on this. There is a terrific desire for unconsciousness. And if you didn't know this about this preclear, you would go on trying to make him more alert.

Communication depends upon a greater awareness and the ability to put out further space. And you take somebody whose entire ambition is tied up in being unconscious so that he won't survive and you say, „Come on now, fellow, let's have some more space.“ Oh no. No, he doesn't want any of that That will make him survive!

Now, maybe you don't see completely how this problem is idiotic. It's even turned away at the present time to the extent where, although most people will vaguely admit that

¹ *apatheia*: a reference to one of the central themes of the school of philosophy founded by the Greek philosopher Zeno (ca. 334-ca. 262 B.C.). It taught that man should be free from passion and indifferent to emotion, pleasure and pain, but not without rational feelings. *Apatheia* means without feelings.

there is such a thing as a human spirit, and this in most of the lands of the world, it's a sort of a disgraceful thing.

„Well, yes, when I was younger I went to church,“ they will always say. I don't know quite what church has to do with this. I've been puzzled about this lately. But they will say this: „Yes, when I was younger I used to believe in this. But of course then I realized that...“

Scientific world today is tremendously interested in teaching people, teaching them, see, „There's no such thing as a human soul. You understand that Of course, you can make up your own mind about it, students, but there really isn't any such thing as a human soul. You know that.“

And if you were to go into a physics classroom and try to convince the students there that something existed in this universe which could manufacture energy without using other fuel, he would say, „It's against the law of conservation of nature.“ And you could ask him in vain which Senate or House resolution or bill this was.

He would ask you, by the way, probably to change the mass of something by creating its energy, because he's demonstrated many times that he can take time, space, energy, matter one way or the other and show you that they're *still there*.

They have very cute experiments. They take something and burn it and trap all of its gases and ashes, and they weigh it before they burn it and they weigh it after they burn it and it weighs the same, outside of the moisture which has been lost through heat. And they demonstrate this conclusively: that matter cannot be destroyed.

And when you buy that one as a preclear or when your preclear buys that one as a preclear, the next time he tries to rub out this facsimile – *brrww*. Shocking.

But you go around and you find other people that just go *whoo-whoo*, and they're all gone! All this energy is gone. But the fellow who really buys conservation of energy, he's in a bad way, because he's bought the fact that energy cannot be destroyed, it can only be converted. And that's what this universe would love you to believe. It's really survival conscious; it's going to survive in spite of anything. Its space is going to survive. The great protagonists of this universe advocate the fact that space is space is space is space. That's their definition of space: space.

And „Space is space,“ and „Two things couldn't occupy the same space.“ Korzybski. He's wrong, unfortunately wrong. Two things can occupy the same space or one thing can be in two different spaces. But not in this universe. He didn't add that He was a man of lots of words.

Now, when it comes to understanding life by studying the behavior of the MEST universe, it's somewhat like learning all about cows by studying cowbells or something, because it doesn't work out.

You don't understand life by understanding mud. And the test for this is entirely empirical. I believe, thirty-five hundred years of written history, men have been trying to solve life by saying it was mud. And some guy decided that the human spirit, as advertised and sold in certain packages by certain organizations in the world, was not quite what the human spirit

was, and that life did not necessarily have to be the material universe, and he decided that things didn't necessarily have to be, and so he looked at the problem. And then all of a sudden you could change the mental attitude and physical attitude, to a large degree, of a human being. And up to that time, the changes were very limited. You could put him on a chopping block and cut his head off, and that sure changed him, but that was not considered nice.

Now, we look at all this and we find out that we're involved with studying something which is nothing in this universe. And so, of course, it's very hard to study. But that doesn't say it's nothing in every universe and that we just needn't get so arbitrary about it. Just because we look around and we see one universe is no reason why we suppose that there's only one universe.

You can immediately – can experience three universes. Immediately. There's your universe, and you know that doesn't necessarily agree with this universe. And if you look around at all, you will find out there's probably somebody else in the world, and his universe doesn't necessarily agree with your universe, or haven't you ever had an argument? So, there's three universes you can experience and three different kinds of ideas.

A mathematician can draw up a great many symbols which will represent all sorts of situations that wouldn't apply to this universe. So, it is fairly safe to assume that we aren't dealing with one universe or three universes, we're probably dealing with a lot of universes. Fairly safe to assume such a thing. Much safer than to assume there are only one, three or two universes. See, that's not a safe assumption. Was considered a safe assumption once.

A fellow by the name of Piazzzi, I think it was, walked out and discovered the eighth planet He was careless. He had a telescope and he pointed it at the sky. And the world was running a wonderful cycle of „don't look.“

I've forgotten who it was, I think it was Hegel. Hegel had just written a book proving conclusively the number of planets available in this solar system consisted of eight – seven. And here was somebody with the eighth. And he had proven conclusively „because seven is a mystic number and is a whole number and doesn't factor itself,“ or something – that there could only be seven planets. And he proved this without looking. And Piazzzi pointed a telescope up there and saw the eighth planet and reported it Everybody said, „We know there can't be one. Hegel said there wasn't any more. That's that“ Do you know, it just took years for somebody else to find that eighth planet again.

It's not a safe thing to do to say there is only one of anything, or that it is conclusively ended. Something always comes along. That can also apply to me, by the way. All right.

Let's take a few of these elements of this universe and find out how it is that life, from whatever universe it is or whatever thing it is, how can it exist in this universe. It isn't that life is this universe necessarily and it isn't that life is coincident with this universe completely, but there must be something in common at least between life and this universe, otherwise they would never get together.

So life then must have some sort of an idea about time. First thing, it must have some sort of an idea about time, otherwise nobody would ever get anyplace at the same time or a lot of things – not that they ever do. But you wouldn't get a general agreement on being there.

You know, you wouldn't have any present time if life, you see, wasn't in some sort of an agreement about time.

Well, you'd never have anything coordinating with anything in terms of matter. For instance, electrons flowing and other things flowing have a terrific coordination in terms of time. So that life has a concept of time, and this MEST universe has a concept of time, and these two universes then can come into confluence because of the mutual concept of time. And we look a little bit further, and we say, „What is time?“

‘Time is change in space.’ Well, that's fine, but time must be running someplace. You ask anybody where tomorrow is, and you ask anybody where the future is, and he'll tell you in this society, by the way, that it's over here on the right side; down low and on the right side normally – that's the future. And if you ask the Chinese, it would probably be over on the left. This is established entirely by your reading habit that time has a location. Because the future of any book is over to the right, and you're always reading into the future from left to right. Time has no location.

But if you could consider the MEST universe as coordinated in its motions and these motions merely continuing, and if you could conceive of life not as a flowing mass or energy, if you could conceive of life as a sort of a pointer which hung over this change of motion... A pointer like this hung over this change of motion. Here's the flow of change of the MEST universe. And life has a coordinated viewpoint on the flow of change, and life stands still and observes this change, instead of looking at it in reverse. Life, you see, is obviously the one thing which can mobilize MEST, so that one rather thinks of life's concept as something that moves all around.

If you could see life as a single viewpoint on this coordinated change, you would get the idea of what a flow of time is. It doesn't go anyplace, time doesn't, it doesn't move in any direction; it changes in its atomic structure, its particle structure and so on, and it's just this consistent interchange. And as it changes life observes these changes and then life measures this as change and doesn't move in space, but these things move in space, and you have a fairly good idea of what time is.

You could go into that and think about it for a while and it becomes very plain; there's nothing much to that. But much more important than that is what in the name of common sense is space?

The utter conceit of any Greek (much less anyone from MIT) of using the word „space“ without saying what he meant anywhere in his own work, and using symbols for space in his mathematics without saying what space was, is a conceit which should have a monument built to it, real big monument Gutzon Borglum or somebody should build it.

Because this is as bad as a streetcar conductor driving a streetcar without knowing what one looked like. Yet they've had this beautiful idea that „Everybody must know what space is because we all agree that we know the word.“ Well, believe me, that's not good enough, not half, and not for anything, because we know this word space: „It's a hollow spot with indefinite boundaries,“ evidently. You read physics and study it for a while and you find out that's what it is: it's sort of a hollow spot with indefinite boundaries, in something.

So, going back in this problem, one was faced with something very horrible: he didn't have a basic definition; that was astonishing. And this definition was said by the physicist to belong in psychology, and was said by the psychologist to be a problem of physics, and that was as far as it went. What's space? Well, you had to solve – get some idea what space was. All right.

There was a missing basic definition: What is space? Boy, nothing easier. Space is a viewpoint of dimension, and that isn't just mixing words up, because the second you use that definition you can actually just crack cases with that definition. It's a viewpoint of dimension. That's all it has to be. The Doctorate lectures cover this at great length. But here, we're just concerned here with that awful simplicity. That's a very stupid sort of a simplicity to say something is a viewpoint of dimension and we immediately know more.

Well, you can, of course, have several coincident viewpoints of several different dimensions, because life can make space with great ease, only life can make static space. Ah, something new – static space.

Why, the physicist knew all the time that he was working entirely with a static space; the physicist knew all about statics. We'll get that – a moment He knew that space was static; this was nothing strange that a being could make static space; space was static. Or was it?

I wouldn't like to go on very broad record saying this, because somebody might pick this up and build a bigger atom bomb. And we wouldn't want that.

The funny part of space in this universe is, it is not static space. We're not living in static space. The rate of creation of new space in this universe is – MEST universe – is probably one over c . New space. And that gives you apparent motion on the part of anchor points in a consecutive and continuous line.

You go back and throw this into the Einstein theory and it'll work I mean, it's fascinating, but here's space. Space is going „new space, new space, new space,“ see? „New space, new space“; all the time new space, brand-new space.

And of course, in every brand-new space it's a brand-new space because you have a change of position of particles. That's why it's new space: particles of light, which are the most fluent particles which we observe in this universe are traveling at a certain speed – particles of light All right At each new position they are a new anchor point And they assume a new position at a very high rate of speed, measured by themselves, with life viewing it

Here is something which, to some degree, we get to an upper limit of understanding, because we say, „The speed of light is.“ You see? We say it's 186,000 zum-zum-zum miles per second. That's the speed of light But we're saying „miles per second“ and the second we say „miles“ we're talking about space.

But if we considered each particle creating new space every time there was new relative position amongst the particles – new relative position amongst the particles, you have a new space, you see? We would then see that space was being created at the rate each particle was moving.

Don't look so lost It's not important.

The only thing that's important about it – if you want to build an atom bomb. Energy is the flow of particles, and energy condenses into matter and we're off into the material universe again. We can have a wonderful time with this. But these particles are anchor points, so we get lots of relative spaces rather than a pack of anchor points. You see how this is?

Instead of saying we have this space which is full of anchor points which are all smashed together making a solid object, we'll say this solid object is a bunch of relative spaces; makes more sense because it works better in processing.

But let's get down here to the very, very important omission: to leave a fellow without any definitions was the dirtiest trick that heritage could do, and I'm going to get even with heritage sometimes.

I had a *Book of Knowledge* when I was two years of age; my father bought me a *Book of Knowledge*. I didn't know what he expected me to do with it; I couldn't lift one of the volumes. And there was a very, very beautiful young girl, I remember, on the cover plate of one of the volumes, and this beautiful young girl was reading probably a *Book of Knowledge*. And it said as the caption under that, „The Heir to the Ages.“ It should have been „heirress,“ but it was „heir.“ „The Heir to the Ages.“ And they disinherited me, because here were terrific essentials which didn't seem to be present And the one that wasn't present was the one that said it was absent, which was zero; there was no zero.

You know, everybody came along and they said, „Well, zero. You know what zero is. You want to flunk arithmetic? You better know what zero is. It's a goose egg. And you put it down on a piece of paper. That's all. And if you don't know that, you'd better quit“ And that's about all a mathematician knows what – about zero.

But mathematics unfortunately came into the picture immediately, because mathematics turns out to be a servomechanism of the human mind. Or the human mind – if a mathematician won't agree with that, because mathematics are godly, we know that. So we'll just put it this way: „Let's make the human being a slave.“ The human mind is a servomechanism to all mathematics, because mathematics is something which man uses to solve problems; the human mind is that servomechanism to all these mathematics. Therefore and thereby and therein, let's observe something once and for all, right now, that there isn't any problem with that microphone, that there isn't any problem with that glass of water, there is no problem with this platform, there's no problem with these lights; with the management of the hotel there's a problem, but not with the hotel. There's no problem until there's a mind there to conceive a problem about it Now, that's a hard one, sometimes, to get home.

You go down and drive down the street and you realize there's no problem about any one of those cars, but somebody comes along and tells you, „Well yes, one of those cars might run up over the curb and might run into another car and might smash the other car.“

You say, „Who is that a problem to?“

„It's a problem to the drivers.“ They start to say, „It's a problem to the cars.“ It's no problem to those cars. Whether or not they break down, improve, have less gas consumption, more gas consumption or run across stubble fields, it's no problem to them at all They never

think about it; they just do *it* And if they break down and that's the end of them, well, they have broken down and that's the end of them; there's no problem, in other words.

And you see neon lights flashing, and these neon lights say – I won't put a commercial plug on here – let's see, these neon lights say, well, „Coca-Cola.“ (That isn't commercial anymore, that's just highway robbery.)

You see this big sign down here, neon sign and it's flash-flash-flash, „Coca-Cola, Coca-Cola,“ you know – flash-flash-flash. And you say, „There's no problem about that sign.“

Somebody would say, „Well, yes there is, it might go off! It might stop shining!“

You say, „That's a problem to the sign, huh?“

„No. No. It's not a problem to the sign. But it would be a problem to the fellow who maintained the sign!“

And you say, „He presumably has a mind.“

All of a sudden, the fellow starts to get a new viewpoint on MEST. This stuff doesn't think.

The engineer loves to build up tubes and plug in sockets and oh boy, cranks and wheels and shiny dials and call it an ENIVAC or a UNIVAC or something less publishable. But when it comes to that machine solving problems, remember, that machine never solves a problem that isn't fed to it A mind thinks of a problem and feeds it to the machine.

Yes, you could set the machine running so that it would go on solving problems endlessly and you could go on setting it so that it would go on solving problems endlessly on the basis of the fact that it had been set to solve problems endlessly, and it would hand out answers, but there would – not a single one of them would be what we classify a problem, because they all would have been started in concatenation by a fellow who combined some MEST and who set the machine running in the first place. And the answers would not be answers till somebody came along and read them. And then they would be answers.

But somebody says, „Well, they go into books and they're published and they're sent all over the place, and it's all automatic, it's all automatic, it's all auto – – and we got to have everything automatic.“ But the point is, MEST doesn't think.

So, this tells you immediately that there's something wrong here with mathematics in general if they say, „Mathematics exist as mathematics, have always been mathematics, will always be mathematics, and are entirely independent“ – we all get down on our right knee at this moment – “and are entirely independent of the human race.“

Oh no, they're not I saw an arithmetic textbook in a ruined cabin one time; been lying mere for years, hadn't solved a problem all the time it was there.

So life takes these things in symbols, combines them, does things with them, changes them and creates problems with them. And if life immediately says, then, „Well, there must be a why to the reason MEST is running this way, and there must be a reason. There must be a reason.“

I could tell you what has more reasons than anything else that you know about at the moment. The thing which has the most reasons is the human body. It's got a reason for everything. Boy, it's really got reasons!

And is it daffy! Oh, but it's got lots of reasons. And these reasons, all added together, add up (if you want to run it back far enough) to what? The survival of something which can't die. Hideous, huh?

Well now, let's look at this mathematics, and we'll realize that there is something else about mathematics. Mathematics are very strange. In the field of algebra, an algebra professor will be the first one to demonstrate to you that one equals zero. He'll be the first one to tell you this, because he could prove it to you very proudly. He'll write up his algebra equation and then say, „Well, of course, you divide anything by zero, and of course that makes an error.“

Does it always make the same error?

„No, because by dividing by zero you can always make one equals two.“ He could make two equal twenty by dividing by zero. Any time he divides by zero he gets a different answer. The jerk. It's a wild variable!

There's a gradient scale of zero, and any mathematical equation which unqualifiedly contains zero as zero is going to solve in different ways, and then we get quantum mechanics. That's the safe and stable mathematics with which they are building the atom bomb.

Zero is a gradient scale.

All right, do you mean zero right now? All right, we mean zero right now, and zero – don't write it down on a piece of paper, then, because the second you write it down on a piece of paper you're writing zero for the future.

Is there always going to be a zero of apples on that table? I'm afraid you can't guarantee that. So, zero then becomes nonabsolute.

Have there ever been apples on that table? You can't guarantee that either. But the second you say „a past zero“ you have a nonabsolute. Well, that's just there.

Now, you mean a „zero of what“?

Well, a zero of nothing.

What's nothing?

Well, it's nothing of course; it's not anything.

Well, if you want to say what's not anything, you will have to say not anything past, present and future. *Whoo!* We have an unobtainable goal. And we got a wonderful maybe, yes. All right.

We've got zero, then, something else. Zero where?

And therefore, if a mathematician wrote „nonlocated zero, geographically located zero,“ if he put it on a piece of paper which was going to be moved, it would become a variable, because a zero to be zero would not have any geographical location. None. That would

be a real zero, so any time he says, „A zero of apples on the table,“ there’s still something there; there’s a point on the table.

And therefore, zero is a wild variable in all mathematics. That would be very disheartening for a mathematician to realize that, because he’s been pinning his faith for years – at least he had zero.

Now, what’s that got to do with us? Well, we find out that life to this universe represented zero but didn’t behave like zero should. He had no location, no wavelength, had no time element in itself; it didn’t have any mass, and we examined it and we found a theoretical, absolute zero, as far as this universe was concerned. But this didn’t mean that it didn’t have a somethingness elsewhere. It has a nothingness here, and in this universe it begins to identify itself with space.

The first thing with which a spirit identifies itself is space, so the space has nothing in it so the being thinks he is nothing. And that’s your first identification and he starts off from there, and of course, he isn’t there from there on after.

This, in short, was the heritage with which one started to solve the problem: life as a function and behavior in a society which did not know what time was, space was, energy, zero or mathematics. And this is a very poor heritage for a physicist to start out on.

Well, I don’t say I’ve solved these things. I’ve merely pointed out some of their idiosyncrasies and have succeeded in divorcing us from a great deal of superstition, because the one thing that happens, as far as we can find out, when a person can’t look, he has to think. And a person who does an awful lot of thinking isn’t looking. And the person who does the most thinking is crazy.

And if we want people to be happy, we’ve got to get them to a point where they can see, because this stuff doesn’t bite; doesn’t bite them. Might hurt their shins.

And we find out such astonishing things – that work is desirable; that’s fascinating. Nobody in America would believe that. Work is desirable, pain is desirable, impacts are desirable. Action of anything, any characteristic is intensely desirable. And so, some of these weird things about life begin to explain themselves.

And how do we find out about this?

Well, we just look.

We have processes which bring a person up from thinking about it to looking at it And the second he looks at it, why, it all blows away, all the clouds and worries and doubts, anxieties which he had.

But believe me, he can think of enough reasons about enough problems to avoid looking for an awful long time. And I think he’s avoided it very successfully that – for forty-five hundred years mat I know about, and I have been trying to figure out ways and means of breaking the habit of not looking.

And if all we did with these processes, if all we did with these processes was to make better drivers, we would still have reason to be here, because all the drivers on the highway are busy thinking. Ooh!

Knowledge is an instinctive truth, really, and one never figured himself in any direction but deeper into another problem.

If you want to know, Me, in its purest sense, knows pervasively and instinctively, and you don't find out about knowing by thinking, you find out about knowing by being able to look.

And the first stage is you know how to look and then you become free enough so that you know. And it's the most elementary problem in the world, idiotically elementary. And that was why nobody ever wanted to solve it Nobody wanted to solve the problem, because nobody wanted to look like an idiot As a matter of fact, it is as much as a man's pride is worth to solve this problem. All right.

There are the various elements. We have a life which approximates zero in this universe, which is busy surviving, madly surviving and hoping nobody will recognize the thing that it can't do is die.

But a thetan can do all sorts of things in going upscale and downscale and sometimes getting down to a low, low level, that it just can't bring itself back up again. But it's still surviving in spite of the fact that it's at that very, very low level, it's still surviving.

PROCESSING AND ITS GOALS

A lecture given on 1 October 1953
by L. Ron Hubbard

62 MINUTES

The first talk today is entitled „Processing and Its Goals.“ You possibly know quite a bit about this already. But possibly new light can be shed upon it because it actually has been codified much more closely than ever before.

Every now and then, perhaps, an auditor has said to himself, „Well, what am I trying to do with this fellow?“ He’s had qualms about it. „Supposing I free up the mind of this man? This man’s a criminal, he has criminal potentiality. Supposing I free up his mind, and then we just find that he goes out and shoots more people dead than before?“ There’s always this question. Perhaps until a person sees this dearly, there always will be the question: Is there any use in setting somebody free?

That many auditors seem incapable of really letting a preclear go—many of them, many of them will bring him up to a certain point and then immediately start to run techniques which won’t send him any further. They get up to a point where *they’re* free, and then they think that setting him just a little bit more free than that will make a superior wolf.

I’ve seen this. It’s not a very happy fact I don’t expect you to accept it unless you yourself observed it.

But in processing – in processing, our goal is freedom. The only thing wrong with individuals is their restriction. But actually, what happens if you go to the complete limit of freedom? Freedom would be restriction. And we’d have to define what was restricting life. Well, life is actually being restricted by MEST, and it believes that it’s being restricted by life. And life, dramatizing the restrictions of MEST, turns around and restricts life – which is antipathetic to the survival of all life. That’s not good.

But life, to learn about MEST, approximates and imitates MEST. MEST is quite restrictive, it’s quite forceful, it’s made out of force. And so we get this imitation, and this imitation comes back into life, and then life restricts life.

It would only be in such a way that parents desiring the very best they could for their children would do the things to their children that they do. They do these things in the belief that they are preparing the child for life, preparing the child for better living. This is not true. None of these things that a parent does prepares the child for any better living.

Life itself, which is to say existence in the MEST universe – when you say life itself in this universe, that’s just what you mean: existence in this universe – has a heavy enough hand on a human being without adding and complementing that heavy hand with a parental hand.

And when the parent steps in to compound the injury that the MEST universe can do, it makes an individual stand alone: He feels himself defied now on all fronts with no refuge.

The moment he does this he starts downscale. And he becomes what is essential in MEST, which is the „only one.“ And he runs this computation, the only one, deeper and deeper and deeper and worse and worse and worse, until he practically is the „none one.“ The „only one.“ Now, we'll cover that a little bit later in these series. But that is mainly what's wrong with your preclear. It is not enough to say he is alone. If he were alone he'd be happy about it, but he's the only one who can do it, the only one who can't do it He is the single identity, which itself must face up to the entire existence.

And most people go around carrying the idea of „I“ and „they.“ And sometimes his „I“ will include the two or three people present with him. But it is „I“ against „they.“ And the „I“ considers that all „they“ are collective and unified and working together and that the „I“ itself is separate. So to each individual you get these two pools: you get – [marking on blackboard] here he is, see, and he's capable of just this little tiny bit of force. And here *they* are. See? That's a sad frame of mind. Yet if he looked around and wished to examine it, he'd find something remarkable: He'd find out that all the people of a downscale culture think the same thing. This presents a rather funny picture, doesn't it? It presents every fragment supposing itself to be the only fragment and that all other fragments are collected and unified.

And out of this sad picture we get anxiety. Because „I“ does not consider that he will be permitted to be happy. He can't be permitted to be happy, because „they“ aren't happy and he has to agree with them, and their collective mass is much greater than his individual mass, so he naturally feels that he is succumbing. It's very elementary when you look at it this way.

Truth of the matter is there is no body of „theys.“ You can go down here and take, one by one, each policeman on the Philadelphia police force aside and talk to him quietly by himself, and if you did that for two or three weeks you would probably finish off the personnel of the Philadelphia police force. You'll find every one of them is hoping that the rest of the police force will go on accepting him as a policeman. And each one of them is convinced, you see, that if „they“ really knew, why, they wouldn't be able to accept him as part of the police force. The police force to him is a large force, you see. It's a large group. And this large group is built up of units and these units are not unified, not worth a nickel.

Infiltrative sources, agitators and so on work upon this instinctively. They will go to workers and they will tell each worker how alone he is in the world, unless he unifies and unites. And they'll get this big mock-up of a big unification called a union just so the agitator can act as a parasite on the worker.

Now, this would be rather the wrong way to go about it to convince each man that he was offended – which is the standard operation. They convince each individual that he is offended and put upon, and the only way he can resist this hidden source of force is by unifying against that source of force. And therefore, the whole group is depressed in tone because all of them feel like they are resisting, that they *have* to stay together, and there's enormous force available here. Now, to expect such a group to be happy or successful is almost impossible.

Here, the worker is convinced that there are two bodies: here is the worker with himself here, see, and then here's the rest of the workers here, and then here's management up

here as a separate body. And he looks at this as three groups now and he becomes antagonistic, as this group, toward this group and hopes both groups will assume that he's a part of this group. And if he's a member of management, he hopes that this group will assume he's part of that group, although he's really here too.

Now, there's a rule of thumb used in the MEST universe which tells you at once what a facsimile is: If you want to trap him, make him resist it Make him resist it and you've got him.

A thetan, a life unit, starts resisting something – a thing – and that, if it is a MEST object, of course will resist back, because it is following the laws of MEST which are Newton's laws: inertia, interaction, acceleration. Life doesn't have to follow those laws at all, but it starts fighting MEST and it resists MEST and then MEST resists it. And then MEST, being inanimate and unthoughtful, can resist much harder than the individual can resist, and the next thing you know, the individual has accepted what he has resisted. Insidious.

Now, if you can get anybody to put up a battle at something, he will eventually become the thing which he battled. That's a facsimile. Here you have a number of units of energy being shot at an environment Makes a picture. It takes it just as surely as though you had made a plaster cast of the environment. Just as though you'd taken a picture of a footprint The plaster particles in this case would be the units of energy shot by the being.

Show you how that is. This is a facsimile. Here is the individual here, and here is another person here, and the individual puts out units of energy in this direction; and these units of energy are energy and they are capable of becoming compact and becoming matter. And these go out here. And now we have the person go away and we have „I“ here, and T has this picture.

This is the most astonishing thing to a preclear when he finds this out that his facsimiles don't have guts or backs. They don't, you see. They're casts of the surface. And so he gets the idea he has to look *behind* everything to really find out about it, because he hasn't got any of the *behind* anything. He only has the surface.

And these beautiful facsimiles which are put up, you take them and crush them together, you see, and they're very light pieces of energy. But they represent patterns of very forceful energy sometimes, and so the preclear has the idea that he must be facing the thing when he is only facing a *shell* of the thing. A facsimile is a light – you might say – energy cast It is the imprint rather than the shoe. Fools one very much.

But why does he start to take pictures in the first place? Well, in the first place he could make pictures; he made them all solid. They were very solid, very compact pictures. And then he started to make them of things. This mechanism is still with him, you see, and he starts to make pictures *of* things, and he duplicates the force of them.

Why does he duplicate them? Just because he's resisting them or because he wants them. But he doesn't start out wanting them, he starts out resisting them. And then he resists and resists, and then he finally gets the idea that this thing is resisting *him*, and the vectors turn around and the facsimile starts to collapse upon him. And the next thing you know, this facsimile will accept a duplicate of this facsimile, so he feels he wants things just like the fac-

simile, mostly because the facsimile is an impression of something which is resisted. And the second you turn resistance around, you get pull. That shouldn't be unclear to you. You just turn a resistance around and it'll pull.

Now, you can take a preclear and have him look at Grandpa in a facsimile, and then just turn the facsimile around and you'll get various combinations. But he'll find that there's a communication line there, there's an energy line. He thinks it's a communication line, and really I guess that's what you could call it, but actually it's just lines of force, resistance. And he's looked at Grandfather and resisted Grandfather often enough so these lines of resistance have become very heavy, and you get this strange picture of the child who just has to have the ally that he hates.

And you run some preclear along, and you try to run off the grief charge of Great-aunt Bessie. And you start in at the beginning of this grief charge and you start on through the grief charge and as you go on through... All of a sudden, „I really hated her!“ he says.

„Well, all right. Let's finish it off anyway.“

„No, dickens with her. I don't care about her, I hate her! I'm not worried about her!“

So you run out how much he hated his great-aunt Bessie – and all of a sudden said, „Well, you know, she wasn't a bad old girl, after all.“ And then if you don't – if you returned into it a little bit deeper, you would find out a great love for Aunt Bessie, and here's all this complexity.

It's just the matter of whether or not the facsimile is a collapsed line or still an extended line. See how that could be? He's resisted and resisted and resisted. All right, he gets to the point of complete resistance and the point of complete resistance is an utter breakdown of all resistance, which results, then, in an energy deposit, which itself has attractive force just like gravity. And he's got an energy deposit called Aunt Bessie, and now this will pick up other things like it and you get associative reasoning. It's built on resistance: things resist him, he resists those things. And that thing which has resisted him harder than he has resisted it – but he's doing all the resisting, you understand – but his picture is something resisting harder than he resisted it and he thinks it's still there, only it's resisted so hard that he is it. Therefore, he has to accept what it wanted simply because of the lines of force involved therein.

This shouldn't be very difficult to see. If you stand up and lean your hand against a wall for a few minutes – you just stiffen your hand against the wall, then you take your hand away. Even if you put your arm in your pocket, you'll still feel your hand against the wall. I mean, this isn't a matter of running the effort of it, all you've got to do is just *lean* on that wall for a little while and then stand back and try not to lean on the wall. Well, you can run it that the wall is leaning just that hard against you. And if you're trying to push the wall away that hard, the wall is trying to push you away that hard, you now have an energy picture of the push of the wall. And that energy picture of the push of the wall would become a desire for the wall if it so happened that your pushing against the wall collapsed you against the wall. This is obvious, then, that you couldn't resist the wall. So if you can't resist it you have to have it. See how that is? There's just nothing to this at all. If you can't resist it, you have to have it.

And so the MEST universe gets them going and coming. And you start running Acceptance Level Processing and you find out that some fellow has been taught very carefully that he must detest flatirons. His whole family told him to stay away from flatirons; Mama told him and Papa told him, and his grandparents told him that flatirons were bad and that he mustn't touch flatirons and he must stay away from them. (Maybe Mother worked in a laundry or something.) And he went on about flatirons and he knows he has to detest flatirons; that's the whole point of existence. When he sees a flatiron, he has to resist it. See, they got him fighting flatirons by warning him about flatirons, and so he starts resisting these flatirons. And then you find him at the age of thirty-two with a passionate desire for flatirons, he loves them; he keeps small gold ones around.

Well, this happened immediately after the first time he was really seriously burned after having been very well indoctrinated about flatirons. A flatiron was senior to him now, so he wanted flatirons – it wanted him, he is a flatiron.

How many preclears have you ever found who wanted to be bedposts or who were trying to be plates or platters or the Sun or MEST objects? Well, if you've never looked for it, it's possibly because you haven't encountered it. But if you look for it, you'll encounter it every time. You'll find preclears are trying to *be* MEST objects. They're not analytically trying to be anything; it's just this matter of resisting something and the thing collapsing on them and then wanting it. It won. (And reference Book One, the winning valence.) And there's the mechanism back of the winning valence.

A person resists and resists until he can no longer resist and his resistance is overcome, which immediately results in „a need for.“ Well, the only way he can now go on resisting is probably to turn the facsimile around. (He does many things with it.) But if he turns the facsimile around to resist the other way to because it's senior to him, you see that you could run this in such a way that if he resisted the flatirons long enough, that all the force of resistance for flatirons would be the flatiron resisting.

A person would thus get very mixed up about it all. He isn't carrying anything in his bank except his own energy and his own energy is a picture of those things which have happened to him. There isn't any foreign energy in the bank. It's all his own energy. Therefore somebody comes along, namely Mama, and says to him, „Well, it's all your own fault. You know that you're responsible for it“ He knows he is because it's his picture made out of his energy. You see, he can't say anything else, see, sure it's his fault. You see how that is? Because everything that happened he now has in a package, which is made exclusively out of his own energy. So therefore he must have done it because he did the facsimile. And the facsimile is his. And if people keep caving in this and saying, „Well, you're just pretending to be hurt You know that you aren't hurt,“ he'll get this funny idea of pretending that – well, he knows he can really help these things.

And I swear there are people going around with fractured skulls and all sorts of things that aren't even vaguely healed up, knowing they have to have them because they're their fault and they did it, and that they had nothing to do with. It's not somebody's fault that he happened to be sleeping in a bed when the wall fell in on him. And yet he'll be convinced these things are his fault.

Then an ally will die that he has resisted and fought with a great deal, and when the ally dies his immediate assumption is that he killed him. Have you run across that manifestation? „Well, if I just had called earlier on the telephone, I would have stopped him from leaving the house and therefore he wouldn't have stepped under the truck.“ You get the idea This silly line of logic, making oneself cause across the boards for *bad* things.

Well, it's not sensible, not even vaguely, because it isn't true. But the facsimile pattern: They resisted the ally so there are overt acts; and the ally resisted them, so there are overt acts. And now every picture of the ally is being made to substitute for the ally that is missing. And the pictures are their own pictures, so the ally is now their person but the ally is now dead; so, of course, it follows out that if the ally was only theirs, only they could have killed the ally and that's that, so the ally is dead. Here you get a confliction of the two universes. Here you have guilt, so on.

This is not difficult to understand *in action*. It is, perhaps, a little bit difficult to understand in words. But if you'll just sit down and start to resist the wall with energy beams from yourself for a while, you'll all of a sudden see the whole mechanism start to show up. You'll find out that eventually you will feel, „Well, it's kind of a nice wall.“

Now the funny part of it is, is you have to be very calculatingly precise to resist the wall. It's quite a trick. It's a much easier thing *not* to resist the wall. This stuff is so much space that if you weren't very careful when you leaned on it you'd probably stick your arm through it It's a very nice calculation of wavelengths and matched lengths and matched space areas and matched facsimiles and *whoo!*

You start running a preclear, by the way, as some of these Resistive Vs, you swear that if you moved one hair of his head onto the other side of his head he'd die from his conduct He isn't going to move anything, he isn't going to change anything, he isn't going to let anything happen if he can possibly help it That's his behavior towards you.

Well, that's just this sort of thing. It's such a nice, neat calculation to start resisting the MEST universe at just the right wavelength and get just the right facsimiles, that after a while, if a person were to think of it, he would realize that he's doing something like walking a tight-rope across Niagara Falls. But instead of that, he says, „It's all I can do. I can't do anything else, I am trapped.“ You see, he's just done it so often, he's so used to this wavelength. But if you just shift your perception a little bit...

One of the ways to shift your perception is just get the concept for a moment And by the way, do this, all of you, just for a moment here. Look at that wall back there and say to yourself very forcefully, get that concept very forcefully: „It's an actual wall. It's real and actual.“ (*pause*)

Do you note anything happening?

Audience: (various responses)

What happens? What happens to that wall?

You're running half of the energy flow on it, and of course, during that moment the wall would tend to fade or disappear. And if you will hold that concept for just a little while,

the wall will disappear. And if you hold it with your MEST eyes for a little while and if you run that for a while with MEST eyes, your MEST eyes won't see it That's MEST eyes. That's very interesting.

You want to run the opposite just to get yourself out of it, which is: „The wall is not there.“ And so I want you to run now – look straight at that wall and say, „It's not there.“
(*pause*)

All right, now what happens to that wall?

Audience: (various responses)

Get more solid?

Audience: (various responses)

Move up to you?

Audience: (various responses)

It's dangerous to run those two things for a little while because MEST starts to disappear and you have to fumble. And if you had a few dollars on you, you wouldn't want that to happen. So you don't want yourself getting upset, so don't run that concept too much because...

But it's really just like walking a tightrope trying to keep check on time, motion, and so forth, and these particles. And a person, to assist himself, can't do anything else but make pictures, but he then says he's doing it to assist himself. He starts to have reasons, you see.

Once he sees it, somebody points it out to him and says, „That is MEST.“ A little child, you say, „That is a rock.“ I swear little kids very often say, „Where? Where? Where? Oh, there. Oh, sure.“ Next day he falls over it and busts his shin. He goes through this cycle of resistance.

Now, MEST is rigged with a gravitic pull when it's in solid mass. There is such a thing as gravity – it is blood brother to magnetism – and the gravity of Earth keeps one down on Earth. But twenty-four hours a day there is a current of gravity going through your body. Does that stay with you? No. You can set that up on equipment such as a physics lab and you'll find out that that gravity does not stay there. The gravity does not stay there, but a picture of the gravity stays there in you. It doesn't stay there on MEST equipment; it doesn't keep reading on a scales.

A butcher's scale is a gravity meter. And when you take the meat off that scale it ceases to weigh the meat right away. And when you take a man off the gravity level or move him on the gravity level, what do you know, he keeps on weighing the meat He's got pictures, you see, and those pictures are pictures of the flow of gravity.

One of the weirdest things you can do to a preclear is to get the idea, in terms of effort and thrust and so on, that he is standing up and then that he is not standing up when he is lying down. And he will get some interesting flows in his body. He'll find out that when he tries to put a force down or to *hold* down, he'll start feeling like he's going up. Well, this is because he's carrying pictures. We can explain it that way: he's carrying these pictures around

of gravity, and the pictures, because they are consecutive pictures taken through time, when they run off, they start to run off consecutively through time. But it isn't the time that is here, it's the time that is in the bank. And all the force is there, everything he's resisted is still there. Now, that's a very provoking fact to most people, very upsetting.

Now, there are tremendous numbers of conclusions that could be drawn from this, but life itself is not dependent for its ability to think upon force; it *thinks* it's dependent upon it

You know, you yourselves have probably taught somebody to think it over by giving him a solid slap in the jaw. You probably taught somebody „a lesson.“ (That's what it's called.) And you've probably been taught a few lessons by MEST when it fell on you or you ran it into something. And this is essentially education as it is understood in the modern school system. You get an impact and the impact is a piece of solidity, and the solidity then has a certain gravitic component, and it will compare and match itself to other pieces of solidity in the bank; and so you get currents flowing, more or less automatically, and this is thought per impact And that's stimulus-response thought impacts.

Life, all by itself, is evidently quite capable of thought independent of MEST. But it doesn't think about MEST: it can think about anything. But you take somebody and bang them around and they will become thoughtful. They will every time, if not unconscious.

And you have immediately, then, the gradient scale of unconsciousness, which ends at the bottom with a theoretical, absolute unconsciousness, very theoretical because it has no duration that you can determine. Upscale a little bit to very, very thoughtful conduct and philosophic reasoning, upscale a little bit to some practical reasoning, and upscale a little bit to doing something.

The Indian, the Iroquois Indian, I think it was, had an illness. He called it „the sickness of long thinking.“ And this never was truer than somebody who has been seriously abused.

Now, very often this has operated to our benefit. We have H. G. Wells, for instance, talking his first departure from action after, I think, he had a broken arm. And he said the broken arm gave him an opportunity to read, and he read a great deal of things and he became interested in thinking and he started writing. He was just a little boy when this happened to him.

But you'll find this history going rather thoroughly through the race: that illness is followed by thinking, and that a person learns from a number of injuries. This is stimulus-response at work, but this is one of the behavior patterns of life.

It doesn't follow, then, that a person gets sane because he has an impact. We've found this quite the reverse. But it does follow – something does follow there: that a person who has resisted and then begun to *want* things finds out that he should have energy.

Now, you wouldn't think, that sitting there today, you wouldn't suppose that people think they have scarcities of energy in themselves. You wouldn't realize it, unless you really looked, that in national magazines of a great country on the face of the Earth today there are ads which are calculated to save energy or to create energy from exterior sources. And you would hardly suppose that a great civilization has mechanized itself solely because it knows it doesn't have enough energy to do it itself. No, you wouldn't think that this had happened,

because this is really insane. But that is the case. Energy, it must be saved. There are labor-saving devices. It's wonderful.

A man who has a labor-saving device would automatically – you'd say, to be sane about it – would have to, perforce, have such an urgent scheduling of all available energy that he *bad to* have something like that. It wasn't that it was desirable, because having something to do gives one an opportunity to create and use and direct effort And in this universe that's about all there is to do. And that is action and motion and enjoyment and sensation, and all the rest of them are in that same category: the creation and direction of effort And when you get a labor-saving device, it is something which creates or saves or directs effort for you – automaticity.

So, let's take a look at a society for a moment and just wonder what's going on in a society which has, as its prime motive, the acquisition of labor-saving devices and the acquirement of money so that it doesn't have to work. The goal of the society is retirement and the end of the society is obtaining equipment which saves it from putting out effort.

We'd say, if we looked around real quick under the roofs of some of the state institutions, we'd find quite a few loops. I won't say this is the case. But the common denominator of neurosis and psychosis is one common denominator that is so obvious, whether you talk to the person or not it's „can't work.“ That is the common denominator of neurosis, psychosis, straight across the boards: „can't work.“ Because when a person no longer creates, uses or directs energy, he is no longer able to keep his facsimiles at bay! And so, they collapse upon him. And they go into restimulation and he only wants the bad things which he himself has formerly resisted And the common denominator of neurosis and psychosis is „no effort,“ which is to say, „can't work.“

And if you want to know whether or not somebody was crazy in your family, just think it over for a moment and find out who it was that couldn't work. And you start processing on that person, more things will turn up than you ever dreamed that were there.

The people who worked, maybe they were mean and explosive and ornery and said terrible things and so forth, but if they worked they were not very aberrative. It was the person who didn't work that did you in. Simple.

Very often these people go completely unspotted in a family. Well, that was dear old Aunt whatever-her-name-was – Abanapaca – and she never did anything around the house, she was a lady. „Oh, she never did anything to me when I was a child.“

„No?“

„No.“

Put him on the E-Meter. That's where your preclear got religion! That's where he got scared of ghosts and things that go *boomp* in the night and why he can't sleep now without a light on in his bedroom. That was dear old Aunt Abacanapoo. She was the one in the family that didn't work.

Because, you see, it just follows through: the person who is no longer able to put out effort is the person who has resisted so much with effort and has fought so hard with effort

that the effort has at last caved in on them completely, and now they know they can't create or use effort. And such a person uses, for his own energy, impacts, past impacts. They're energy-hungry. They get starvation on the subject of energy. No matter what kind of energy, any kind of energy, they're starved for it and they can't get enough of it. And so they try to *eat* themselves out of it in the MEST universe. But they can't cure this in MEST, because what's wrong with them is in their own bank, and their own bank isn't the MEST universe. So they can't just cure it up out here in the MEST universe and they'll go through all sorts of gyrations of trying to get more energy. They don't care how it's evaluated, what kind it is, where it came from, whose it is, anything. More energy – that's their whole plea. Kleptomania, sexual perversion, all of these things are just – no matter how bad they sound, they're simply that trying to get a piece of energy, trying to get this chunk of energy.

These people will actually argue with tractors and things and fall under them and surreptitiously try to acquire sufficient injury in order to have energy. „Now,“ you say, „why is it that these preclears can't – some of these preclears can't think of anything good. They always think of things that are bad; all their facsimiles are bad. Why is this?“ Well, it's very simple. You see, the bad things are the ones that have the impact and they're only bad because everybody said it was bad to get injured and he couldn't have pain. But there are blocks of energy, and the preclear is starved for energy. And being starved, tries to pull in every piece of energy in the whole bank on himself, because it's just the reverse of what I just explained to you at first you see: he doesn't want that energy at all. But he resisted having to have exterior energy until that caved in and he felt he had to have energy from an exterior source. You see? So he winds up trying to grab all the heavy pieces of energy he has in the whole bank, which means all the heavy facsimiles, packs them around himself very solid and drains all of the white out of them. And you have black. And your preclear gets resistive – Resistive V – to processing.

Well, what does this tell you, then, about processing and its goals? It tells you that today we are handling two things: we are handling geographical location of the individual (much more of that later), and we are handling a problem of the purest mechanics in the world, just energy, scarcity of. It isn't even *kinds* of energy; just *any* kind of energy will do most of these preclears, anything.

You wonder why this girl yelled and screamed at her brother, day and night, until her brother beat her up. And she didn't learn anything about that. She went right back and yelled and screamed at her brother until he beat her up. And instead of learning some more about it, she went right back again and yelled and screamed at her brother. And you say there is just something wrong between brother and sister. „Well, it's because of the brother's vicious temper that made him beat up the sister and this made her very upset about life.“ Oh no. You're looking at the wrong side of it. He's in good shape; he's the guy that's delivering the impact. See, he's in real good shape. And she keeps asking for impacts. And the only reason she starts a fight in the first place, probably, is because she's got to have some more impacts.

You go down the highway here and when you find a wrecked car, if you find the driver and you give him a quick check on the E-Meter, you'll find out he's energy-scarce. You'll find out that when he goes home, ordinarily in the evening he takes some pills he's got – they're gelatin tablets, they're put out by Doctor Wolfits – and these gelatin tablets, he takes three of these gelatin tablets and he takes just so much vitamins and he takes this and

that and he takes it in warm milk, and then he has supper and he eats just so many calories of this and that, and so on. He may be very careful about his food or he may be very careful about how many hours he works and careful he doesn't get tired.

That's the most remarkable thing of all: a person just really has to go through an enormous lot of stuff to figure out „being tired.“ This is the end-all of silliness. They have to sleep and they *have* to have a rest and they have to save their energy, save their energy and conserve and save and conserve; that's the MEST universe: save it and conserve it. It says we can't be destroyed, so you have to save and conserve. All right.

What's this tell you about the goals of processing? You want to get your preclear into good shape. But that's too indefinite. What is good shape? Is it better moral conduct? Is it „Does he pay his quarter regularly into the poor box?“ It could be a number of things, you see. You could adjudicate this in all ways, shapes and forms. People have been doing this since the beginning of man. They've been saying, „I know you're a good man, because you...“ and then they add their pitch.

The Indian, by the way, used to have a very strenuous code of training for children. The whole tribe would praise this child for a certain action. And they'd just continue to do it. Everybody would gang up on this kid, and this kid was really in the groove. (The Indians lost out in the face of the white man, by the way.)

Now, where do we have or how can we observe whether or not we've done anything for a preclear? Well, it would just be have we gotten him into more motion that he himself is controlling? (Many, many people are in motion that they aren't controlling. It's what you call a manic state or a frantic state or something of this sort) But is he in better motion that he himself controls? Is he capable of putting out more work? Does he work? Is he interested in handling effort? Now, let's not use that definition of *work* the way it is used all the time, which is a crushing, boring, repetitive activity in which must – one must engage in order to eat That is not the definition of *work*. *Work* is foot-pounds of energy; creation and direction of energy and effort.

Well, will he create and direct more effort? Have we done anything for him if we haven't made it possible for him to create and direct more effort? Obviously we've not done anything for him that we really could do. We've made his life a little less boring or we've made his life more interesting or we've made it flatter or less interesting or something, but if we haven't increased his ability to create and direct foot-pounds of energy, we've done nothing for him.

And what is the best representation of that? The best one – talking now about Homo sapiens in particular – the best one is changing his communication condition. If you see an alteration in his communication, you have done something for the preclear. And if you don't change his communications, you have done nothing for the preclear.

Now, the truth of the matter is you very often will process a preclear who is on a hectic, frantic level of communication which appears, at first glance, upscale. And you start processing him and the next thing you know, he doesn't anymore talk like this, he's starting to talk like this. You changed his communications. That's all you were trying to do. And because

they slowed down did not mean that you worsened the case. They might have slowed down, you see, and gone under his control. That would be the test.

Now, it would take more processing to speed them up under his control. But there's the test of whether or not you've done something for a case. Not because communications are sacred, but because communications are the best representation of the handling and direction of foot-pounds of energy. That's the number one index right there, because it includes perception and it includes force.

So all of a sudden your preclear says, „You know, I'm seeing better!“

„End of session.“ You've changed his communication level.

Next time you see him it may have slumped. Very often, a case goes over a sort of an up-down curve; it improves and then sags a little bit and then improves a lot and then sags quite a bit and then improves some more. And it's always on a higher high. That's quite normal in processing. It isn't a smooth, upward curve, it's a jumpy one. But processing should occasion a communication change.

Now, how do we tell, then, whether or not a person's going to work? All right, let's say you're hiring a janitor and you want to know whether or not this janitor is going to keep the building clean. It's very easy for you to establish whether or not he's going to keep the building dean. You say to the janitor, „How long have you been working?“

He says, „Well – uh – I first – uh...“

Fire him. Don't hire him. Fire him first Reverse the cycle, because he's not going to keep the building clean the way he should. And you say, „Well, how long have you been working?“

And he says, „About ten years,“ hire him. He'll keep the building clean.

It's just one of those jackleg tests. What's his communication lag?

Now you're going to hire a secretary, and you say to this secretary – you could say – you could look her over and take micrometer calipers and find out the bicepular distances and all sorts of things, but it isn't necessary to do that. You just sit her down to a typewriter and you put some copy up in front of her and you start a stopwatch and she does sixty-five, seventy words a minute, hire her right away, quick Does it accurately, sixty-five, seventy words a minute accurately, *bang*. Because the accuracy shows control. If she does it inaccurately, very inaccurately, she's just in a hectic state of motion. Sixty-five words a minute for a secretary is phenomenal. A really good secretary would do about eighty accurately on a typewriter, consistently.

Would there be any sense at all in hiring somebody who made thirty-five words a minute? You don't want them in the office. It would be one less person, you say, so that would be one less person doing the work. No. She'll take the people around her down at least two persons apiece.

And yet, in business colleges they turn people out like that People just can't go any faster than that and they turn them out like that and they go out and they go into offices and they lose the papers and they fumble and they lose the mail and they hold it up and they get

that big order that – they hold it up long enough so that it is cancelled and so on. And you can't quite spot where all this is happening in the office unless you know something about the mind.

If you wanted to know what was wrong with an office you would simply walk through and give everybody a communications-lag test and fire all the people who had a lag and the office would straighten up. That would be all there was to business efficiency if you used this point Now, this is a horrible fact.

But in treating preclears, this is of the greatest importance to you. Because if you haven't changed the communication lag, you haven't done anything for the case.

Now, why is their communication lag going to stay slow? Is it just willful perfidiousness on the part of the preclear? No. Is it just the orneriness and meanness of the MEST universe that would make a person into this condition? No. What is it? It's a scarcity of energy: they can't put out any space because any energy that comes into the space is immediately drawn up into the bank at such a rate that the space collapses. And so they don't have any space. And out in front of them, if you ask somebody real quick, you'd say, „Whose space is it in front of your nose?“ – flash, and they'd say, „Other's, somebody else's.“ They'd say, „George's“ or „Bill's.“ Yet a person ought to own at least a foot in front of him. Very few people do. A great many people don't even own their noses. And a great, great many more don't own anything in front of their ears, nothing forward of the ear. They haven't even got this space; this space belongs to somebody else.

Why is that? It's energy starvation. Now, a person has gotten a lot of impacts at some time or another in his life, and these impacts act as a sponge for further impacts. And the person has begun to believe that he himself cannot create energy.

There's only one thing for which the whole universe punishes, there's only one punishment, one crime and that, in its fullest sense, is communicating. That's the one crime. Putting out an anchor point. (That's essentially communicating.) Putting out an anchor point is the one thing for which a person could get punished, which tells you why the people that get to the rank of general and admiral get there. It's traditional in every army and navy of a conservative country that a person is advanced in the ratio that he doesn't do anything. If he commits no crimes, he gets there. And this isn't a criticism of it, it's just the way things operate. It's just the way things operate. It just happens that that's the way it is and they don't want to get well, and so we can't do anything about it, can we?

Well anyway, the only thing that is punishable is putting out an anchor point. And so, you can tell how often this person has been slugged, slapped, hit by the reluctance he has in putting out an anchor point But there is another thing here at work: it is the remaining, the residual potential a person has in creation of energy. Some people have a tremendous energy-creation capacity. And these people can take an *enormous* slugging around without altering their communication level. That's because they're still up above that break on the Tone Scale. Although the energy-creation potential might be different – isn't necessarily, but might be different – for every individual on Earth, there is this similarity amongst all individuals: There is a point above which they create, manufacture and direct their own energy, and below which

they depend upon energy from exterior sources before they can operate. That would be the make-break line.

On our Tone Scale I would hazard that this is well above 2.0. Because it is above eating. If you want to run shame out of your preclear, just run „the shame of eating,“ „the shame of having to eat“ Because a being in a very cocky state of mind knows very well he can create enough energy to run this motor. And it's only when he goes down Tone Scale that he has to start eating. And he gets hectic.

You see, eating is getting the mock-up of somebody else and crowding it into close confines so as to drain the energy out of it That's eating, that's stealing somebody else's mock-ups in order to go on living, and it's exterior energy. So there's a theoretical line above that – theoretical line above that by which a body would create enough energy to keep on going without eating. And I think the stomach feels the main shame about that, because this is where shame on eating shows up very remarkably. And I have run into little children that as soon as I processed out their general parental behavior around them – the behavior of the parents – particularly parents forcing them to eat, why, the child ceased to have any stomach trouble and also ceased to eat to amount to anything at all. You'd say, „What a tremendous efficiency rise this body has had. This child is now getting along on two glasses of milk and a couple of pieces of bread a day.“ Well, you figure it out chemically and you say, „Well, there's that many calories and there's this and if it were all drained down – there must be a lot more energy in milk than we thought there was, so that proves he's still getting...“ But you see, there is a theoretical point where eating doesn't exist Well, a person would be very high-toned, he wouldn't be desiring somebody else's mock-up.

All right Now, the make-break point is actually the point where the person begins to eat And anybody who is eating is then, to some degree, subject to the liabilities of having to receive energy exterior, rather than energy created, in order to develop and direct energy. You see? He's dependent upon exterior energy if he's eating.

Now, we get to the second break point below that. It'd be where he is no longer capable of producing independent and dear thought but had to depend for the generation of thought upon former impacts, which themselves were storages of energy. Their impact was a certainty, and so he relies on the certainty impacts in order to get his data. And a person in that shape will only look for data, they will never look for truth.

Now, some of you might have thought that I meant psychology, but I don't. Psychologists have their own troubles. That's why they're in psychology: they hoped they'd be solved. All right.

The goals of processing, then, should become very manifest to you. They should be the restoration of the ability to create and direct energy. Now, to direct energy, one must have a good sense of location. And so the rehabilitation of location, as well as the rehabilitation of the ability to make space, as well as the rehabilitation of being able to create particles in that space all come under the same heading.

How do you know if the preclear is in better shape? He's in better communication.

Now, don't think he gets into better communication because he starts to read people's minds. It's very possible, it's very easy to read people's minds. I wonder why people try. But – there's hardly anything there.

It's very simple to go over the plan of creation and see that theta – mathematical symbol, not a mystic one – must impact with something and withdraw from it in cycles to operate with and know anything about the interior material with which it's dealing. So the cycle of life would be impact-withdraw, impact-withdraw.

With what we know today and what I'm talking about today, we can turn a cycle of theta, where it has gone in just a little bit deep, and bring it back up again with what it knows. Just because it disentangles itself from MEST does not mean that it becomes, then, blank and ignorant of MEST. So what you're trying to do is turn that cycle: You're trying to kind of pull the preclear out of it.

Now, if your preclear, immediately after you process him, goes out and buys a lot of heavy MEST, you may have processed him so far that he's quite willing to enter a brand-new cycle. Or you may have simply deepened his thirst for chunks of energy. Don't cure every preclear's thirst for chunks of energy or people like Ford Motors and so forth will go broke. I won't go so far as to say that that is the only reason people have cars, is they just have this energy hunger and there's a big chunk of heavy MEST and they sort of acquire it – or it acquires them, low on the scale.

You're trying to bring the preclear up past these break points, in short, where he is no longer compulsive, obsessive about masses of energy. And you know that he is no longer compulsive and obsessive about it at the moment when he is able to communicate better. You see?

So what's the goal of processing? You could say immediately „Restore and better the communication of your preclear.“ And you would have said, shallowly, the whole thing.

How do you do this? By remedying, mechanically, the scarcity of energy. One does that with contacting the MEST universe, showing he is not dependent upon the body, or by simply feeding the body, with mock-ups by the preclear, enough chunks of energy so the energy is no longer obsessively absent. You have to cure his scarcity of energy either way by showing him there's an awful lot there or an awful lot here.

And that's the goal of processing.

Let's take a break.

THE MOST FAVORABLE PROCESS

A lecture given on 1 October 1953
by L. Ron Hubbard

36 MINUTES

All right And this being the fourth of the series, concerns itself with the most favorable processes.

At this time, I would say, by calculation, that there was some ten to the eighteenth or twentieth or thirty-first power techniques. To know all of these techniques and to know everything that they do is almost impossible.

There's really no reason to go over most of these techniques, except in passing to people who are interested in investigation, research, phenomena But an auditor wanting results is apt to fall into the track of going back over all these techniques, one after the other, if he's not careful; because he will get, either in his own case or in the case of some person he's processing, philosophic twist of mind which starts delivering up all manner of computations and answers about existence and combinations of thinkingness and combinations of interrelations, which themselves amount to, in the aggregate, the track that has just been followed for three years.

He would find, if he used the techniques which we are now using, facsimiles, the Theta-MEST Theory – all of these things would come up. He would find Lock Scanning, he would find grief charges, he would find methods of repetition, he would find all the techniques involved in PDH (pain-drug-hypnosis). He would go on and on and on with endless amounts of data.

This universe specializes in data. We're not interested as much in data as we're interested in results, because a collection of data is only an examination of the past, and we're interested in predicting a future. And if we're interested in predicting a future, then it's obvious that the best way to predict the future is to make it That sounds highly adventurous, but let me assure you that the only time in the past when you've ever thought hard is when you didn't have or thought you didn't have enough force, enough energy, enough MEST or enough ability or skill to overcome the opposition with which you believed yourself to be faced, and you started to think.

Force is a substitute for a complete pervasion. Force is the first entrance into randomness, and below that is thinking and figuring. And so, a person starts to think, on a low level of the society, when he considers that he is unable to put out enough force to solve his problem – whatever you want to call it However brutal this may seem to you, it follows through.

Thinking results from an insufficiency of supply. That tells you, then, that the person who was very dependent upon the exterior environment for his supply would think very hard, and would then become dependent upon his exterior environment entirely for thinking. He would become a puppet in the last analysis, wouldn't he?

And so we go on this gradient scale of the fellow at first realizes that – he says, „Let's see now, I think I will take on this galaxy.“ And then he finds out he doesn't have quite enough force to do that, so he says, „Well, we'll confine ourselves to the solar system.“ And by the time he's about two, he says, „Well, let's see, I'd better confine myself to the world, this town, my family.“

And now he gets to be thirty-two, and he says, „Well, I can barely confine myself to me, because if I were just a little bit bigger I could handle me.“ In other words, „If I had just a little bit more force, I could direct the actions of my body efficiently, so the best way to do is to figure out how to train my body better.“

It's not that thought is junior to force, but compulsive thought directed toward a prediction of the future is prompted by an anxiety of the future, and the future – anxiety about the future results only from a recognition that one has insufficient force to overcome the obstacles which will greet him in the future.

Therefore, thinking, in an effort to predict what is going to happen, could be on two levels: one, a very, very, very high level by which a fellow is just playing with it; he's just fooling around and he's – so on, and it's lots of fun. Scientists do this. These people are fantastic, they can be physically at the bottom of the scale and mentally at the top of the scale almost simultaneously, and you'll see this happen. As long as they're tinkering around with a ham radio set or a formula for something, why, they're just as happy and pleased. It doesn't matter whether this formula works out or not. They're not doing that because they have an insufficiency of force, you see, they're just interested – something to look at, something to play with.

And then they go home. And when they get home, they really start thinking, because there they have problems. You've got the wife, she's not interested in chemistry. And they've got the kids, and they seem to make an awful lot of racket. And if he could just make a little more money, why, then he could solve some of these problems. And that kind of thinking simply results from the fact that very many factors object to his reaching out and cracking a couple of skulls. And it results from the fact that when he goes down to the grocery store, the grocer stands there, you see, and says, „Money.“ It results from an insufficiency of supply; it results from the fact that he doesn't have a big enough house, he doesn't have enough wives. Insufficiency of supply, right down the boards. All right.

When he comes up against that thinking process, he is into the field of anxiety. And you will find some very splendid thinkers in the field of science, so on, who are just marvelous as long as they're at work, and who are terrible social blunders – not make social blunders, they *are* social blunders.

You recognize what's happening there: the man is trying to predict the future at home, because of an insufficiency of force, supply, energy, whatever you want to call it. So there's two levels at which theta operates, and you'll find it operating in every human being the same

way, and one of these levels we call analytical thought. We really even shouldn't call it analytical thought and we don't, but we did in the first book so we've kind of been stuck with it. What we are calling it now, more technically, is a mathematical symbol, which, being defined by its own definition, does not open up things to argument, and we simply call it *theta* or *thetan*. That's fine; *theta* is a Greek letter, which in itself symbolically represented thought. So let's just scotch the whole problem and just put a mathematical symbol there, and not have any further semantic arguments, and say this theta, then, operates in its purest level just on an observational, computational level, which is not interfered with by stimulus-response mechanisms. It doesn't think because something is compelling it to think; it thinks because it's interested.

And the other level of thought is, simply, „got to,“ and „can't“ And that, of course, is where human beings think at home.

So, we run into these two levels, and we get the paradox called man. And man is doing what he's doing and misbehaving the way he's misbehaving because he thinks he has to, because he has an insufficiency of energy to overcome his future obstacles.

Any thief in jail will tell you he had to do it. Pretty Boy Floyd, I think his name was, wept very gently in jail, because actually, he was an unfortunate creature, he was a victim of circumstances. When the police officer for whose murder he was being jailed had walked up to the car, it just came over him that he had to shoot him and he did. And he went to jail, and he explained to all the reporters that he was really a good man at heart, but he just had to do it. And so does everybody believe when he gets into this maze called computation, in this environment, into the „just-have-to-do-its,“ and „can'ts“ – insufficiency of supply.

This is reflected very broadly. You know, every once in a while somebody will walk down the street, and he will need a hat. And he'll see that there's a hat sale, and he will have an excess ten dollars in his pocket. And he'll look at the hats, and there's a hat there he likes very much, and he looks at the hat, and then walks on down the street without buying the hat. Why?

Well, he knows his insufficiency of supply is so great that he can't have a hat. This is stimulus-response; it is not rational. There's no reasonableness to this. He has the money in his pocket; he has the time to go in and buy the hat; he needs the hat; there is the hat he wants; and he doesn't buy the hat, because he can't have a hat. Why can't he have a hat?

Now, you could go over and talk with somebody on this line and try to argue him into realizing that he doesn't have an insufficiency of supply, and he will still have an insufficiency of supply. You can reason, talk, cajole, bribe, do anything you want to this reactive mind, in an effort to lead it into a reasonable activity and adjudication of its environment, and it will still go on being a normal human being.

You can, however, reduce its motion. Its motion reduces, but doesn't increase. The reason the motion of the reactive mind doesn't actually *increase* in terms of controlled motion, which is to say, increase in terms of better procurement of energy, is because it isn't manufacturing any energy. It is borrowing energy from elsewhere and using it.

Now, it starts borrowing this energy from the beingness of the person himself, which is – we call *thetan* – again, a mathematical symbol. *Thetan* doesn't mean „spirit,“ „soul,“ or anything else – it's just avoiding all those terms; it's just saying no responsibility, no responsibility – it's just a thetan. All right.

And the reactive mind has an insufficiency of supply, and the thetan, the being of the person – that's you, by the way. People who go around talking about „My thetan thinks...“ You're just listening to some more of this reactive mind, because a person doesn't have another thetan; he's it. When he says „I“ and what he means by „I,“ and everything he means by „I“ is him, and that's the thetan. And the thetan gets a lot more things added to him that are not necessarily him but he's appropriated them too, and Freud called it „alter ego,“ because it was a nice term. Well, in the same way we use *thetan* as a nice term. And a thetan there, it may be still perfectly competent to use – create and use – energy. But the reactive mind, with which this being is still connected, is energy-hungry, terrifically hungry for energy. And so every time the being puts out a little erg of energy, the reactive mind-the thing the analytical mind is running – the reactive mind soaks up from the actual reasonability of the person, *slurp*, what little bit of energy the reasonableness of the person puts out, because of an energy starvation. Do you see that?

A person could be very, very competent in creating and directing energy. And every time he creates a little energy, it sort of disappears and he doesn't quite know where it goes, and before this he never knew where it went Now, you ask this person to exteriorize; that is to say, you ask this person to be at a little distance from the body. This will come to a lot of people as a shock when you do this to preclears. You just – in off the streets – you just say, „Be three feet back of your head now.“

The fellow says, „All right, I – I am. Now – hey!“ Big shock. He finds out just in that moment there that he doesn't happen to be an integral part of this MEST thing.

Now, when he's three feet back of his head, he has some little chance of putting out a couple of ergs of energy without getting them soaked up, as long as he doesn't have his attention immediately upon the body. But if you could put him out there several miles, he could then safely generate some energy, because it wouldn't immediately be taken away from him by the reactive bank.

Now, the reason the reactive bank can take it away from him is because a large portion of the reactive bank is his own. This is just old stuff that he picked up like goats chew up tin cans, and he just sort of picked this up here and that up there, and he's got this old favored facsimile that he swiped someplace, and he's just got junk, junk, junk, junk all around. And it didn't mean anything and it didn't do anything to him till one day he got into confluence with a body. And when he got connected with the body he put this stuff into the body too, like you put things into trunks in the attic. And now it matches his wavelength and he can control the body better and this works out just fine; only he isn't just quite sure how it's working out, but it works out But every time he thinks he's matching the wavelength of what he put in there. And all of his control of the body and everything he's ever taught the body is matching up with his wavelength.

And so every time he thinks, the body picks up any energy which is created and it starts to act as a sponge on a starvation of energy. And as a result, when he makes a facsimile, the facsimile itself is pulled in, just like it was water going into a sponge. And when the thetan puts out a little beam of energy, *pam*, that goes into the body.

Now, I'm not talking about anything strange or esoteric. Because all of these things have been strange and esoteric, one has a feeling that maybe they still are. But if you just take pc after pc and you say, „Be three feet back of your head.“ „Now be eight miles back of your head.“ „Now, that's fine, now put out a beam of energy.“ „Now walk across the ceiling.“ „Now find-change something.“ And then, „Now come back and pick up the body and throw it over on the couch.“ And he does and...

Every once in a while you get a preclear that does it just like that. He doesn't know anything about what you're doing. You have to assume if it keeps happening, person after person, that it must be an objective phenomenon, instead of an objectionable one.

I dare say, however, that you could go on trying to teach aborigines or something the fact that when meat was decayed it made their stomachs ache, and they'd probably go right on blaming God. But this is possible that you could do this. But there are a lot of people around that are very, very hard to convince on this. I've had an auditor say to me, „Well, I know my preclears really don't exteriorize.“

„Why do you know they really don't?“

„Well, it never shows up on the E-Meter.“

„Well, what preclears have you tried to exteriorize?“

„Well, right after I finished the course, I tried one and he couldn't, so I've given it up.“

„What do you have them do now?“

„Well, I double-terminal them.“

„Well, what does that do?“

„Oh, it makes them feel more comfortable.“

„Well, why don't you tell – by the way, during the course, did anybody tell you to be three feet back of your head?

„Well, a fellow tried it once, and I wasn't, so...“ In other words, he's just working on a complete no-action basis. He knows it can't be true. You take this same fellow and start Acceptance Level Processing and what do you find? Acceptance of exterior energy; nothing but Just the thought of stepping back of his head, you see, puts out enough energy to really start pushing him back of his head, and that energy goes *slurp* and there goes the thought, so he knows it can't happen. Very magical, nothing up the sleeves. You see how that would work out? Therefore, the fellow couldn't believe it! So you have to have another technique.

And that other technique would merely consist of feeding the bank enough energy until it was no longer starved and the fellow could think of stepping three feet back of his head

without the energy connected to the thought being absorbed and, therefore, the thought disappearing.

Now, it's a horrible thing that actually, the actual being of a person could think the most wonderful and pleasant and esoteric thoughts in the world, and have them instantly disappear. Have you ever had a preclear, you said, „Put up a mock-up“ – energy picture is what a mock-up is, nothing more nor less – “put up a mock-up out there of a girl.”

He says (*pause*), „Can't!“

And you say, „No, no. Go on now, just put up an energy picture of a girl out there. Put up a pic....“

„Can't!“

„Come on, try, try.“

„Well, I almost did that time.“

„Well, do it some more.“

„Yeah, I can get a picture of a girl, what are you talk... she's gone.“

„Now put up a few more, put up a few more.“

„All right, all right. Yeah, you know what happens? I put this picture of this girl out there and she slides into this black cloud over here.“

Now, that's been going on ever since he's been putting up pictures of the girl. But putting out the energy itself, the energy of putting it out was also absorbed, the memory of its appearing and being seen was also absorbed by the bank, and it made a complete wipeout. If you as an auditor recognized this, you could see a great deal of sense in good old Self Analysis. You just keep putting these mock-ups there.

The person says, „But my mock-ups have no persistence. I put them out there and they're gone. I put them out there and they're gone. And – I just – sometimes I can't put up mock-ups of some things at all.“

What's happening to those mock-ups? They're chunks of energy and they're being soaked up by the reactive mind like a sponge. And they're soaked up so fast and the impression of them being soaked up also goes with their being soaked up, and so the person doesn't think he can put out a mock-up. But if you just keep it up...

One of the worst cases I ever saw in this, I made a sort of a test out of. I just set him to work for two hours a day, and was on the telephone and so forth, making sure that he was doing it. And he was pretty good; he went on and did it. He did it for about six weeks at about two hours a day, and he could get the prettiest mock-ups, and one day somebody said to him, „Why don't you be three feet back of your head?“ and he was.

And he said, „There's nothing surprising about this.“ He said, „I knew I could do this all the time.“

Now, here you have the snake eating himself all up, starting in at his tail. And when a case gets too starved for energy, it responds like a sponge for energy. And it starts to pick up

everything inflowing, and it specializes in inflows. And it specializes in betrayal, of course, because betrayal is getting the anchor points smashed in. It specializes in anything and everything you can think of that has anything to do with collapsing anchor points, because every time the case tries to put out a little bit of space, those anchor points, themselves being energy, come right into the bank and are absorbed. It's just a question of mechanical – just plain, ordinary energy.

And the reactive mind is so starved for energy that it has to figure all the time how it's going to get more energy. And it doesn't care how, whether it gets it by being run over by a truck or by eating fish or anything else. Anything goes. And this is the behavior of the reactive mind. What we normally consider the reactive mind would be the body, but the actual part of it is, is the thetan has a reactive mind of his own – it's this bric-a-brac he carries around.

See, out there in space you get – 270 degrees, or almost, in a vacuum, and electricity behaves in a peculiar fashion. It has no resistance. You could make a bomb this way. Somebody over in Russia wrote a paper on it; I suppose they shot him immediately. (And Russia probably has now issued a manifesto saying it now possesses this as a weapon, that being their usual cycle.) They take something in absolute zero and, having no resistance, they keep pumping a can full of energy, and of course, they could pump billions and billions and billions of volts into a can. And then, when they took it out and it would all of a sudden warm up, what a terrific electronic flash you would get, because no resistance, you see.

It presents the silly problem of having a quart can into which you could pour a tank car full of milk, and it all goes into the quart can, because it's absolute zero. And now you've put it out where it's warm, and you've got a tank car full of milk again, only you've got it too quick, so it splatters over the landscape.

Now a thetan is into this. When a thetan is in the vicinity of absolute zero, his own energy behaves accordingly; hasn't any resistance, there's nothing to using energy. He just uses it. He can put it out this way and that way and tie it in ribbons and do other things with it. There's nothing to it. And then he gets down here and he's got air and it's warm and it's not a vacuum, and he wonders what's happened to his energy. He can't make it anymore.

Every once in a while, a thetan will pull in something that was packaged one way or another and he didn't quite know how, and I don't know quite how he packages it, and you get a terrific explosion in your preclear or in front of him or behind him. And a lot of your cases have gone down Tone Scale immediately following an electronic explosion, which occurred after an operation.

You ask them, „What was the exact symptom when you started to go downhill?“ They can't remember. It's a dispersal, of course. „Well, what was the symptom?“

They think this over for a long time, then they say, „Well, I don't know. I remember I was operated upon for gallstones. About three nights later, it seems to me, I woke up in the middle of the night and there was a blinding flash in my stomach.“ Now, it's hard for a person to recall those things. The easiest way to make him recall it is just tell him to start mocking up explosions. And if he starts mocking up explosions, all the data about explosions will eventually come into his possession.

But here we needn't go so far afield as absolute zero or thetans or anything else to get anywhere with this argument. All we have to do is start feeding the reactive mind energy, and the reactive mind stops this think, think, think, think, think and starts straightening out.

Now, the energy is a somethingness; the somethingness has to have a nothingness around it. And you start feeding the reactive mind space, lots of space, you reduce the havingness of the preclear. The real answer is to start feeding him space, but you can't do this, because it starts to evaporate the energy which he has. And you give him more and more space and more and more space, and he has less and less and less and less, and you're coming down to where he has identified himself with nothing.

The thetan thinks he's nothing, because his first contact with the MEST universe is space, and space is nothing. And so he's space as far as he's concerned. And you could, theoretically, run out this whole thing. You could run out the idea that he was nothing by simply running out space with Q and A, which I'll give you during these lectures.

But you reduce his havingness. And if you will go out and find a little child who is eating candy and you jerk the candy away from him, what will a little child do? And if you keep taking candy away from him, what will he do? Eventually go into apathy. It doesn't necessarily follow that if you keep giving him candy, he will go way up Tone Scale, but he'll sure be cheerful about it.

So you don't want to take all the candy away. As much as a thetan would hate to admit it, energy is delicious; it's real candy. And you'll get some character processing himself, and he'll process himself *endlessly*. Just like candy – just go on and on because it tastes so good, but he doesn't dare admit that it tastes so good, you see. He's got to have a reason for doing it. Therefore, you will find some cases, it's almost impossible to run anything on the case but a concept, because the concept will keep chewing up the energy and converting the energy, and it doesn't waste any energy. So the thing to do is to restore a lot of havingness to the preclear, by the form of mock-ups. You give him havingness.

Now, why do you go out on this cycle of returning his havingness? The only thing wrong with his thinking is his thinking. What is wrong with the mind is wrong in the mind. It isn't wrong on Jupiter. See, what's wrong with the mind is wrong with the mind.

We have this unit called the mind, and we don't care what shape it is; we'll draw here a circle. And everything that is wrong with the mind is connected immediately and intimately with the mind. It sounds like one of these idiotic statements, but it's... Therefore, you're not going to get him over claustrophobia, you're just going to get him into a rigid control of claustrophobia by simply making them occupy small spaces like closets. „I'll show you, you little brat, cry in the dark. Throw them in the dark, that's the way to cure them.“ Well, they go into a sort of a rigid apathy about the dark, and after that somebody says, „Are you interested in the dark?“ or „Does darkness worry you?“

„Doesn't worry me. No, doesn't worry me anymore. It used to, but it doesn't worry me anymore. Doesn't worry me a bit, really doesn't worry me. Never think about it anymore! What are you asking for?“ All right.

So there's trying to work it out in the MEST universe, you see. So the problems of the mind are in the mind, they are not on the Coca-Cola sign. The Coca-Cola sign, which I mentioned earlier, may be in beautiful neon, but it does have this tremendous characteristic it says, „C-o-c-a C-o-l-a,“ it says. Does it? Does it say anything? It sure doesn't It's sitting there, and it's a certain form and shape, a series of geographical locations in MEST which has absolutely *m* meaning until you come along and read it And then this series of shapes translates itself as a picture, which goes back to a sound, which goes into a picture, which connects up with the stomach and the taste mechanism. And this horrible gooey syrup that they pour carbonated water in regurgitates in the bank and you know what you are looking at, you're looking at a sign that says „Coca-Cola.“ Well, boy, that's really artificial, between ourselves; that's going way around it and so forth. But that's MEST talking.

Anytime you can make a MEST appear to talk, you're going to get a chain of aberrations following it, by the way. When MEST can appear to talk, it can start to be sensible. And as soon as it starts to look sensible, watch out, because it can't talk and can't think.

This, by the way, is no condemnation whatsoever of books, television, radio or motion pictures. These, which constitute the major aberrations of the society – it's no part of me to run them down. If people want to be foolish enough to go to motion pictures, let them go; let them go crazy.

Now, a picture – picture occurs in the mind only after this „resistance and then want“ cycle takes place. See, resistance. A picture will occur in the mind automatically when that happens, but pictures seldom occur of possessions which are not resisted particularly. But you get this concatenation of a desire of MEST all the way along the line, which is a reversal. And the MEST says that you want it, because it's got gravity, and you've mocked up the gravity, so obviously you've got all these computations on the thing and you need it You have a reason, too – you have to get to work every morning with that car. That's beside the point that you work some, maybe, five hours out of your eight to pay for that car, but that's beside the point You have to get to work with that car – big reason.

So when you get this car, you actually have an *object*. Well, this is tremendously desirable – an object It's a big mass of energy. Fine, there's nothing wrong with owning energy, nothing wrong with owning cars or anything else. But there's something wrong with the next abstraction: losing the car, finance company.

And here's a car, and then it's gone. Well, when that first happens to a fellow, he keeps a picture of it. It's very touching and nostalgic. A person only keeps pictures around of things he can't have. He only keeps blocks of energy around when he can't have energy. Isn't that sweet, nostalgic and touching? The only reason, really, no matter what the preclear says – the only reason he's got that picture, the only reason he's got that picture of Papa that keeps recurring to him all the time („Papa's a dog; Papa's no good“ and so forth) – the only reason he's got that picture is because he can't have Papa, so he's got a picture of Papa.

Now, you see this dramatized. The old lady who has lost a son has that picture square on the middle of the mantelpiece; that's right where it is. As long as he was alive and breathing and happy and cheerful, it was in a trunk or on the back of the piano or something of the sort. She didn't need a picture. But now she hasn't got him, so she's got a picture. And that is

the role of pictures and one of the reasons, specious or spurious though the reason may be, why people have pictures. But that is one reason up from a more pertinent fact: just the raw fact of energy.

Now, the picture combines something that belongs exclusively to the thetan, which is the aesthetic. The combination of energies and forms and spaces so as to create what a thetan classifies as a pleasing object or motion would be what an aesthetic is. Well, he could keep something just as an aesthetic and wind up by chewing it up just because he was short of energy. The energy has become important. This would be the degeneration of the person from an aesthetic individual to a very practical man. He started in with the pictures and wound up by chewing them up for energy, you see.

So you can count on it with a preclear that what he's got in mental picture form is there because, one, he's short of energy, so he's got this picture because it represents a mass of energy which he's liable to chew up someday and he won't have that picture anymore either. The second reason is it's something he can't have. And when he really can't have it and he knows he can't have it and it's gone forever, it's a black picture and he can't remember it.

First he had a picture of it, you see, and then his energy scarcity made him eat up the picture and now he hasn't even got the picture, so he says he needs pictures to remember. He doesn't need pictures to remember; he can make all the pictures he wants, unless somebody's convinced him he can't or unless it seems beautifully sad or dramatic to him not to be able to. All right.

So, the blackness which you see accumulating is many things. The blackness can be the blackness of nothingness, the blackness of space or it can be a blackness of substance which is chewed-up and charred energy, which is still better than no energy. The person who has solid masses of blackness packed around him is going around with the consolation that he's at least got some black energy. It's very, very insulting to him, too, when you suddenly point it out sometime, „Well, it's at least energy.“ You're not being properly sympathetic. All right.

When, then, you evaluate a process, it would be along, more or less, the following forms: One – the weakest process is, one, does it convert a thought-energy pattern into usable energy? That would be one, see. That would be the weakest process, and that would be Concept Running. What Concept Running does is, he can't have the energy because the thought in it is too dangerous, he thinks, so you just run the thought out of it and then he can at least have that little slice of energy. All you've done for him is give him that slice of energy, which he already had but he can't use. You see that? And that would be the weakest process there is admissible at this time.

Also under that classification comes the running of an engram. You're running the perceptics out of an engram; you're running a slab of energy flat without destroying the energy, see, so the energy doesn't impinge an effect the way it is, and so it becomes a usable piece of energy.

Restimulation is „Gee, what a nice, beautiful, big piece of energy – slurp. Uuuh! Hey, wait a minute“ – chronic somatic. He almost could eat it up. And he keeps it there and gimps

and limps or stutters or twitches or something for the next twenty years in the hope that it will all of a sudden go away and he'll be able to consume the rest of it. If there's an analytical thought on top of it at all, it's that one, and that's a chronic somatic.

Another thing is there gets to be a big scarcity of pain. Some preclears you have to really fix them up so they can make up a lot of pain before they're happy, and then they get so they have to waste pain in brackets and then they can have pain. And at that time, this now makes a lot of facsimiles available to them they didn't have before, so momentarily they'll come on up on an upsurge just because they can have pain. If they can have pain, then they can have a lot of the energy in the bank, you see. So then they can drain on this bank some more, and it'll go flatter and blacker. That's no good; that isn't really what you wanted to do with the case, but the fellow is a lot happier if he can do that. All right. Weakest process.

The next process admissible, as far as processing is concerned, according to my own investigation and experience, is the restoration of energy to the bank, the restoration of energy to the bank. And such a process would simply be Self Analysis. You just keep putting mock-ups out there. You increase the fellow's havingness. You get him back to a point where he realizes he can at least have some mock-ups. He might not be able to get the real thing out here, but he can get some mock-ups. You see where we're going in this processing?

The mock-up is the substitute for MEST, or a substitute for a mass of energy, because, remember, we're working with three universes. And if he can't have a mock-up of his own which is solid and can be stood up this way and patted together that way and pulled out that way, and he can mess around with this energy and so on – if he can't do that comfortably, if he can't create energy in blocks and solidities of that character and so on, well, the next thing to do is to show him that some does exist around, which is MEST, and he's somewhat convinced he can't have that, so he's out of present time because he can't really find it. He knows it quite isn't there and he can't have it, so he's out of present time.

If he can't have present time, he can at least have blocks of energy. If he can't have the blocks of energy which exist right here and now, he can at least have them someplace in the bank. And so, he gets thrown back on the time track and you get the past tense manifestation of psychosis; that is to say, the psychotic's always in the past. Why is he in the past? Well, he's got all the energy out there, and he's way back there looking for some now. Of course, it drives him pretty batty and he's in pretty terrible condition and so forth, but he's still got energy hunger. So that would be the next process.

And the third process on a level of acceptability as far as he's concerned... (Number two, by the way, includes Expanded GITA and Acceptance Level Processing, any process which restores kinds of energy.) The third one would be restoring a specialized cycle to the bank, and that would be just one thing which we'll go into later: explosions. That's the most valuable kind of energy of all. Gee. Gee, that's wonderful. It's why you get all these boys down at Los Alamos chewing away at atom bombs. The glee with which they work on this would turn you a little bit pale. All right.

Here you have one type of facsimile which, when run, is tremendously effective. And the reason why is the explosion is the basic desirable thing, and it's what got him into wanting energy in the first place. So if you give him enough explosions and he mocks up enough ex-

plosions and mocks up enough explosions in brackets and so on, why, he's much better off. And this is coupled with running attention and admiration on the blackness which immediately follows the explosion. A part of an explosion is the blackness, you see, and that's where, really, the blackness gets nailed down on the case.

All right, then, we get mobs of people admiring the explosion, which explodes so noisily and beautifully and is followed by the blackness, and we don't stop their admiration just because the blackness followed it; that was what happened in real life, so the blackness never quite went away. So he's still got this tremendous store of blackness in the bank. It's still energy, but you give him enough white energy and the black energy has a tendency to go away, and it does go away. But you get admiration of it; that is, you just mock up huge masses of people looking up very admiringly at all of the explosion, particularly the black part of it. And the blackness gets more and more soluble and more and more soluble, and sometimes your preclear gets sicker and sicker and sicker and more horribly – and he feels terrible, and big compartments start to fly out of his mind, and big chunks of blackness start to disappear around his body. And this opens up communication lines to all kinds of facsimiles and – that are all sucked dry, because you see, when they're sucked completely dry it left only blackness. And he couldn't communicate over that line anymore to the bank, and so it just stayed there. And all of a sudden it swells up, and this happens to be a time when Lord knows what happened, and he's suddenly confronted with the huge picture of an elephant immediately facing him. And various things happen which make life interesting. But that technique and that sickness is really only very bad when you don't back it up with objective processes.

Now, you can run what I just told you, which is this third kind – you run the combination of lots of explosions and lots of admiration of explosions and so on, you'll only get him into trouble if you omitted the objective type of process; that's to say, you omitted the corners of the room and the other unlimited techniques as contained in Triple SA. You keep those up and he just goes along fine.

Now, those are the three first-line processes right up to there. And the fourth one would consist of any process which put him into immediate cognizance and made available to him, obviously, so that he knew it, the MEST universe present time. We're going upstairs with these processes, you understand – we started with the weakest one and we're getting stronger ones now. And after he finds out we're really – can have present time and present time is wonderful and so on, and after he can have these huge masses of energy and so on, well, let's start him into the fifth one, which is the rehabilitation of himself as an energy output unit, including his personality. And that's the fifth process and the upper echelon one.

Now, we go above that and we get to what we were talking about in the Doctorate Courses, which is just the construction of your own universe, which is interesting, if you can make large masses of energy. You won't get anybody to be really interested in making his own universe unless he has big, beautiful, gorgeous blocks of energy that he himself can make and carve up and put together and so on. You know, there is nothing like something that you could get a good, solid contact on. Well, MEST is good that way. You get a contact on MEST; it doesn't belong to you but it might as well, because you had your hand in it, I'm afraid.

And we've talked about MEST as a villain, but we're talking about it because I like people to agree with me sometimes – not too often, but I like the no-randomity. But you've got this whole MEST universe as an antagonist if you insist upon being a single man who is not even part of the collective group. And so people agree with you when you say, „That MEST universe did this.“ The MEST universe didn't do that any less than you did it to the MEST universe. Actually, it's a series of overt acts on the part of the MEST universe and your part that finally *stuck* you with a collapsed terminal on the MEST universe.

Now, you'll notice that we haven't gone into overt act phenomena. We haven't gone into engrams. We haven't gone into para-Scientology at all-past lives, Fac One – none of this material. And that's not because it isn't there anymore or somebody changed his mind, it's because we don't need to do it anymore.

But if you want to know what's happening to your preclear and what he's talking about, it's very, very fortunate that we have dug up, exhumed and brought to view a lot of phenomena which will be uncovered and talked about by a preclear during processing, whether you like it or not.

The preclear keeps saying, „I can't get the camera away from in front of my face. You keep telling me to run this, but this camera keeps sticking in front of my face!“

You will say, „That's very funny; it probably refers to a libido complex on the part of his father. Well, let's see, the camera, camera – camera represents pictures. Of course, he's talking about pictures; we've said something about facsimiles, so he probably has a necessity for facsimiles. That's probably what he wants,“ and so on. „And we'll just go on and neglect this thing. And we'll run it out next session.“ *Rrruh*. So you go down to the hospital...

That's a Fac One machine, of course, and whether you like it or not, or when the pre-clear doesn't like it, it's got so much energy connected in – Fac One is such a heavy block of self-created energy in fighting a camerallike projector that it has been particularly delicious at various times in the past And now he's gotten to a point where it's no longer delicious, it's just plain nothing but agony left in it and he can't touch that thing any further. And he'll get lines of agony walking across his body from the left to the right and the right to the left and around. And furthermore, he gets them into every endocrine gland he has, because these were selected out one by one, and you'll get a sudden terrific enlargement of the thyroid and all sorts of things will happen. You say, „Well, that camera in front of his face, that doesn't mean a thing. We'll just go on to something else.“ You're in for trouble unless you do something about that camera in front of his face.

What's the best way to do something about the camera? And that's simply to process, just what I was talking about, number four or number three *until you've got the camera gone, and make sure it's gone*. Because it's phenomena you're going to encounter whether you want it there or not. But it's in para-Scientology merely because we can't really accurately establish its source, but it's phenomena. In para-Scientology we can weave beautiful pictures and pleasant dreams and speculations and be highly scientific and curious and interesting and so forth, but we don't necessarily have to get hanged with the data.

So, what is the various – the chains of reasoning, then, that you would follow in assaying – assessing a preclear so as to know what process to follow with the preclear? Well, you

look at the fellow and you see whether or not he's in a body. If he's in a body, he's in bad shape. He's worried about Gertrude. He just can't seem to get it off his mind, you can't get him to concentrate. So you say, „Well, let's see, this case is – I don't know quite where we'll enter this case, but he keeps talking about Gertrude.“

Well, actually I can tell you a hundred ways we can process Gertrude – oh, thousands of ways. We can run facsimiles, we can run overt acts, we can have him shoot Gertrude and Gertrude shoot him and back and forth, and we can do all sorts of things – oh, most remarkable things to get rid of Gertrude. And if we want to fool around with it, and you really want just this fellow – fellow came to you because of Gertrude and so forth, you can just run the concept „Gertrude is in present time,“ „Gertrude is not in present time,“ „Gertrude is here,“ „Gertrude is not here.“ And we have a spot out in front of him say, „Gertrude is here“ and „Gertrude is not here.“ And after a while he stops worrying about Gertrude. But that comes in that first echelon I mentioned, which is the weakest process but yet got rid of an aberration.

You go down to an insane asylum or something – Volney wrote me the other day about some fellow that had eighteen dozen electric shocks and a prefrontal lobotomy and had all his teeth kicked out (in other words, psychiatrists had amused themselves no end), because he had a witch doctor who stood out in the front yard and gave him orders.

And he said, „Well, nobody can see her but myself, but...“ This is after the prefrontal lobotomy, he was still talking. A great shock. They wrote a huge – oh, they wrote pages and pages in the psychiatric journal, „Prefrontal lobotomy case still able to talk.“ Anyway, he was out there in the front yard – I wouldn't mention the name of the hospital because I'd hate to condemn anybody in that hospital at all or give out any names, so we won't mention Sawtelle out in Los Angeles. We won't say a word about Sawtelle, I'm sure the doctors there – the psychiatrists rather, not the doctors – are doing their absolute level best I won't say their best to do what, but it's sure their best.

Because here's the technique which springs this character who had a prefrontal lobotomy. He had a witch doctor out in the front yard and she gave him orders all the time. And all the therapist would have had to do is, „All right, get her certainty that she's there.“ That's all. Crumbled right at the edges, right with that entrance point And then, of course, you would have gone on in your certainty that she's there and just run it all ways from Sunday, and you would have finished off with it The only anchor point he had out, evidently, was one witch doctress that didn't exist.

You'll find a lot of preclears have demons; they come in and start talking to you about demons. Mystics sometimes will talk to you about demons and so forth, and you start to get them down to works, and they'll say, „Well, we can't do this, because this demon keeps flying around up in the air.“ They're not crazy; they're just being confidential. They've thought this all their lives; most of the people walking down the street kind of believe there's a demon around someplace. Of course, it's them. But anyway...

It's a very good thing to ease the fellow's mind, so he'll give you some concentration. So you go in on that first level of case, and that's the highest level of abstraction you want to hit in the case. You don't want to go any further into abstraction than that; it's just this concept level.

Now, there are a lot of interesting and dynamitish things you could run. For instance, Dick Halpern mentioned to me one that was just dynamite on this sort of thing – and it just throws the case into collapsed convulsions practically – and you just keep running, „It’s mine,“ „It’s not mine,“ and „I own it“ and „I don’t own it“ You know, took subzero Tone Scale – start running it as brackets and concepts on certainty, and you’ve really got a picnic on your hands.

I tested this out I had run some similar stuff to this, but I thought, „Gee whiz, now, he says, ‘It’s mine’ specifically. I wonder if you just ran ‘It’s mine’ on some preclear...“ The next thing you know, what happened? Ha. This preclear’s hand, Homo sapiens’ hand, was straight up in the air and quivering like this, you see. As a thetan he had restimulated himself and he couldn’t get his own arm down, because the electrical discharge was too great in it „The body is mine.“ That’s all I ran on this fellow and his fingers were about flying off. If I’d kept it up he probably would have shattered himself, but we couldn’t keep it up any further. Just „It’s mine“ – not on anything, particularly, except his body – “It’s mine.“ It’s fascinating.

Any of these concepts have a terrific level of workability, and if you get a Resistive V case, you won’t be able to get him to run anything else right at first, unless you’re a very, very insistent fellow; because he knows what’s wrong with him; he really knows what’s wrong with him: it’s Gertrude or it’s demons or it’s something else. He’ll write you books about his own case if you’d let him. He knows what’s wrong.

In other words, what’s wrong with him is he’s figuring. He’s figuring because he hasn’t got force enough to overcome it; he’s thinking about it Well, he can’t think in terms of force so he thinks in terms of words. There’s the way we go on a case.

Those are the most favorable processes of which I have any cognizance at this time.

Now, on the level of abstraction, there is a very cute process which de-valencizes an individual fairly rapidly. And it’s awfully nice on some cases to process the preclear instead of Mama. You know, Mama is sitting there, but you’re supposed to be processing the preclear and he’s running out Mama’s problems.

When you find yourself doing this, there is one, a process, which is very good about taking out valences, and this is called Q and A. Q and A stands for „Question and Answer,“ and the answer to the question or the question to the answer are both the same, because this is identification. And what is the question? It’s the Coca-Cola sign.

Is there any problem or abstraction connected with a Coca-Cola sign? No, the answer to a Coca-Cola sign, in terms of MEST, is a Coca-Cola sign. So it would be the Coca-Cola sign as a question, feeling of a questionability with a Coca-Cola sign, a feeling of... Then you just turn the same sign, you understand – the same sign, not another sign – around facing the spot where it was as the answer. And a fellow, as he does this, begins to feel that he’s resolving all the problems of existence, because that’s the truth.

The only answer to a Coca-Cola sign is a Coca-Cola sign. The only answer to Mama is Mama. The only answer to Papa is Papa. The only answer to yourself is yourself. So, you’d just have a preclear mock himself up as a question and then as the answer. He starts to feel

very learned. And most of the time he won't be able to turn himself around facing himself; in other words, he won't be able to get out in front of his face or anything.

He'll just sit there running question, answer – identification complete and utter. Identification of the complete maybe; the question, the answer. And that is the technique.

Now, you have the preclear mock up Mama's body over his own face as the question, then you turn Mama's body around on him as the answer. And then you mock up Mama's body on his face as the answer and then turn Mama's body around on his body as the question. And then you have him mock up his body – Mania's body out there, and have him put his body on Mama's body as the question, and then turn his body around as the answer. My, he feels so learned. Because that's all the questions and answers there are.

And you do this with anybody he's concerned about, worried about or in the valence of, and you'll produce enough of a shift of valence to materially influence a change of attitude on the part of a case. This is not a long technique and it shouldn't be run very long. It's only when you run into such a tough valence problem or such a tough problem about some object that your processing is grossly interrupted, at which time you simply fly in with a little bit of Q and A, and throw him out of the valence.

You find that the person is in the valence of a bedpost? therefore, the bedpost was the question, and it became the answer. And so you get him out of being a bedpost and then you can process a human being.

Okay, let's take a break. That's not the end of the afternoon session.

SOP 8: STEPS VI AND VII

A lecture given on 1 October 1953
by L. Ron Hubbard

62 MINUTES

SOP 8. The reason why I'm giving this time to SOP 8 is I find that SOP 8 is relatively simple and, therefore, very difficult of course. And so, we have here lecture five – SOP 8 – and we start in of course with Step VII and go back to Step I.

And the reason why I'm explaining it at this backwards level is because we want to take the most difficult case first, and then they'll get easier and easier, and you can tell more and more about it. I see so many faces suddenly look up with a sharp expectancy when I say, „The most difficult case.“

So I'll say right here at the beginning that many auditors, myself included, quite commonly run a couple of concepts in brackets before they go very far with a preclear. They run „There is no remedy,“ „There is a remedy,“ with certainty. Don't, by the way, go into „There is no solution“ because, of course, that just jogs into the middle of the reactive bank. It's like a train at full throttle hitting its bumpers on the track. Because that is, of course, why the reactive

mind got built is there is no solution to a being's survival who can't do anything but survive. There's no solution, he has to survive. And so he has to convince himself that he can't survive so that he can survive. I hope you followed me closely with that I don't see many faces brighten up when I say that because if you have a life which is immortal, it goes right on, and if life, being immortal, is now forced to do what it can't help but do, it's going to assume that force is necessary to make it do this, and therefore, without force, that it would do something else. You follow that? It immediately draws this conclusion that there must be something else about it that it's necessary to have force to make it do, you see? This is not solvable; that's why you don't understand it.

You see, it has to assume, then, that it can do something else except survive if somebody uses force on it to make it survive. And it assumes that it can do something else except survive, and this, of course, is an imponderable, because it can't do anything else but survive. The answer is the answer. And we get a very silly situation of an entire computing machine devoted to solving a problem which is solved, but it can't permit itself to know that the problem is solved without exposing the fact that it has no solution.

If you were to take a UNIVAC, an ENIVAC or an ESKIMO or some other kind of electronic brain that was built to multiply five times five, and then start to force it with all sorts of super currents and batteries and resistances and voltages to make sure that it always said five times five, you'd start blowing circuits someplace in the machine. You just overload

the machine. It knows very relaxedly that five times... is five; it knows that And now you start piling up on its circuits, „Now, you’ve got to say five times five.“ It would immediately turn up a conclusion, naturally, a negative solution on five times five if you started to jolt its circuits too heavily, because something would start sort of giving way.

And the next thing you know, if you kept insisting that five times five was five times five, it would blow enough circuits so that it would no longer give you the answer „five times five.“ So it cannot now answer the problem which it’s been set up to answer. It’s just as silly as taking an ax to the machine.

Now, you have inhibited it from giving the right answer. You’ve overloaded all of its circuits so that it can’t give any answer, and so it can’t give the right answer, naturally.

Maybe you’ve still left islands of operation in this machine that will give answers of some sort or another, but these won’t be connected. Everything will seem different and dis-related, and the machine will sort of putter along and break down and be patched up again and break down some more. Because the one thing it can’t admit is just exactly why you look at me with blank faces. It can’t admit this: it’s doing exactly what it is doing.

I gave you, a little earlier, Q and A. Now, just in this exact connection I want to make another comment on Q and A. Q and A is interesting simply because the thing is it. There is no problem connected with it until a problem is introduced into it.

Now, you can run concepts on Mama and concepts on Papa and concepts on self, on and on and on, when we’re dealing with the same thing as the Coca-Cola sign. Not that Mama and Papa are inanimate objects, but for all intents and purposes, really, all that’s ever been contacted about Papa and Mama was the physical beingness and existence and the space surrounding Papa and Mama, And the answer to running out Papa and Mama is simply Papa and Mama; not their emotional relationships, but just their physical beingness in terms of energy.

Now, you see how far wide something like Self Analysis could shoot a person if he started in running concepts and stories – connected stories. Several people have come to me and said why, for children, don’t we put up the story of Little Hood Redding Ride, I mean Ride Hedding Rood – “Why don’t we put up this story consecutively with the big, bad wallop and so forth?” And I say, „No, because the mind doesn’t happen to operate consecutively, unless it’s rather bad off.“ You don’t want consecutiveness, you want differentiation, because the mind is adding up on a gradient scale fact plus fact plus fact plus fact, and all these gradient scales of facts add together and connect and go together, and therefore, we reach an inevitable conclusion because of the identification of all of these – we’re trying to *differentiate* with Self Analysis, we’re not trying to *identify*. And each mock-up, then, is itself. And what is the answer to each mock-up?

Now, out of all the material that we have had, only one book is misleading and that is a book called *A Key to the Unconscious*. It is an interesting book, and was written in effort to demonstrate to the psychoanalyst or the child psychologist that if he wanted to plumb the depths of the mind, he could do it symbolically with great ease. You will not find many psychologists will buy anything closer to reality than an abstract symbol. And they wanted to think about the symbols, and that book was released for that purpose. The fact of the matter is

it's a bad book simply because it permits the thing to be computed upon. One sets up this dot, „Complete the picture.“ All right.

The fellow says, „Well, I see a railroad locomotive.“

At this moment the psychologist, the psychoanalyst can say, „Aha! What adventure on board a train are you trying to hide?“ He's not trying to hide any adventure. He sees a train, reminds him of a train.

Well, the funny part of it is, is the mind, the reactive mind wonderfully enough can always come up with the most gorgeous reason as to why it made a dot into the headlight of a locomotive. Always has a reason, never without one. „Never be without a reason“ is its motto, because there isn't any reason, you see, and so it has to have a reason, because it's got its circuits overloaded in an effort to force it to have a reason, because it's got a reason. So if you force it to have a reason, it'll blow enough circuits so that it doesn't have a reason. If it doesn't have a reason then you can evaluate for it And if it can be evaluated for, then it can be enslaved. See how that works out then? You couldn't make a slave out of a human being who said, simply, „Five times five,“ and then kept on saying, „Well, yes, that's the answer. Five times five. Survive is the answer.“

You've got to convince somebody one way or the other that he can't survive in order to make him survive. And if you can't survive and you make him survive, then you can say, „Well, the only reason you are surviving is because you are doing so-and-so and such and such in exactly this way or that way,“ and so the mind can become enslaved, and this is its trick mechanism. All right.

Q and A, The answer to any object is the object. The answer to a lake is not how much it costs; the answer to the lake is a lake. „What is a lake?“

„It is a lake.“

Now, this is the type of identification which brings about matter itself. If there weren't this type of identification, if a person weren't all smashed together with the idea of force, there wouldn't be any physical objects, nor would there be a wall here, nor would you have a body.

This trick also works to give us objects. We take a great deal of space with its anchor points and condense it, and we keep condensing it and condensing it until we get matter. And you make matter that way. It's very interesting matter; if you condense it enough, it really explodes.

All plutonium in the atom bomb is, is too many spaces too condensed, and it can't tolerate it and it's just pushed past the point of tolerance. And you just add this little item of plutonium to this little item of plutonium and you put them together and now you've really got too much mass for that amount of space, and so it explodes. That's all you make – there's other ways of making explosions, but that is the most extreme one which we now have.

Just apropos of nothing, it's quite amusing that an enormous amount of talk was given to whether or not the Russians had the secret of the atomic bomb's trigger. That's very amusing, because the trigger of the atomic bomb could be as simple as having a piece of plutonium

at one end of a rod and a piece of plutonium at the other end of the rod, and then you just drop the rod vertically so the two ends collapse, and that is the trigger. I guess the Russians never would have figured that out. You're just adding mass to mass beyond the tolerance of mass, and you get an explosion.

Now, possibly life hopes for this as its final release. It can do this, you see. And if it can just get solid enough and a person can just get impacted enough, he eventually figures out he'll go *boom*, and then he'll be free. I swear some preclears are doing this.

So you have all of this methodology wound around this obvious identification. And the identification of an object with an object is the question and answer concerning an object

Now, your mother came in and she said, „Why is your face dirty?“ Well, this is a silly question. She wants to put you into the past immediately. It's a little method of control all of itself. The face is dirty because the face is dirty, not because one was playing in dirt. This is obvious. The answer to a dirty face is a dirty face. It isn't even that a dirty face is something to be terribly resisted. There's a fellow by the name of Al Jolson made a fortune out of it.

Now, identification of object of [with] object goes down in thinking to the extremity of the identification of similarities, and when you start to get an identification of similarities, you are already entering into a fringe of thought on the lowest scale, practically psychotic or a Case VII.

That microphone is that microphone. You see, two microphones, you say one microphone is the other microphone. They have different serial numbers on them and as far as MEST universe is concerned, they are occupying different spaces so they are not the same microphone, but they are similar. But if you really identified the two of them, you would see only one microphone. You would just simply refuse to see the other microphone if you said, „All microphones are the same microphone.“ But still, there's an answer to this microphone on the left, and that is the microphone on the left. The entire problems connected with this microphone, as far as that microphone is concerned, is this microphone. You get the idea.

Now, when it gets to a point with a person where this microphone on the left is the microphone on the right, and then when that microphone looks *like* it might have a head and this reminds one of Uncle Bill so that Uncle Bill is this microphone, and when we think of Uncle Bill we think of microphones, and we think of microphones we think of Uncle Bill, we have the reactive mind: A=A=A=A And it's very simple, isn't it? We got that in the first book.

He rowed a horse, r-o-w-e-d as in a boat, and he r-o-d-e a horse are the same remark to the reactive mind; it wouldn't make any differentiation between these two things.

The reactive mind states, „Mama is the wife. And everything that Mama did wrong, the wife is doing wrong,“ and doesn't consult any further – A=A The actual identification is that Mama is Mama, and the wife is the wife, and actually, there is no relationship between. There's no such thing as a similarity. A similarity is a pretended identification, so that we get two identities, and they pretend to be similarities. And what you straighten out with Question and Answer Processing is simply that.

This is so obvious to the analytical mind, to the thetan, that the second you run this he begins to see this. „There's something very pleasing,“ a preclear will tell you, „about this. It's

very charming about this technique, I don't quite know what it is, but it's certainly pleasant" It's recognition of truth, and it does it instinctively. So Q and A is an interesting process.

Now, in all of the work which has gone before, we have been trying to solve identification. That's the truth of the matter. Things which are not similar become identified, one with the other, and this creates a thinkingness problem which is unresolvable because it's not a solvable problem. Two similarities become an identity: „An apple is an orange.“ It's not an orange, an apple is not even another apple.

There is nothing as big a lie as arithmetic. „One plus one equals two.“

Oh no. „One what?“

„Well, all right, a symbol one plus a symbol one equals two.“

‘Two what?’

„Well, symbol two, of course.“

„His ones certainly don't look like twos. Well, and that one is not the other one; they don't combine, they're two separate slabs of ink.“

Oh, you have to really beat a kid up to get arithmetic in his skull He understands perfectly with his mind that you can say, „Well, I've got two apples.“

„How do you know you've got two apples?“

„Well, there's an apple and there's an apple, and that's two apples.“

And this conveys the idea of two apples to somebody else, but mind you, it doesn't convey an identification of those two apples. *That is psychosis*. When you say, ‘Two apples: one apple plus one apple, and they are the same apple’ – psychosis.

Now, a preclear who has already left the world of the sane in trying to solve this problem that he can't survive when all he can do is survive... You see, the answer to survival is to survive, and there's no nonsurvival to make a dichotomy, so you have to pretend there is one. It's a very interesting problem. You've got this identification sitting right there in the middle of the problem. And any way you go out from this to solve it, you are solving an identification. Grim.

Your preclear comes along, and if he's in terribly bad shape, he will have gotten to a point of identification where he's crushing everything into a mass. You give him a symbol, it is a thing. You say „dog,“ this has no relationship to something that runs around with four legs and has fur and a tail. It is a thing that is „dog“ – that is what it is – and this „dog“ is an object And you try to plow the word *dog* out of his reactive mind, and you'd think you'd have to take an ice ax to it.

If you've ever noticed this, if you've ever run a preclear who was very, very bad off, these words are heavy, they have weight; you can't take them away from him. Well, try and take this preclear's pocketbook away from him, try and take their shoe away from diem, try and take anything away from this preclear. Uh-uh.

You say, „Now, would you please put your purse down over on the chair while we are processing?“

Uh-uh. Right here, see.

„Purse is self,“ is what they are running. Well, we know this is not so; purse is not self. And yet that preclear, if investigated a little further, would inform you possibly that the purse was herself.

Now, you'll find around a sanitarium that people are being the bedposts, literally. I guess nobody ever thought to ask people in sanitariums what they were being before.

Here's a rigid catatonic and you go up to this rigid catatonic, and you say, „By the way, what are you being?“

This rigid catatonic never talked to anybody before. And the rigid catatonic looks at you rather disdainfully and says, „I'm being a bedpost, of course,“ and goes back to being a bedpost. Why? Well, a bedpost just seems to be a good thing to be. They got conquered by a bedpost or something. It doesn't matter how it came about, the fact is that this body is identified with a bedpost and the body can't be a bedpost, and that's insanity. All right.

So we got – immediately we see in Q and A that sanity lies in Mama being Mama and Papa being Papa and roads being roads and microphones being microphones, and we see that insanity lies in microphones being Papa. And it's just a little bit of a rising scale of insanity to have a bunch of gradient similarities whereby you can work up and prove absolutely the microphone is Papa by a series of concatenations which have plus and minus signs and which are taught in universities and called mathematics. It's not quite sane because not any one of those symbols is anything in itself, and the second you start to break it out into the real world and hook it up here with MEST, you'll find out it doesn't work.

As long as mathematics compare exactly with the MEST universe or with some universe, as long as there is an actuality to it, as long as there's space and as long as there's action, mathematics is true. But mathematics is not true the second you add a symbol.

Now we use words because they are convenient, but the translation is from a sheet of paper. That's one class of words, it's actually one style; from somebody's speech, another type of word entirely conveyed by a sound wave. This restimulates a picture, one knows what the other person's talking about.

You go to the university, they tell you nobody can exactly proximate what anybody else means, because words mean different things to everybody. Well, the next time somebody says that in a university and you hear about it, why, you just look at him with a deep sigh because he'll be making the gate sooner or later for the little white men in coats. Because nobody has any quarrel about this. The mind in a good state of beingness doesn't have any trouble when it says the word *dog*.

Well, of course we mean different kinds of dogs, unless we're very specific about it, and when we say, „A Pomeranian,“ a fellow can say, „What's a Pomeranian?“

And you say, „Well, it's a horrible little beast. And people carry it in the lap, and it's somewhat like a Pekingese, but it's not a Pekingese.“ Well, you're still not being very defi-

nite, because he doesn't quite know what a Pomeranian is, but that's merely because he has no pictures of Pomeranians.

And you take people who have been raised more or less in the same area. When they say, „The town pump,“ they mean the town pump. They don't even have to have a picture of the town pump to identify what you're talking about. They say, „Town pump“ and that's a series of syllables that means the town pump.

For instance, the whole communications system of Philadelphia came perilously close to ruin when they took up a station down here in the center of town, because everybody could refer to this station. It had horrible boards in it, and you walked across the boards if you ever went through it. And somebody tore it down, I'm told, and made a parking lot or something out of it the other day. And nobody could ever refer to this anymore, and so a communications landmark was destroyed. You could always describe Philadelphia to somebody as a town which had this thing in it. Now there's nothing left except a statue of William Penn, which has its hilarious aspects.

Now, when we are talking a language, we are talking about common experience. As long as we're talking about common experience, we know all about what we're talking about, and there's no difficulty whatsoever in this communication. But when we begin to insist on an identification of the word with the object, we enter into the first stages of neurosis, and there you will find the first stages of neurosis entered by people who say to you, „Exactly what do you mean by that word?“

And you say, „Well, I meant – I said, ‘Pekingese’!“

„Well, exactly what do you mean by ‘Pekingese’?“

„Well,“ you say, „a little dog, a lap dog. It has long floppy ears and pop eyes and it comes from China. And they evidently were big once in China but they're small over here, and you see them every once in a while riding around in Cadillacs being driven by chauffeurs.“

And they said, „Oh, you meant to say a Pekingese *dog*, didn't you?“

Now, you're a very foolish person if you go on trying to communicate with that person, because it's something like you sending International Morse to somebody who can only receive American Morse Code. His level of experience tells him that words are so dangerous – they're so dangerous you have to be very, very careful of them. Well, that means his experience is such that he can't put out anchor points or communicate. And there we have the answer to it he can't put out anchor points.

Let's just go right back to this: We find out that everything is getting identified with everything. The objects are getting closer and closer together, and they are more and more matter, and we're getting everything solidier and solidier. This is only because a person has his anchor points in closer and closer and closer and closer and closer, and he can't put out anchor points. So a person can't communicate when he doesn't dare put a word out there three or four feet. When he can no longer put a word out there, there goes his space.

Well, how do we get somebody over this? Because that's the first thing you're going to find in a lot of preclears. You're going to say, „Well, how do you feel today?“ (*pause*) Going to say, „Did you have a good night?“ (*pause*) „Well, let's get to work, (*pause*) Now, we were talking about your mother last time, or rather, I was.“ And so you finally say, „Are you running that concept?“ (*pause*) The conversation is one-sided.

Now, there is a way you can make this preclear communicate; you can force him to communicate if you want to: Toss him a red-hot poker, (*laughter*) This has been done. It's with great surprise every once in a while that you hear somebody telling this story about the fellow who was in fear paralysis in a hospital, and at the last moment the doctor comes in and he's buckled on his gun, and the doctor says to him, „Well, the place is about to be captured, and we just don't dare leave these poor devils behind in the hands of the enemy,“ and pulls out the gun, cocks it, points it at the guy, and the fellow jumps out of bed and says, „Don't shoot.“ We put him into a state of communication, with duress.

Now, this is simply anchor points and it's simply making space. Any time you can get someone to claim an anchor point, you are still getting him to make space one way or the other, or at least recognize the existence of space. Just let him claim an anchor point.

Now how do we do this? The whole problem is to get him to put out an anchor point. He won't talk to you very much, he won't do this, he won't move around very much. He wants to stay in one room or, if he gets out, his motions are completely uncontrolled. How do we go about this where it's Level VII?

Very, very simple. We get him to reach out and touch something. That's one of the most effective techniques. Every once in a while somebody writes me with great surprise and says, „You know, that Step VII technique

that you say applies to psychotics shouldn't be listed as applying to psychotics, because most of my preclears have gotten better with it.“ And these people obviously aren't psychotic because they have some responsibility for their own actions.

Well, certainly, this is a real good technique and it just happens that this one will follow all the way through, and so we can apply it to a psychotic. It's also a very good technique. You'd ask somebody to find something real. „What is the most real object in this room,“ you ask him, „to you?“

And he looks around, finally says, „The light switch.“

And you say, „Well, go over and touch the light switch.“ It seems kind of silly to the fellow; he knows it isn't there. So he gets up and moves over and reaches out, showing you that he is still able to take the shock of finding it's nonexistent, so to speak, and he reaches out and touches the light switch. It's there. Now, you say, „Withdraw from the light switch,“ and he does.

And sometimes somebody will say, „Well, the sugar bowl.“ (One case, to quote one exactly.) And the preclear goes over, touches the sugar bowl. This one case touched the sugar bowl, touched the sugar bowl again, touched it again and suddenly clutched it to her and said it was probably the first time she had ever felt anything that was really real to her. That's the

way it goes. She'd – made her claim an anchor point, you see. So that is the essence of any processing is getting people to put out their anchor points so they'll make some space.

And if they refuse to do this completely and utterly, you can be assured that they are completely and utterly out of communication.

Now, you can get them into communication, possibly, by the use of a stimulant. And while they're under a stimulant or something of the sort, you can ask them again to reach something, and you actually can pick them up this way. But now we're talking about sanitarium cases. And you shouldn't have anything to do with them.

One of the fastest techniques on Step VII is something I shouldn't have to stress at all. One of the fastest techniques when it works, and it works every now and then, is you walk up to the psychotic in the sanitarium and you say, „Come up to present time,“ and he does, and he's sane and gets discharged. You would be amazed. This works. Every once in a while you can go down the corridor of a sanitarium, and just as the patients – you see them around, just tell them one by one as you see them, tell them in a pleasant voice, „Come up to present time.“ It's an anchor point. They've been lost someplace and nobody has ever told them this, and they come up to present time. I see on your faces you don't quite believe me; it's too simple.

Female voice: We think Ron could do it.

But the percentage on this is not good, so we have to have a technique which has a very good percentage.

Now, if a person won't put out an anchor point, then let's let the person accept an anchor point. This person might possibly get enough blocks or something piled up that they'd throw one block away. This is processing straight in the MEST universe, which is about the only place you can reach a psycho, so just start giving him blocks. „Do you want this block?“

„Yes.“

And you'll find out they will probably accept an awful lot of blocks until you'll finally get one thrown away. The second you've got one thrown away, he's got an anchor point out there. You started to open up his space and you've started to put him back into communication.

This sounds idiotically simple and it is, but sometimes it requires an enormous amount of persuasiveness on the part of an auditor foolish enough to fool around with a psychiatrist's MEST. Nevertheless, it'll work.

As a matter of fact, if all of us sort of as a crew suddenly waded in with what we know into the biggest spinbin they've got here in Philadelphia, we'd probably be able to clean it up in a couple of days. But that's how sad it is that we don't do that work I've been working on some mechanical aids, because it's doubtful if psychiatry will ever adapt itself to anything but a mechanical aid and so I've said, „Well, we shouldn't worry too much about the psychotics. Let's see if we can't work it out with a mechanical aid problem which will at least bring them up to a point of communication so that we can process them rather easily.“

But nothing will wear an auditor out faster than a psychotic, because the psychotic is what? What did we cover earlier? What is the single manifestation, as far as this psychotic is concerned, that makes him psycho?

First male voice: Dispersing all over the place.

Second male voice: Energy starvation.

Energy starvation, regardless of whether he's dispersing or not He's obeying energy if he's dispersing, implicitly obeying energy, if he has an energy starvation.

And he will sit there and he will actually create a sort of a vacuum in front of you. I don't know what he does to MEST air or something of the sort, but he does something to it. And he actually has some kind of an effect on it, there's a sort of a vacuum sitting in front of you. If you don't watch it, you'll start to do mock-ups that fill in the vacuum. The next thing you know, you've got the psychotic there in front of you solid in your bank. It's real fascinating. He's just like sitting in front of a vacuum cleaner. This is where they got the idea of vampirism.

Anybody that wants to fool around with a psychotic is quite welcome to fool around with one, but he shouldn't use techniques which have anything to do with thinkingness. Let me repeat that A person processing a psychotic shouldn't have anything to do with thinkingness. He should keep himself right there with techniques which are tremendously simple and very obvious, because he might ask this psychotic just one little simple question and have the psychotic spin again, all over. He might ask the psychotic to run this concept. He knows the psychotic is better now; now is the time to run a concept on the psychotic. So you run the concept, „I have to be crazy.“ It's too much for him, that's all.

Now, any such statement has to be qualified. I make that statement, so if you want to be on the safe side, never run a thought concept on a psychotic if you want to really play it safe.

If you want to be a little less cautious (don't ever get as adventurous as I *get*; I get in more trouble), you'll find that the psychotic is locked in one exact concept He must reach but can't reach, or its reverse, which is the same concept: He must withdraw but can't withdraw. And those two locked together just right produce a thing called the glee of insanity, but they have to lock together just right. And if you can get into communication enough to get this psychotic to run that concept just for a moment or two, his psychosis will sometimes stretch apart to a point where you can then follow forward with great ease on mechanical techniques. That's touch and go, because he might be just on the other side of it, you see. It isn't quite as bad as it might be. And you get him „Must reach but can't reach,“ and he runs just this and locks up on the heavier side of the incident And he's, of course, got the glee of insanity even more. It's a compulsion operating with an inhibition simultaneously, and these two things together give you an emotion. And this emotion is the emotion expressed by the insane, and it's a gradient scale of it.

At one time or another in any preclear, you could find every manifestation of insanity that had ever been cataloged anyplace, just for a moment or two in some cases and sometimes for a couple of hours and sometimes for a few days. You just trip into something, and on it

goes. And he's obsessive or compulsive or something of the sort, because you're handling the stuff of which this is made.

And so, you can run almost any preclear awhile on „must reach but can't reach.“ And if you run yourself on it for a little while, you will understand psychosis and exactly how a psychotic feels, because it's that glee, that horrible feeling, that awful indecision of a maybe lockup on the two things that theta does best. And that produces this emotion called insanity.

The best technique for this, however, is simply one way or the other to get the person to put out his anchor points. Now, with this technique you can process a cat, a dog. You could probably even process a psychiatrist, and that would be a hard trick for you to do, by the way – process a psychiatrist. You couldn't get him to listen long enough. He'd want to argue about it and think about it, but he wouldn't test it because he'd have to look at it. A psychiatrist hardly dares realize what he's doing, because he hasn't got a solution. And if you walk down the sanitarium walls, you will find a lot of ex-psychiatrists inside. That's not a very unhappy thing. It actually would seem to make these people very courageous to go into this work at all, but they don't even dare admit to themselves that there's any such danger.

You, with techniques, don't run up against this, but they do. And this is this technique. It's essentially getting him to put out an anchor point or receive an anchor point gracefully. You base it on a man's health is proportional to his belief in his own dangerousness to his environment. A man's health is proportional to his own belief in his dangerousness to his environment.

And one does it this way: Here's this cat, see, and this cat's a real timid cat, let us say, or just a plain cat. You know, people don't have to be crazy to be processed, and cats don't have to be crazy to come upscale. So you go into this cat, and you put your fingers down near the cat's paw. And the cat just simply can't resist sooner or later reaching out and touching your fingers. If it's a very timid cat, it will just touch your fingers. And at that moment you withdraw your fingers an inch or two. Not too suddenly, because you'll frighten the cat, but just withdraw your fingers. A cat will look at that hand and touch it again. And withdraw four or five inches that time, and then the cat says, „This is too good to be true,“ probably and quits. So you put your fingers back near the cat's paw again, and the cat says, „Well, I drove that hand away once. Probably I couldn't do it again. Well, I might as well try.“ And so he touches the fingers again. Immediately you withdraw four inches and say, „Ow.“

He didn't claw you. The cat looks at you kind of startled. „That hurt you?“ he says. Well, you just keep this up for a little while, and all of a sudden the cat will be sitting there looking very, very proud.

I had a little kitten about early 1950 that had a very beaten spirit, and I worked it up to a point where it would claw an editor. And this editor used to come down to the house – gee, his ankles were in horrible shape always.

I tried this technique on a dog that was quite neurotic. The dog would jump up on people, and people would slap the dog, so I simply got the dog to put out anchor points just on the basis of inviting the dog to walk forward. And the dog finally would walk forward and snarl. Gee, that got to be a cocky dog, „Gosh, *rrrff!* Bring on your lions. I can drive anything away.“

Now, this is a mechanical approach, and you should know this because it is the only technique I know of which is very, very effective on very small children. A child with whom you cannot easily communicate, yet may be brought to reach out and touch your fingers or touch something which you are holding. You reach down with a bright toy – you will assume immediately because you have been educated that way that a child always wants toys. It's not the case, they throw them away faster than they accept them. So you'll reach down there with a very bright toy or a bright ribbon and the child reaches for it, and not aggravatingly, you just bring the ribbon back with a little jerk, and the child reaches for it again, touches it (remember, let the child touch, let the cat touch, let the dog touch) and you pull it away again.

And the child may either decide that it wants that ribbon, at which time they'll rip it out of your fingers, or that they're very tough and are driving the ribbon away, particularly if about the third time you do it, you say, „Ow!“ But don't take a little child that is very timid and say, „Ow“ too loudly or too painfully, because the child will be quite dismayed and look at you and say, „Did I hurt you?“ You know, that sort of a look. „Gosh, I didn't mean to hurt you. Don't beat me, don't shoot me, don't eat me.“ You just keep that up day after day and all of a sudden, why, you walk in and this poor neurotic little kid that you first ran into says, „*Hmmm!*“ Mama, by the way, is feeling the effects of this, too.

And so it is with a psychotic. Your psychotic doesn't have to be made to talk in order to be processed. You reach for the psychotic's fingers and wait till the psychotic touches your fingers and then withdraw them a tiny bit, the same way you process a cat. And the first thing you know, the fellow will start to exhibit some signs of sanity, *unless* you are going to be very, very clever, and the moment he says, „Gee“ or „Gosh“ to you or something, you're going to immediately run out birth. You just, with a psycho, leave thinkingness *severely* alone, to be on the safe side. Don't run out birth, don't run out anything, don't ask him about anything.

This psychotic, you will find, is usually in contest with spirits, even though he doesn't say so. That's because he's gotten down to the last ditch as a thetan and is trying to waste Christ or waste God so as to save himself. We'll get into wasting when we talk about Expanded GITA, but there at Step VII, you will most commonly find them trying to waste in the material universe. They always try to waste in the material universe what they have to waste in their own mind in order to get well. As an immediate diagnosis, they have to waste in the material universe what they should be wasting in mock-ups in their own mind in brackets to get well.

And so, you will find people around worshiping Christ, madly worshiping God, madly going around with voices of angels and God and so forth talking to them and having a dreadful time about all this. And they're being terribly respectful toward God and respectful toward Christ and so on.

This is not a talk on religion at all; I'm merely telling you an actual observation. And that's because the last thing they can be, you see, the collapsing environment has finally gotten down to them as a thetan. And to save themselves as a thetan, they have to waste admiration of Christ and God. And therefore, you find these things in an insane asylum all the time. All right.

When we're dealing, then, with Step VII, we are dealing with a problem which is basically anchor points, and which will manifest itself either by an inability to accept a single anchor point of any kind from anybody, or be unable to put out an anchor point of any kind or borrow or recognize an anchor point of any kind for what it is. And all this is so clouded with thinkingness and misidentification that these two things must be left severely alone. And you must remember that all you're trying to do is get them to accept a little anchor point, put out an anchor point; that's all you're trying to do. If you can get them to do that, you've got them on the way, unless you turn around and wreck them by running a complex thought therapy upon them, because that's what's wrong with them: the Iroquois Indians' sickness-of-long-thinking.

Now, they're below the level of scarcity of energy which anybody can bear, and they're really starved. They won't eat, they have to waste food. They have to waste motion so they don't move, or they move too erratically, so they have to waste controlled motion. And in this way, they're cut out of the strata of communication with their fellow man, and that is really what a psychotic is, he's a fellow that's out of communication with his fellow man, or out of communication with the MEST universe. And remember, is unable – and this definition follows – is unable to resume of his own volition communication with his fellow man or with the MEST universe. Remember, of his own volition.

In other words, you could be above communicating and still not be psychotic if you could resume of your own volition, with great ease, communication. That's obvious, isn't it? All right

So from Step VII we go immediately into Step VI. We run this technique, you understand, from I to VII in that order; I'm explaining it here from VII back to I to give you the strata of cases.

In Step VI, you have an acute state, very acute state of energy starvation. And it is a starvation which is so bad that you would find the running of concepts upon Step VI almost fatal. In other words, here you have the neurotic who is at the critical point, and who can be very easily tipped over into a Step VII by much more abuse by life. (Not by you as an auditor; you're not going to tip these people over.) Preclears are quite resistant, they just talk a lot and complain a lot.

Step VII is waiting for Step VI, and that's the definition of a Step VI case. This person doesn't think dearly about a lot of things, and is barely able to keep up with the more evil aspects of present time. This is the way they're identifiable. This person is able to keep up barely with the more evil aspects of present time and doesn't go into the future at all about anything. And they show emotion about present time only when confronted with something horrible. Or they merely consider everything in present time is horrible.

Well, this is the neurotic, this is the person who is nervous. You can tell this person. When this person holds a coffee cup, the cup chatters against the saucer. This is the person who, when he has a drink, has a hangover for three days. Or when he has a drink, has to have another drink and has to have another drink and has to have another drink, because, you see, the drink runs him out of energy. And the only way he can get to the state he was in before he

had to drink was to have a full glass in front of him. So he's trying to run back on the track to the time before he had the first drink, and he can't get there.

So, here is the person who, given any sedative really or given any stimulant, will carry it through to its final addiction if given any chance at all. The problem of dope, drugs, which results in the regimen of prescription, does not lie in the dope and the drugs; it lies in the neurotic or psychotic inability to restrain oneself from continuing with anything which will deliver a sensation, because these poor people are completely out of sensation. And then the government comes along and says, „You can't even have the sensation of opium. What you've got to drink is alcohol.“

The last survey I read on this subject, by the way, alcohol was much more harmful than opium, but I don't think they can workably collect adequate taxes from opium.

Anybody who is going to become an addict would become an addict of soda pop just as fast. It isn't so much, then, a study of the drug as it is the study of the mind. And this is adequately demonstrated if you've studied anything about alcoholics.

Well then, what do we do with the alcoholic? He's right on the borderline of a psychotic; he starts something, and we get into our Q and A. What do we do with this alcoholic? What kind of a frame of mind is he in? Well, let's look at Q and A. The answer to being drunk is, of course, being drunk. That's what he thinks. The answer *to* raising the dickens and stealing money from the family is raising the dickens and stealing money from the family. The answer to being nasty to Papa is being nasty to Papa.

Children play this, by the way. A little child gets into some bad frame of mind about life and he decides that this is it and he's acting that way and the answer to being that way is then to be that way. And so you get a continuous persistence of this condition. It's only interrupted when you vary the energy pattern, and you only vary the energy pattern when you vary the admiration available in the bank. In other words, you vary the energy pattern when you vary the energy, and the only thing that will dissolve energy is another kind of energy. All right

Therefore, we need a consistent and continual technique which will resolve for this person, very easily – not extreme, not Explosion Processing, that's too tough for number VI – but very easily and very pleasantly will resolve the scarcity of energy in the bank and mind itself, and that is best answered by something like Self Analysis. And there isn't any better technique for it.

What do you do for the alcoholic? You give him Self Analysis in large quantities. Preferably make him make two of them out there. You'll find out he'd be making them here first, and he eventually gets so he can get those mock-ups out there pretty far, preferably two mock-ups at a distance from him.

How many hours does it take, then, to get that bank up to a condition where – well, it'll take more hours than you as an auditor would care to associate with a psychotic or a neurotic. But at the same time, with all of your skill and with all of your knowledge, and however easy it may look to you, to reach in and touch that button and cure that fellow, and just *zing*.

You're dealing with quantity of energy which he himself and he himself alone can furnish and replenish! It can't be shot to him with a needle; we've tried it.

The answer to an alcoholic, a drug addict, a sexual pervert is a very easy answer: it's lots of Self Analysis. So you get somebody to work with him on the subject You get somebody to work with him to help you out Or you just make up your mind to sit there and slug it through. How many hours is it going to take to bring him up out of that state? Well, that depends upon the deficiency of energy in the bank, as he conceives it to be deficient.

Of course, he first had to get the idea it was deficient before he could get a deficiency of energy, but unfortunately, having gotten the idea the energy is deficient, it now becomes actually deficient And just by flipping that postulate out, you have not remedied the deficiency of energy. The postulate will turn up in the process, but only when you've given enough so the postulate can be given up. So what do you do? Self Analysis, Self Analysis and more Self Analysis.

How long? Eighty hours, two hundred hours, if you can get volunteers. How soon will the case break down and show improvement? Maybe fifteen minutes. Is that good enough to prevent a relapse? No, it's not.

And the main trick that you have is to discipline yourself to give him enough so that they've got enough energy replenished into the bank in order to stay where you want them to be in a stable state, and the only mistake you're going to make about this is being superambitious about these very low-toned cases, and you say, „I'm just going to spring this case, and he's going to go on his way happily, because it's been done before.“ Yes sir, it's been done before, in a minority of cases by a lucky thrust And I'll tell you something dreadful that my reports show: They didn't stay stable. I know the ground I'm walking on when I talk to you about Self Analysis. It's good solid ground. It's so idiotically simple that you as an auditor are very liable to say that it's beneath your dignity. Don't, because it is the remedy for the neurotic.

Let's take a break.

SOP 8: STEPS IV AND V

A lecture given on 1 October 1953
by L. Ron Hubbard

65 MINUTES

Continuing this second hour on SOP 8, I hope, if in a light fashion, I have covered to some degree the two most difficult levels, which are, regardless of what you might think – the most difficult levels, which are VII and VI.

There are those who believe the Resistive V, or the occluded case, is the most difficult case, and that's what we're going to talk about now. It's really not true. The most difficult cases are those who fall into the neurotic or psychotic bands. And once again, may I ask you not to identify a technique with a condition, beyond knowing that this technique belongs with that condition where that condition exists, and that the technique also belongs elsewhere. Just because we say this is the way you treat psychotics is no reason why you should then discard the technique for the good reason that if a technique reaches clear down to VII or clear down to VI, it is obvious that it's a very, very good technique for the earlier steps. It's just as far out as you can go with a technique, you see. That doesn't mean that when somebody is run on Self Analysis, he is a psychotic or a neurotic, or when you ask somebody to find the realest thing in the room that he is immediately a psychotic.

Preclears have a tendency, by the way, to associate these two items, the step being used and the condition, because they're always asking for somebody to evaluate for them. And if the auditor won't evaluate for them, they ask the modus operandi of the science to evaluate for them.

Number of hours people have spent looking over the Tone Scale, wondering „where I am on the Tone Scale.“ They say, „Let's see, I think I have column two here. That's right, I – I must be, gee, oh, I must be about 4.0. Let's see, column three, well, I'm above that, probably about 5.0.“ And then they look over in column six, and they all of a sudden say, „Uurrr, 0.5, well, that's no good. I'm not down there, (*sniff*) I couldn't be down there. Just because life has been cruel to me all the time is no reason I'm down there all the time.“ So, please remember that the best possible technique, then, would be one which would go all the way through all steps, and so it is.

Now, don't think that Take Ten Minutes of Nothing in Six Steps to Better Beingness, which we will cover later, would be a technique that would go all the way through to VII. It barely reaches to V. You ask a V sometimes to take ten minutes of nothing and he comes out at the end of it with so many somatics he's just about ready to spin, so that's not a very widely applicable technique to be put on SOP 8, you see. I mean, you couldn't put it into SOP 8 as reaching all the way through, even though it's a highly generalized technique.

Of course, the next technique immediately after Ten Minutes of Nothing remedies the other step and you'd keep a fellow going fairly well, but it would be quite upsetting to a VI or a VII to take ten minutes of nothing, because their entire anxiety is trying to get something.

Now, from IV, including IV down in the steps IV, V, VI and VII, we have a scarcity of energy brought about by the preclear's continuous necessity to have something and no necessity to have nothing. He's got to have something. And of course this is followed through; he gets something all right, he just gets solidier and solidier and solidier. His engrams get harder and harder packed, because trying to accept something from the environment, as far as the mind is concerned, is almost impossible.

The only energy – we're talking just about energy – the only energy which the mind has in it is the energy which the mind has generated. And even when somebody reaches in and blows up somebody's ridge or something of the sort, the energy which is recorded again is simply the energy of the energy of the preclear being recorded by the preclear's energy.

The explosion itself is not contained in the bank, and there isn't any energy contained in the bank. The pattern of the explosion has been retraced again on the basis of resistance by the preclear. And again, this pattern consists entirely of the preclear's energy. Everyone is holding on to both sides of all facsimiles.

And when we enter Case V, Case V is a little bit better off. Case V still has some energy. Of course, it's kind of black, but it's still energy. And if permitted to do so, Case V will actually avoid further energy, because he's not so far gone but what he realizes that taking this energy in from the environment isn't so good. So he sort of – he realizes that somebody has made an effect of him, and he still doesn't want to be an effect, and he's fighting back and forth about it, and Case V is stuck there with a large black mass of energy. And he can't get mock-ups or facsimiles; that's the definition of Case V, he can't get mock-ups.

But there is one mock-up which he can get. Most everybody overlooks this. Question and Answer run on him would be run this way: „Now, get a large mass of blackness as a question. Now right where it is, get it as the answer.“ That would be Q and A run on him. „Now get a large mass of silence,“ run as a question. „Now get a lot of silence as an answer.“ „Now get blindness as a question“ and „Blindness as an answer.“ And he at that moment will say, „*Huu-oohh*. How did you know I used to pretend to be blind when I was a little boy?“ If you're not up on the latest you would immediately say to yourself, „All we've got to do is run out the pretense and the postulate, 'I have to be bund' and he will cease to be a Case Level V.“ And this would all be very well if it worked, but it doesn't work.

Now, in order to understand a Case V, I am afraid we'll have to go into the whole theory of the explosion. And I will try to do this rapidly, and if you find it too technical, well, then, the answer to that is it's too technical.

You understand that the cycle of life, as represented by the Vedic peoples, consisted of, first, birth – which is creation – and then growth, then stagnation and decay, and that was the cycle. Now, let's look at that, and we find out – the Doctorate tapes has a lot about this – the cycles of action all follow this pattern, and there are lots of cycles of action. In 8-8008 they are listed, lots of them. And so, we get to this cycle of action as a pattern cycle.

Now, I'm going to draw it horizontally, because you're all used to reading books from left to right, which makes that the future. That black, very black part of there is the future for the V.

And so we go from this nebulous thing, this wild variable called „nothingness“ – which, in this case, happens to be a thetan – we go from there into what the thetan creates or acquires and adds to. We come up here, we get to a point where this curve upwards finishes, and we start down where he's trying to live off what he already has. And then we finally get down to where he hasn't got anything anymore, and we again have the thetan. And this is a cycle of action. And here we have, at the same time, creation, growth and then decay and destruction. And this is the cycle of the MEST universe.

Why is it the cycle of the MEST universe? Why does the thetan manifest himself in this universe this way? And this would be a little bit beyond you, quite in different ways in other universes, because he isn't nothing elsewhere.

It's very simple. When we get down to the problem, we find out that he's trying to approximate the MEST universe. And what thing in the MEST universe would he be most likely to approximate? The first thing he would encounter, of course, and that first thing happens to be space. So we have space, thetan, and his whole concept here is simply space. He understands that he has nothing when he has some space, because there isn't anything in this space, and this space in this universe is hungry.

If he happens to be unfortunate enough to have something on him when the MEST universe first meets him, he is, to be colloquial, frisked immediately, because the vacuum of space containing no resistance, yet contains an enormous hunger for anything which is solid, unless that thing which is solid is hung together with the greatest of cohesiveness, such as Earth.

And so Mr. Thetan would appear out in space someplace, if he appears in space – we're not talking about space opera now, we're simply talking about a being suddenly appearing in space. The same thing would happen if the air cover were suddenly ripped off Earth; to some degree the same thing would happen. And that would be that any particle of energy he had which was closely compacted would have more pressure in it than the space with which he was surrounded, and so you would get theoretically a sudden „*who*“ and everything he had would be gone.

There would be no resistance to energy in this space. He would try to handle it, and he'd find weird things happening to it because it isn't his space. In his own space, he of course can adjudicate what the pressures are, but the MEST universe tells him immediately that he is nothing, because it takes away from him anything he has.

So the thetan in this universe considers himself to be nothing unless he has something. „That's very bad to be nothing,“ he thinks, so the next thing you know, he's putting out this and that, and he's acquiring MEST, which is the one thing he can acquire in this universe with great security. There's lots of it; there's also lots of space. You wouldn't think there was a scarcity of anything if you took a good square look at this universe. The amount of matter present, the number of chemicals present and the amount of space present, the number of points of fire present, gee, most abundant thing you ever saw. Big trap.

Anyway, you come up here and he starts building, building, building, building more things, more things, more things. But how does he build them? Well, he puts out some energy; he creates some energy or something of the sort, and the next thing you know – he's entered somebody else's anchor point area usually, which is what has happened to him – and the next thing you know, he puts out this piece of energy, and it goes *pheww* and it gets big. And as the rays reach back to him again, he would even hear its concussion.

When he puts out a solid object into space, it, of course, is in a good condition to explode, if slowly, so he starts dealing with explosions. And all around him he can see explosions in this universe. So it's very simple if he's imitated the space of the universe already by saying he's nothing, he looks around at the most spectacular filling thing he could see in the universe, and it's an explosion. So he gets the idea he has to have an explosion, so he starts adding up explosions. An explosion goes up – brightness, brightness, brightness, you see, and goes off dark. And usually is burned out by the time it reaches him, and that darkness, therefore, is painful; which is to say, the impact and the darkness are simultaneous, and pain is simply a collapsing perception line. Well, it's dark, and then it's gone and he has nothing. So he's approximating this, because the cycle of an explosion is: nothing, growth, dark, nothing. That's the cycle of an explosion, that line there is understood. Nothing, dark, nothing. Nothing, bright, dark, nothing. Nothing, bright, dark, nothing. And this is what he has seen over and over and over and over.

And your Resistive V loves dangerous environments and he loves this and he loves that and he's got ideas about this and he's got ideas about this and he's got it all worked out and it's all figure-figure-figured and it's beautifully figured, and he knows he can't look, because it's black. He's used up all the bright out of the bank, and he has left the dark. One of the reasons why is admiration is the only thing which dissolves force; admiration dissolves force. Force applied will get admiration from a thetan. If you don't get admiration for force, you just haven't used enough force; if you don't get admiration, you've used too much force and he isn't putting out anymore. It's a nice test: how much force you put out to get admiration. Admiration is a thetan particle, it is not found in the MEST universe.

And we get immediately to something quite interesting as a concept. We find out that the only healing energy of which I have any knowledge is that healing energy which is exuded by the beingness, the live beingness itself. Life can heal Me, and MEST cannot heal life. The only really therapeutic agent which you have at your command in a preclear is the thetan. It's all very well to give him pills, but the pills work only because he mocks it up that they work. And that would immediately lead you into the thing of, „Well, if you cured the idea that the pills will work, and you get over the pretense and so forth, and you get him over the pretense in the belief that he's really just doing this, and if he didn't do this,“ and so forth, and we get all involved, we figure, figure, figure, why, we're Case Level V, so let's go on.

Now, we have here this cycle of creation, growth, decay and destruction – that's what life does in this universe, you see – approximated by the explosion, and the thetan is evidently imitating an explosion, which goes from nothing to something to something dark to nothing. And if you don't believe this, all of the (quote) secrets of life (unquote) start unrolling the moment you start running explosions on a preclear, particularly if you start exhausting the bank, you'll start running them backwards. You'll go: nothing, black, white, nothing, or just

nothing, black, white, nothing; nothing, black, white, nothing. And he gets a feeling of regret, of course, because that's backwards. When you run an engram backwards, you get the regret off of it. The fellow regretted doing something, which is to say he's trying to halt the action which is in progress, and you run it backwards and you get the emotion of regret.

And so, it becomes a very simple problem the second one realizes that the thetan can approximate something in this universe and is evidently doing so.

How many men have been known to their mother and father as Son? And how many men have found out that they weren't a good son? Fathers and mothers generally run for many years the beautiful sadness of having a son. And so he finds out he can't be the son. He'll tell you all about this, you see, he'll figure this out eventually. You just keep on running the process.

More computations start coming off, because you start blowing up circuits, and the reason you start blowing up circuits is you're feeding enough energy back into the bank. If you're very clever, you keep him feeding energy into the bank, because actually a Resistive V will take it out faster than he mocks it up in. He will surreptitiously say, „Well, we really ought to run this concept, don't you think? (*slurp*) There might be some white energy left in it (*slurp*).“ And one day he runs all the white energy he's got out of the thing, and he finds out he's awful dark. Now, that happens. It doesn't mean that he's really any worse off; it just means he'd have to process a little longer to get back to where he was.

The Resistive V also is called a Resistive V because he's usually a very tough, ornery, mean thetan. There is a difference amongst life forms; they are individual, one to another. People low on the Tone Scale think of them as a large mass which are undifferentiated. And the truth of it is, way up high on the Tone Scale, they do peel off of a large mass, but they peel off as individuals. They don't come off as „We're part of the allness, and we're indistinguishable from any other allness.“ They don't do this. They know they're people.

Fellow peels off from what you call – you can run this on a case in para-Scientology – the main body of theta. He peels off from the main body of theta. It's just like an airplane coming out of the sky or something of the sort Why did he do it? Well, he had this mock-up down there; it was very interesting. It seemed to get in trouble. And so he thought he'd better go down and see about it and pull it out Well, you say, „What were you just before you did that?“

„Me. Of course, the whole body is me.“ See, high degree of individuality without a lot of identification.

So, we get him running on explosions themselves. By the way, he has a tendency if you run them backwards – give you a word of warning – just to run off some regret and emotion off the bank and to run energy out. This gives him an opportunity to – whereas if you start him in mocking up good honest explosions, you start him in generally, „Now, throw some explosions up there that you can't have.“

„Okay.“

And he's running the resistance, you see, toward explosions, and he'll run it enough so that he'll start to get explosions. Fascinating. He starts throwing explosions around, and he

throws them over here and he throws them over here and he throws them up there and he throws them back there and he throws them – the blackness gets thinner and thinner and thinner. You're not interested in how thin it gets. More explosions, more explosions, more explosions, more explosions.

How many hours worth of explosions? It's a mechanical problem. He gets down, eventually, to a point where he just can't seem to make any headway, and he's having a little trouble, particularly, and he says, „You know there's always been this big slab of blackness across my right ear or inside my skull over here or back of my spine,“ or something. Most preclears will have those. But the Resistive V is too tough.

You see, when he first started in to stack up energy, when he started in to resist the MEST universe, he resisted! *Crunch*. So that some of the explosions which he resisted would have done for a worse person, and he's still got that, you see, and he'll have this large black mass of something or other. And you can boil it all down, but that will still stick around. Well, you just get lots of people admiring it and then you have *it*. See, he's granted it an identity.

There is the beginning of a demon; it's a ridge, and a mass which is – he won't take responsibility for. Well, at the moment the blackness hit him, after the explosion, he said, „I didn't want the explosion.“ That's the postulate he always made by the time this beautiful bright thing turned black and hit him. So, it's „no responsibility“ and „blackness“ are synonymous, so that „loss“ and „blackness“ are synonymous. Loss, something went away, which is a part of an expanding set of anchor points, you see; it's like an explosion – something going away. It's part of a dispersal, and right after that, he knows what he gets on a part of a dispersal; he knows what he gets from explosion: blackness. So you'll very often get people turning on blackness with a loss.

Well, you get this thing, this core of blackness, you get it to mock up lots of people admiring it. It isn't a real – it isn't alive, but he's granted it aliveness by saying, „It isn't mine.“

You can run out a lot of things on a concept, but don't The concept is lovely of „Well, I can't do anything about it I guess.“ That means no responsibility, which means, „I have not sufficient force to overcome this obstacle, and I can't do anything about it“; says, „I have no force about it.“

It's synonymous, so „I have no force“ and „I have no responsibility“ become synonymous, and in this way, you get the no responsibility factors which will occasionally show up in your Resistive V. Very well.

What does for your V rather neatly? Just lots of explosions. How many hours worth of explosions? How do I know? Not anywhere near as many hours as you will have to follow with a neurotic with Self Analysis. Nowhere near the number of hours, but lots of hours.

You really shouldn't keep interrupting a preclear. I do this every once in a while: this fellow starts off on conversation number sixty-three. I've heard it so many times, I know what he's going to say. I know what he's run into, and I know what it's leading into. I know what conclusions he's made and so forth, and I'm all set trying to process a preclear, and he's, of

course, trying relievedly to put out a couple of anchor points. And right about the time he's all set to put out these spoken anchor points and inform you that he has just gotten a clue on something or other, I am liable, in my haste, to overlook this fact and say, „Well, let's get on to the next explosion,“ or something of the sort, you know. You see him kind of deflate – you exploded at him.

Now, why does this blackness hang up? Well, it's because he got perceptions in explosions; therefore, he gets the idea he identifies perception with an explosion. Well, if he identifies perception with an explosion, he then believes an explosion takes place before perception is received. And he is alert to receive the energy which took place prior to the perception. He's alert to get hold of that piece of energy, and it isn't there, so the MEST universe gets him to fighting nothing.

A radio goes yap, yap and a fellow sits there and listens to it for a while and after a while he gets tired, because there's no explosion there. If you don't believe this, just start – as I showed you in that demonstration – just start mocking up a bunch of explosions. As far as that's concerned, any speech from anybody does this, any speech. If a person is delivering out a considerable quantity of energy, people can at least mock up the amount of energy which is being received, and it is less aberrative.

But a fellow who talks in a schoolroom, „Well, children, today we're going to take up side-angle-side.“ (I'm sorry, I can't get my voice down there.) Very, very dull, you see, very quiet, and so forth, without any aliveness to it He's starting in toward MEST, but live theater will never perish because there is theta energy back of every spoken word, there is a tiny explosion back of every perception, there is an explosion there. But the radio, nuh-uh. The movies, no. The books, no.

Now, what do you do when you read? Your V is always a very educated fellow. Why? Why does every educated man you run into that you can talk to who knows anything turn out to be a Resistive V? That's because in order to read, you have to suppress white and receive black. If you want to give any preclear a sudden flash of a book, just get him to suppressing white in brackets. Don't tell him what he's suppressing, just say, „Get the idea of suppressing white, suppressing white, suppressing white, other people suppressing white for other people, suppressing white...“ All of a sudden, he'll start to get this funny idea, and he'll get a facsimile or something of himself sitting there reading a book.

There is nothing much to this, you see – I mean, it's not very hard suppression, but all blackness in this language is synonymous with knowledge, mystery, and what is the significance? Well, why? It's because it's bright. That's fine. Who worries about it when it's bright? You can perceive when it's bright, but then it gets dark, and a person who sees a flash up there says immediately afterwards, „Oh, I wonder what that was.“ Well, that's about the time the black reached him, you see. So if you get somebody to just run the concept for a moment, „What is the significance of that?“ actually, everything is liable to turn a little bit black. „What's the significance of that?“ The mystery! Yes, a very important thing, the mystery.

There is one society, a rather barbaric society I heard about that – somebody told me about this society; I was never there myself – where they took a small child and they put him in a cubicle at a very early age and they restrained all motion. They kept him in this cubicle

for a number of years, and all the time had him suppress white while he was in the cubicle. And then they gave him a diploma, and he was educated. And everybody was cross with him, because he didn't go into a high level of motion with his education. Of course, societies of that character are completely beyond your comprehension; no society would ever do this to anybody!

But there's the restimulation of the blackness. Suppress the white paper and you get the black ink. And the black ink is supposed to say things to you; it's supposed to have significance, you see. Only, of course, blackness doesn't contain any significance, so you're right on a maybe. And then the teacher says, „Now, write it all down on an examination paper.“ *Ooohh*. But it doesn't have any significance.

Now, a person is asked to read a novel The only reason people read novels and read stories like I used to write is because they don't have enough action in their own lives. It's pretty hard to get a four – or five-, six-year-old child to sit down and read Dostoevski. He's not liable to ask, „What is the significance of it?“ He's liable to be completely incredulous that anybody – but by the time he's gotten to be twenty-five or thirty-five he sits down and he says, „Isn't it significant!“ Significant of what? Russian writing? Well, it's significant of Dostoevski, of course. Poor old Dostoevski had embraced the Christian Church before he got through, poor fellow, and he's about the best there is over there. And you still would have a hard time really sitting down and justifying reading Dostoevski if the Rockettes were waiting outside to play with you. I'm afraid you wouldn't do it. I'm afraid if a style show was going on with lots of pretty girls in it and so forth, and it was all free and there was lemonade and beer included, and it was just as dose to you as the book, I think you'd go to the style show. Of course, at this level of society, it would probably have to be as close to you as the book before you would go. All right.

You get the idea, then. The fellow is picking up his anchor points from this dose, with the future over here on his right side, and he isn't bothering, because he doesn't got enough sense to mock up all the scenes he sees described. But if he had enough sense to do that, he would then be delivering into the hands of an author the command power to regulate his own mock-ups exclusively, and he would go through years and years and years and years and years, you see, of habitually depending exclusively upon somebody else to give him a mock-up. And this would be very sad indeed.

The other thing that worries a V comes from one of the Prelogics. There are five Prelogics, they consist of the mission of theta. The effort of theta is to locate things in time and space. Also to create time and space in which to locate things. And an explosion sure does that If you've ever been sitting on anything that exploded, it sure relocated you. And so, one has a tendency to avoid spots where he's been blown up, simply because he was moved, not because it was dangerous to be there, and one gets into the habit of being moved through the universe by something else.

And when one is being removed from hither to thither by something else, he gets into the very bad habit of depending upon the environment to move him around. And when he depends upon the environment to move him around and when he's had lots of explosions move him around, the dispersal characteristic of the explosion or the dispersal characteristic

of moving around generates a feeling of fear in him about going back to places he has been. And he is *unable to return*, which makes it *impossible for him to exactly duplicate anything*.

The inability of the person to go back down the time track exemplifies this; it merely means he was unable to go back to a geographical location. You can find the geographical location that he can't return to, too, and just run Reach and Withdraw toward it, and its reach and withdraw toward him, and it'll show up just as mechanically as that So we have this condition whereby all a person's activities can be traced back on an aberrative level which is dependent on energy, which is a reactive level – can be traced back to the explosion.

Now, differentiate please, between the reactive level of stimulus-response, as depending upon an explosion, and the thetan's ability to be or approximate or think up something to be anything. Now, remember that, that this is not the thetan working wholly stimulus-response. He doesn't work that way, but he's been handling things which work that way, which is to say, reactive things in MEST so long that he recognizes the pattern very ably, and will eventually decide he might as well follow it along, which gives him the idea of going across this action. But because the thetan on his analytical beingness level does not like to go this cycle, because it's reverse for him – it's not that he's a mirror image, this cycle just happens to be in reverse to the way he'd like to go. He doesn't want to get older and older and worse and worse and shorter and shorter cycles and shorter and shorter cycles, he just doesn't want that. He'd rather get better and better. That's his natural bent, but the explosion gets worse and worse. It gets big and bright, and then goes. All right.

Your V is located on the wrong side of the explosion. It's as simple as that And boy, will he evaluate on it (*tsk*). He's got to think about it before he can be, because he's fresh out of locations in which he can be. And you will find that the V has had enough bad things happen to him, he's been fixed in space enough that he has decided there are many places he can't be. And unable to be there, he then is unable to return. And being unable to return, he also mustn't be left behind, so he becomes the „only one“. You see how he could become the „only one“? He doesn't like to be left behind.

Do you know, you often hear somebody say, „Well it was all right for me to leave him, but it was not all right for him to leave me.“ Well, that's just an explosion operating, that's all – mustn't be left behind. Well, how is this an explosion operating? Residue. Debris and residue is the unadmired end of the explosion. And that which is not admired tends to persist, and the V has come to the end of the explosion where all he has left is the debris, which is what is being left behind, so he's very anxious about being left behind computationally. He's got to excel. He has to be the one that does the leaving. Yes, because the conservation of energy tells him that you can't burn cinders. So you can't do anything about residue, so that's a real point of apathy, and that's what's left behind when the explosion explodes.

Now, this sounds too dopey for words. Don't bother with its explanation, because you can get that off any Resistive V if you just start in running explosions on him in brackets. Now, you run it in a bracket, then you handle a Case Level V.

Actually, the best method I know of to handle a Case Level V now is Step Level V of SOP 8-L. And that has the single difference of you run explosions at Case Level V, and you mock them up in brackets. In other words, you have the preclear mock up explosions for him-

self, then you have somebody else out in front of him mock up explosions for themselves, and then you have other people somewhere else mock up explosions for each other. And then you have, if you want to finish off a complete bracket, the preclear mock up explosions for other people, and other people mock up explosions for the preclear, which is, of course, what people used to do to each other's mock-ups like mad. A fellow would put up a mock-up and somebody would blow it up.

That's what a thetan is trying to do. What is the thetan trying to do? He's trying to put up a mock-up.

Kind of simple, but a kid, if you start giving him mock-ups out of *Self Analysts*, he'll actually do it just day after day after day after day. It's the one thing a thetan loves to do. And if he's not permitted to put up mock-ups in MEST, which is best by the way, he'll put them up in his own universe. He thinks it's much better to put them up in MEST.

A painter would much rather paint a painting over here on the wall, because then it gets other people's admiration, and he thinks he can then pick up other people's admiration and use that in the bank. And it's very interesting. What he's doing, he can do approximation in his own bank of the admiration which is coming to him, which is an exterior control, which gives him a pattern which he can then mock up. But if he can no longer mock up a pattern which is coming in to him, he can't get other people's admiration admiring his painting, so he begins to believe that people don't admire anything, because he can't feel any of this admiration. Well, that's because he isn't mocking up the admiration which is coming in to him anymore so he can have some admiration.

Now, you just run this in brackets as I gave it to you there, and he'll start learning about life. He'll tell you astonishing things. He'll suddenly say to you, „You know, I just can't stand the idea of accepting money from anybody.“

And you'll say, „When did that come up?“ And you say, „Well, what – how did you – what do you mean?“

And he'll say, „Well, it just occurred to me that all the bright and beautiful things of life are only possible if you have money. And I suddenly realized when I was a little child I used to like bright and beautiful things, but I didn't have any money to buy them with. And then my uncle gave me some money, and I bought this and it broke.“ It'll be some very, very involved thing, you see, and he'll go off, tail off into some long explanation of how this all comes about Well, you just run a few more explosions, and he doesn't care whether he had any money or didn't have any money.

Well, at first you may have to run these explosions; you've asked him to get an explosion and he thinks you mean something that would go *bang* and real fast, and he won't do that He's got so much pressure on it all, he's suppressed – in order to get hold of, if you please, enough (not so he wouldn't get hurt) – he's suppressed so many explosions in order to get hold of them and own them and grab them that he's gotten the idea that he has to suppress all explosions. And do you know you wouldn't be able to get the fellow to hold a lighted stick of dynamite in his hand if you paid him? He thinks he has to suppress all explosions. So when you get a person reading too much, he's suppressing white, which represses his explosions. And he's living in a carbon-oxygen engine, and the carbon-oxygen engine needs explosions

in order to exist and only exists and only runs if it can be permitted to explode in a certain way, and so he suppresses existence and runs down in his... This is just one of the explanations you will get from a V as you go on and on with this processing. He'll just give you lots of them.

Well, don't stop him too often; the poor fellow can't put out anchor points anymore. Let him tell you about some of them. But if he starts going off on nothing but philosophy, and if he goes over fifteen or twenty minutes on one explanation of why it was that, you'd better stop him and get another explosion in. Because what he's trying to do is run out and eat up the whiteness he has just mocked up on the pretense that he has a good reason to do it. So there's your V. All right

Step Level IV of SOP 8-L is a slight variation on Expanded GITA. And it is Expanded GITA run, as I've mentioned earlier, so that you feed the bank the various objects which it is resisting. And the only reason you do this in SOP 8-L is to give the person a good insight and understanding into enough things so he'll let go of some of his most cherished problems and get on with processing. And that's why we have SOP 8-L as a slight variation and part of SOP 8. It's not another process; it's SOP 8 addressed toward cases which start sliding down the line too far and which have to understand before they can be. And it is introducing the very best method I know of for handling a Resistive V. This is – at this time that's the best method I know of.

So we get SOP 8-L at Step Level IV using Expanded GITA, not to remedy a thing in terms of energy really, but just enough so that he'll see that he has to accept a certain level of being ill. You see, we're in a society at this time where it's not polite to be well. Particularly America; America has gotten itself into a dreadful situation, because everybody is so equal. And if everybody is equal through a country, you are immediately posing the very bad situation that one psychotic sets up an example that anybody is supposed to be equal to. This can be very rough. So you'll get an impressed level of agreement, one with another.

So what's acceptable is a slight case of dyspepsia or something of the sort. A person has to have something wrong with him, and so you start feeding him an acceptable level of illness. „Now, just get an acceptable level of illness. Now, put out the level of your own discomfort until somebody shows up that it was acceptable to.“ Aw, this is tricky; this is a sneaky one. You just say, „Put out your condition out front till somebody shows up it was acceptable to.“ This will clean out postulates out of the bank, but it doesn't do terribly much for the case; it brightens the case up.

And it sure teaches them about life. Because there's Grandma. And he says, „What!“ Well, it seems like the only thing Grandma would ever accept from him was being ill. He would run around and be happy and cheerful – wasn't acceptable. But he'd stub his toe or get a cough or something like that, and immediately Grandma would say *slurp!*

And he runs this for a little while, and he all of a sudden will say, „You know, all that old lady wanted was sick people.“ This will suddenly come to him. You start running Grandma accepting illness elsewhere, and this will suddenly occur to him. This was all that was acceptable to her. She was sweet and sympathetic all the time when you were sick, but boy, she sure didn't like well people.

It'll come to a person immediately that he wanted his parents worried. See, what was acceptable to him was a slight level of worry, because the only time his father would pay any attention to him, he suddenly discovers, was when there was – when his father thought there was something wrong. So his father would say, „What's wrong? Have you hurt yourself?“ You know, „What's wrong? Have you hurt yourself?“ And that was the only attention Papa ever gave him. So naturally, he had to worry Papa a little bit to get some attention. So he finds himself winding up eventually with the computation that he had better worry, so he's worried.

What's he worried about? Well, he'll give you a lot of reasons why he's worried about it. A worried condition was what his Papa had concerning him, and so he began to miss this. You see, Papa was no longer as worried as previously, so the answer to this, of course, was to set up being worried, Papa being worried. Question: „How do I make Papa worried?“

Answer: „Papa worried.“ So he's in Papa's valence a little bit and worried.

About what? Well, if you watched him for a little while you'd find out what he was worried about, because he would start expressing it All of a sudden there's a backfire in the street, something on that order, and a squeal of brakes, and this is the first time he's showed any animation at all, he immediately rushes to the window to see if somebody was hurt (*slurp*). An impact has happened, and this is so he could be sympathetic.

How can you be sympathetic? The way to be sympathetic is Question and Answer again – Q and A The way you be sympathetic is simply to be the other person. Sympathy is mocking oneself up as the other person, and if one does this expertly one thinks he gets the energy from the other person's illness, you see, or impact.

Operations are real tasty. If you don't believe this – if you don't believe this, I think Hippocrates was one of the first to state that a patient should go around and tell about his operation six or seven times; they always did. And you go out in the Midwest – that's a part of the United States; I think it was, the last time I looked – and you will go back on the farm district, and believe me, if somebody's had an operation, boy, has he got conversational material. He's just got it for years to come. Of course, after a while everybody will have enough mock-ups of his operation so they don't consider it tasty anymore, but they'll still sit there and listen while Uncle Bill tells about the time he had his three toes amputated for frost. It's impact, you see.

This is the way it works out, then, that you have things resisted until they become accepted, and that unfortunately is the acceptance level of the individual. And a person runs Step IV of SOP 8-L simply by running his condition as acceptable and other people's conditions as acceptable and remedies as acceptable and then you try to find things that really are acceptable to him.

Now, the SOP 8 list of Expanded GITA is very helpful, but there's one being printed in a later PAB which you will find even more shocking. Very well.

This isn't therapy so much as an education. He finds out that he has resisted dirt to a point where he can't have anything but dirt, so he's stopped bathing. But that's very peculiar. He remembers distinctly being well-trained in bathing – beaten, in fact. And so he gets hold of a mass of energy which consists of his beatings, impacts. And when he picks these up, they

have the aberration in them „don't bathe,“ of course, because dirt, every slash of the whip that he was spanked for being dirty about, has in it, actually, very often literally... Have you ever run this phrase out of a preclear? „I'll teach you how to...“ When he picks up the mass of energy which is desirable to him, he also picks up the thought panel which he then tolerates, but then he doesn't realize why he's so unhappy.

Energy is good, and yet somebody says this is bad and pain is bad and this is bad and that's bad and it's so bad everywhere else – “You have to look where I tell you to look,“ you see. That's the way it runs. Very well.

You take the Expanded GITA list, and you simply run the Expanded GITA list as acceptable; what is acceptable in it, what's unacceptable, what's acceptable in it. And boy, you'll find some strange things, because you'll find that some of the things in the Expanded GITA list have to be put into an incredibly bad, undesirable form as far as you're concerned, at which moment they become very acceptable to the preclear. All right.

„Brains.“ *Nneerr*, nothing happens. „Dull brains.“ Nothing happens. „Dead brains.“ Nope. „Decayed brains crawling with maggots,“ (*slurp*).

That's the way it goes, and this fellow realizes, to him, that he actually has – all of a sudden it shows him to himself suddenly as what he's pretending not to be all the time, but he knows he has become. And he feels like sort of a Mr. Hyde under the cloak of a Dr. Jekyll, because the society at large wouldn't tolerate him for a moment with this acceptance level, so he says he hasn't such an acceptance level and won't accept it himself analytically – oh no – but there's his reactive mind just dying of starvation for something too horrible to mention, even on the tape. And what you do is cure a flock of appetites. It's therapeutic, sure; it'd run out if you just ran explosions, but he all of a sudden realizes this is what's happened. And he faces, for the first time, the fact that he had an appetite for such a thing.

I've had a preclear look at me very alertly and very smilingly, and all of a sudden tell me, „Well, you know, that's the first time I ever admitted it to myself, (*sigh*)“ And you run it a few times, and he has no such appetite; it's gone. But he's been suppressing the appetite, and so we run into Freud's unconscious mind complete, and we could run it out complete. And it's explained utterly as far as the preclear is concerned, and therefore we're happy about it And there goes the unconscious, the sputter conscious, the id conscious and all the rest of the suppressions and mayhems and the savage and brutal ravings and so forth of the barbaric and primitive self.

That isn't any barbaric and primitive self; a person gets this when he gets civilized! When he gets *real* civilized, he really develops some *weird* appetites, because he's been told he can't have this and he can't have that and this is inhibited and that's inhibited. And you get the poor old savage running around climbing trees, eating each other up – oh, they're happy about it You'll go around to a cannibal, probably he's trying to run out a scarcity of men. So, in such a way we can solve, very easily, a preclear's inability to understand why it was that he never got along with certain people, why he was never quite acceptable to his parents, and this is one of the most revelatory things that happens.

He realizes the acceptance level of his parents was too low for his own consideration. He will usually suddenly decide this, if he is one of these rejected people. He'll find out what

was acceptable to his parents. And it's usually quite weird, because it's very weird through the whole race. And if he had been a sick, anemic, very, very studious and extremely obedient little boy, or if she had been an entirely gaunt, sex-starved female, he or she would have been completely acceptable to the parents, utterly.

The person says, „Well, no wonder I never wanted to get in with this family. I wouldn't be such a person, I just wouldn't I wonder if that's why I am that kind of a person now.“

Well, and so we bring it up to Step IV. That's a very simple thing to run, you understand, it's just run horrible things in brackets, and you just run them until the preclear finds some things he'll accept and find out what kind of people the parents accepted, and he suddenly begins to winnow out existence, and he takes a look at it, and his familial problems and that sort of a thing have a tendency to vanish. It's a very, very easy thing to run.

What is acceptable to the parents? He finds out.

What's acceptable to him? He's astonished and incredible.

All it takes to run this is an imagination, which you don't care how horrible it gets. And that's good for you, too. All right. And so we've got Step IV of SOP 8-L.

Good old Step IV of SOP 8 is still quite workable, but the best things to run in SOP 8, and the things that you should really teach the preclear about are as follows: wasting fighting, wasting work, wasting pain and wasting admiration. You don't care how he wastes these things, but you want them wasted in brackets: wasted for himself, wasted for others and wasted by others for others. Those are the four, and they're really all that's important.

But there are the most important ones of the category, because they suddenly demonstrate to him that work is scarce, and he wants to work. They demonstrate to him that pain is not unbearable and is even desirable, and they tell him that he's shunned admiration because he's seen it given away to too many unworthy objects. And it tells him he hates force, because its – fighting is something he doesn't dare have. And it brings him out at the other end of it, scrappy as a bantam, and then he gets mild as can be. „Why fight?“ he says, „Except maybe it might be exciting.“

Well, so Expanded GITA actually could be boiled down to just that, as given in SOP 8 in the Issue 16-G. It can be run just like that, in brackets as the only amendment, just like it's printed in Issue 16-G, and it'll get therapeutic results. But we don't need that much processing now; we want to teach him something about life. That's the only reason we're processing him at that level. And the only reason we're processing explosions at Case Level V is to feed the bank, and mock-ups at Case Level VI is again to feed the bank energy. We've got a starvation problem.

And we go right straight down the line through Step I, Step II, Step III, and if we're successful in any of those three steps, we do not have an immediate problem of starvation in the bank, so we just run those off. But we'll cover those later in the next lecture.

SOP 8: STEPS I, II AND III

A lecture given on 2 October 1953
by L. Ron Hubbard

62 MINUTES

Continuing now these lectures on SOP 8, SOP 8-L, we want to cover specifically Steps I, II and III of SOP 8.

A little later this afternoon there will be a demonstration on Acceptance Level Processing. The reason for this is several people have asked me how you did it

And now, it's too simple. Did you find anything very complicated about Q and A when I gave you a demonstration on it? Very uncomplicated. Well, Acceptance Level is just a little more complicated than that.

People have a certain thirst for complication. Very often, steps such as I, II and III will be complicated by an auditor, either in his understanding or in his application.

These three steps are actually all of a kind. Any case that exteriorizes or is going to exteriorize, will on these first three steps in a very short space of time (twenty minutes, fifteen minutes). I give myself about five minutes on these first three steps. Just a quick rundown. I'll give them Step I, give them Step II. If they're not out, I give them Step III and, generally, if a case is going to be rather easy, he will be exteriorized almost immediately.

If he's going to be very rough, you'll find that he will have a variation. And he will flick through Step IV and Step V and he'll have to have this and that. You'll find out that if he's not out of his head with a good auditor in about twenty minutes, half an hour, then he's going to plot a curve of exteriorization and then he can't get out. And then he exteriorizes again and then he can't get out again. The reason for this should be obvious to you: it's that he has enough energy starvation so that he is incapable of putting out energy without restimulating something in the body. You see how that is. And the second that this occurs, then you've got to remedy energy starvation one way or the other.

So that here he is, the first time you ask him to get out – first time you ask this fellow to get out of his head – of course, everybody has made this very difficult by planting the phrase liberally in the bank, „You're out of your head.“

„No, I'm not out of my head.“ You know, Dianetics still works.

The readiest means of testing, if you want to know, *pant*, right this minute, whether or not a person is going to exteriorize on those first three steps, you just – I mean, rather quickly and without any energy starvation remedied, you just ask him, „All right, now I'm going to snap my fingers.“ (*snap*) „Did you hear that?“

„Yes.“

„All right, hear it again.“ He says, „Yes,“ he'll be out of his head in three steps, if not one.

Why? The sound which first told him that there could be such a thing as sound, evidently, on the evolutionary track, came to him out of an explosion.

And if he can receive and recall sounds easily, in recall, and get the same sound back, he is not worried about an explosion. And if he is worried about an explosion, it's because he's pulled in all the explosions in the bank in order to drain the energy out of them.

See how simple that is? That's a simple test, and it simply tests whether or not the person has sonic. If a person has sonic he's not locked up in an explosion. This doesn't say he won't be anxious about explosions, it doesn't say that explosions couldn't be run on him with profit, but if he has sonic, why, he'll get out those first three steps.

Now, if his sonic is very dim or conceptual, we immediately can plot this curve [drawing on blackboard] of his case: He's in his head and he's out of his head and now he's feeling better and now he's feeling horrible and now he's feeling much better and now he's feeling not quite so horrible and now he's feeling... And he'll go over the humps on lids for some weeks, really, until he's finally feeling fine. He can get to that state, but he gets to that state on a basis of remedying an energy starvation.

All right, let's look at the mechanics of what happens then. We're breaking SOP 8 into two pieces; we're breaking it into Steps I, II, III and Steps IV, V, VI, VII. You have two distinctly different types of cases.

They're on a gradient scale and we could break it as handily at Step II, but it would not be the same, true.

We have two different types of cases – always have had. There's the occluded case, and the case who has recalls.

Now, actually, there's three cases, but this other one is a sleeper. We have the occluded case as an intermediate case. And up above that, we have a case who has good recall in terms of perception. And then below that level, we have the case who recalls with vivid perception things that never happened. And this we call, sarcastically, the wide-open case.

The wide-open case is very often found at Levels VI and VII. And by the way, you'll find Step VII cases who can exteriorize or who are exteriorized but who are mad as hatters, inside or outside. You'll find some cases, by the way, that they present a perfectly sane aspect and then you say, „Be three feet back of your head,“ and they're roaring mad. They start to take off for Arcturus. Such a case – such a case: they just start off into space and they're gone and they're not going to come back, and the body – this person has never heard of exteriorization or anything of the sort They are marked by people who tell you how bad things are. This is the single characteristic of that case: it's how bad things are. Now, they'll tell you bad occurrences and horrible happenings, and so forth. And as soon as a person has, as his constant chatter, „Well, I saw this... When I was a little child, I was told that ants got into the skull. And I never believed it, but the other day I saw a person that ants had crawled under the scalp

and had eaten the whole brain away.“ Or „I knew a fellow that when you touched him on the shoulder, all of a sudden the whole shoulder caved in, because he'd had cancer for years and hadn't known it, and he died the next week.“ I don't know why it is, but in farming districts you'll find this type predominating. Well, very well.

Where it comes to your exteriorize-and-run-away case, you'll know this case, because – it might be a pretty girl, by the way; don't take an exterior manifestation. Might be a pretty, sweet-looking girl that something has gotten hold of. And it isn't the girl you're talking to, by the way; it's the something that got hold of. This girl isn't in the possession of a demon like they used to think of; she's the demon.

Might be a very nice-looking, pleasant young man. Very handsome. He hasn't had time to mess this body up yet very badly. In a few years, the girl and the boy, they won't be in such good shape; they'll look pretty bad.

But you get young people, and you'll quite often run into this, and you say, „All right, be three feet back of your head now,“ and all of a sudden, *pow*. They'll just go completely limp, just like a rag doll. They just slump forward in the chair – silence. That's all you know about it, see. I mean, they sat there and they were chattering away and they were telling you how their great-aunt Rebecca had the mumps when she was ninety and it rotted her jaws away or something. They're engaging in some pleasant conversational topic. And somebody says, „Be three feet back of your head,“ see, *pam*, and they go slack or they get stiff. Well, they're gone.

And I know of one case where an auditor – this is a bad moment for an auditor, a real bad moment for an auditor. It's your own darn fault for telling such a case, you see, to be three feet back of their head when they obviously were nutty as a cuckoo dock. Because the thetan, uninhibited by the body, really takes off.

So this one auditor pleaded with her. He said, „Think of your little child.“ „Think of your parents.“ „Please come back.“ „Life isn't too terrible to live, life isn't too awful. Please come back.“ Just slack, see. The body is just sitting there in a complete slump. No twitch. „Well, if you come back I can do a lot for you, and life will be much better than it was in the past.“ Still slumping. Finally, this fellow, after a half an hour of pleading, came out with the line, „Think of your poor auditor.“ And it brought her back.

By the way, she was entirely sort of blasted at the time this occurred. She returned into the body and was just – all was revealed, you know. She was really groggy. It took the auditor a lot of Straightwire, and so forth, to just straighten her out a little bit so that she could navigate. That's rather typical, no real damage. So there's a corpse left around; the thetan didn't want it.

This person can be expected to assume a rather different attitude toward existence just through that one exteriorization. Well, that type of case, of course, is normally delusory. But it isn't a problem in energy so much; it isn't a problem in anything I know anything about except they just can't reason, don't reason, they're antisocial, and so on. And it's mainly a question of postulates and downright cussedness. But what you've got to straighten out is the thetan. The easiest way to process the thetan is actually when exteriorized. You just get the

thetan to change his mind, and the thetan is being very resistive and saying, „Well, I don't want to change my mind. I want to think things are horrible. The devil with it.“

Well, that's just a being you're talking with; you're talking with a person. Only this person can now talk with you safely, because this person is many feet away from you, and you can't find out quite where they are in the room. And they can use this body as a Communications medium, and so they talk real brave and they tell you the truth of the matter: 'To hell with you.'

Now, this is a problem that a demon exorcist in the early Middle Ages would probably have written up as a highly significant something or other, and it would probably now appear as one of the... The person who exteriorized her would probably now be canonized at least, if not shot. Now, three... You didn't like that pun. All right.

„Be three feet back of your head.“ Please tell me why nobody ever said this in the last umptousand years. This is fantastic. Because 50 percent, at least, of the people who come in and sit down, I don't care what their age is – something like this – you say, „Be three feet back of your head.“

Sometimes you get the reaction, „Why?“

„Well, it might be more comfortable outside.“

„Might be more comfortable outside! You mean people are inside their heads!“

You would be just amazed how often one gets that reaction. One girl I know was given 125 electric shocks because the psychiatrist found she was outside of her head. Too sane for him.

Anyway, let's look at the mechanics which we can theorize at this time – evidently works; it works out in theory – but let's look at the mechanics of why a person doesn't easily get out of his head, and why, after he's gotten out of his head two or three times, and so forth, he all of a sudden stops getting out of his head and sticks or something.

We have inside this person's skull a lot of energy deposits. It's very real energy. It's there, it's measurable, it has quantity. If you don't believe it, look at some of these very solid people. That's nothing but this type of energy.

Now, the thetan is in the midst of all this, see. And the first time you ask him to put out a beam, you get this kind of a situation, you see. Here he is, and you ask the thetan inside the head to put out a beam. So he puts out a beam against the front of his forehead and lengthens the beam. And the second he puts out a beam and lengthens the beam, it'll just back him right out of his head. Therefore, „Be three feet back of your head“ is much better than „Push yourself *out* of your head.“

You see, *be* in another location, don't *move* to the other location. Moving is energy and use of. And being is, of course, just another geographical location. He doesn't have to use energy to be from one of these places to another.

This is fantastic material which has been discovered here and I don't blame people at large for wincing about it. Fortunately, an auditor doing SOP 8, SOP 8-L well delivers a tremendous conviction in terms of the public with which he's surrounded, simply because he can

change over 50 percent of the people he processes from dark to light in a very short space of time.

He could take, for instance, a juvenile delinquent, see, and he'd say, „Be three feet back of your head.“ „Now, why are you being a bad boy?“ „Okay, can you change your mind about that? What do you have to pick up to be more agreeable to your parents?“ „Oh, you don't want to be agreeable to your parents. Well, what makes you unwilling to be agreeable with your parents and the society at large?“ „Oh.“ It'll be some kind of an answer. „All right, well, change your mind about it if you can. Can you change your mind about it?“

„Yes.“

„Well, shift your postulates, then.“

All right, he does. But he looks around at the same time, and he sees he's not the body; been kidding himself all this time. He looks around and he sees what the situation is in relationship to this body. He suddenly becomes interested in the fact that he has a couple of anchor points out, and the body is depending for its electrical current on this and that, and gets tremendously interested.

You've given him a brand-new world. After that, he hasn't got time to be a bad boy. And after you've finished this very short session, he goes home and he says, „Hiya, Pop.“ And he's always said „*Hm!*“ And so we have an altered behavior pattern. How much processing? Five or ten minutes.

You see, you could do that often enough, if you care to; you could do that often enough to carry a tremendous impact on the people around you.

It doesn't require anything superspecial in you or for you to hold your breath or put your feet in a certain proximity one to another to generate enough energy to give them enough force and power to back up out of their heads. You're just wasting your time. You just communicate with them, you want them three feet back of their heads, and a very large percentage of the people you run into simply will be.

And, of course, those people who are being difficult about it get more time from you, which is probably why they're being more difficult about it Because you see, they get hours' worth of attention whereas the other fellow only gets a couple of minutes. This guy is in good shape, though, and he's happy and there's a lot of adventure waiting for him and the other fellow, he's just going around getting the beautiful sympathy of being very aberrated. All right.

So he puts out this beam here, and pushes himself a little bit the second he puts out energy, or he does it inadvertently as he moves out of his head. And the second he does that, this... [drawing on blackboard] There weren't any agitated deposits in the vicinity of his head when he did this the first time, but you've shifted him somewhat on the time track. And the next thing you know, this is the picture which his skull represents, and this material may be of a gluey consistency or something of the sort, and it goes into restimulation and he gets the idea that he's fixed in his head.

Really, there's no reason at all why an occluded case can't be ten yards, eight miles – and very often, by the way, they will be a couple of hundred miles away. They will exteriorize if you just say, „Where would you like to be?“

„Oh,“ the fellow would say, „I'd like to be home at dear old Gladolia Manor.“

„Okay, be in the living room at Gladolia Manor.“ And they will actually, completely exteriorize with a great deal of certainty into the old homestead, something of the sort, and look around there and take a good look and see that the place isn't the same as it used to be. And they'll get interested in this and so on.

Then you start to operate them dose to the body and you're operating them dose up to where the energy patterns are and the energy lumps and blocks are, and so on. And this energy goes into restimulation. And the next thing you know, it's all sticky and they get the idea that they can't move because of course you can't move if you're surrounded by stickiness.

And so, this condition changes to this condition. Well, normally the change isn't as marked. If this condition is going to be present at all, it's at least present to the degree that a person doesn't have any sonic recall, because all of this is based basically on an explosion. All right.

Therefore, Steps I, II and III may have to be repeated if it takes you too long to do it. If it happens immediately, *pom*, you're not going to have to worry about this case very much. Of course, there is this about the case: This case may have to do a lot of work outside his body.

Such as one girl, she was apparently in apathy. She exteriorized beautifully, she had a great certainty on exteriorization and so forth, and she didn't change in aspect very much after she exteriorized, which always makes one somewhat suspicious.

One's suspicion, by the way, is quickly answered if some preclear tells him, „Yes, I am up there.“ Oh yeah? Because his immediate response would be – is „My body is down there.“ That's his viewpoint That's where *he* is. „My body is down there.“ He doesn't think of where he is. When you get people talking about „my thetan,“ that sort of thing, you, all of a sudden – you know this is not true. But it doesn't matter too much whether it's true or not, the person's... But this lady didn't change; she was obviously exteriorized. She'd say, „Yes, I'm here.“

„Where is here?“

„On the lamp here.“ Still sad, still apathetic, so forth, until I came out with Cycle of Action Processing. This was the one mysterious case. This case wouldn't seem to shake out of apathy. Exteriorized, good perception and so forth, wasn't really stuck anyplace – mysterious case.

I came out with Cycle of Action Processing whereby the preclear simply mocks up the end of all the cycles of action he has tried to start You realize that people hang up in the middle of a cycle of action.

Let's say a fellow is seventeen years old and is just about to receive the rank of captain of his company, and he is stopped dead in his tracks. He never finished the cycle of ac-

tion. He didn't get there. The fellow who is on his road someplace and suddenly runs into a truck, doesn't get to his destination.

And this girl started finishing off cycles of action, things which she had wanted to do in her life and had never been able to do. And we find out that exteriorized or not exteriorized, she was still heavily in the complete conclusion and conviction that anything she started to do, she would be stopped because her parents continually stopped her from doing anything she wanted to do. It was enough for her parents to discover that she had an ambition, to immediately throw it away.

And this girl sat around by herself finishing off in mock-up form all the cycles of action, and she worked for two or three days by herself and she got up to the age of five. And she went on, and the next time I saw her – it was about a week later – she was bright, she was cheerful, she was a Theta Clear; there wasn't any doubt about this whatsoever.

But you see what hung her up. She was exteriorized, all right, but all she was convinced of was the fact that she would be *stopped* in any action begun, so she started to get well. And the first step of it was Step I, „Be three feet back of your head.“ She could do that, but of course, she couldn't finish any further action. We had to get her out of the conviction that she would be stopped in all actions before we could achieve Theta Clear.

Well, this condition, when it does result, will require from the auditor a considerable amount of processing. If it takes longer than half an hour to make a Theta Clear, get ready to slug. Those you make in fifteen, twenty minutes, half an hour are going to be stable and stay that way for quite a while with this slight exception: They will rush around and get into adventures and be too ambitious and get very upset about this and so on, and get an explosion and blow up in that, and they get adventurous, you see.

And you'll see this fellow every once in a while, and he's looking real sad, and you'll say, „What's the matter?“

„Oh, I'm back in my head.“

„Well, what's happened?“

„Oh, nothing much. Going down the street and it occurred to me to be very curious about what was happening, and there was a five-alarm fire across on the other side of town. And just as I got there, why, all the gasoline drums inside the storeroom started to burn up, and it looked pretty, so I went in to see and,“ he said, „I got apathetic about it after a while and...“

What has happened is he's been in too much contest he sees the MEST universe making all this terrific explosion, and he himself can't make explosions that good, so he figures out he's no good or something of the sort Or he just gets an explosion in his face and by mechanical energy decides he's been blown up. It's something he decides.

Now, this is where postulates enter in, and this is where postulates belong. Changing postulates on a Case Level IV, a Case Level V, the devil with it. It isn't postulates that's worrying these people, it's energy, and I know of no method of changing postulates in them that doesn't immediately increase their force potential. You see that?

Immediately the fellow begins to feel very forceful. You change this postulate – he feels fine for three minutes, four minutes, half a day. And he's got his force potential up, he's still inside the body and he starts to emanate energy and he starts to excite the whole bank and so he sticks. See, every time he gets a little bit tougher, he starts exciting the energy deposits in his vicinity. At least, we can explain it this way. And there he goes. So you change the postdates in a IV or V or VI or run concepts on them, it doesn't matter what you do to them; they're not going to alter very much, because they just get more force and then they get their energy deposits upset, and then they decide that they can't. And so you bring them up again and they get more forceful, and then they excite these energy deposits again and they quit again. And they'll just run this cycle and you can just go on up the line, only it's a very flat curve when you're doing this. They feel better, they can think better, all kinds of things. But they know that there's a place to get to on the Tone Scale, and they know they're not arriving there.

So Step I, of course, is something that is accomplished in just a moment or two. You say, „Be three feet back of your head.“ The fellow is three feet back of his head. Now you go through the rest of the drill of Step I, which is asking him to be in various places. You'll do better if you don't ask him to immediately look at the body. You'll occasionally get a Step III that looks at the body and immediately pops in again, who will act as a Step I till you ask him that question.

You say, „Look at the body now.“ And the second you say, „Look at the body,“ it startles him so to see the body there that he gets very upset, or he can't see the body or the body's black. And this upsets him and he's done, he quits. So don't ask him to look at his body. Just ask him to be three feet or six miles, whatever you want. There isn't any mystic significance in three feet, it's just a handy distance. It's better than one foot. Six miles is better except you lose track of your preclear.

You know, Dennis, the Director of Instruction in London, he's quite a fellow, and he didn't have any great reality on Theta Clearing for himself. All of his reality was completely objective, because he himself was an occluded case at the time. And one day he says to a fellow, he just starts through the rote and routine of, I think, Standard Operating Procedure 5, and he says, „Be back of your head,“ and the fellow didn't say anything. And Dennis says, „Well now,“ – to himself – „I think I'll have to do some mock-ups.“ So he says, „Well, let's see, Ron said that very often where a person is stuck exactly on the track, he'll have the facsimile he's stuck in.“

By the way, you occasionally do that. You say, „What do you commonly see?“

And the fellow will tell you quite cheerfully, „My grandfather's face lying in the coffin.“

„What do you see?“ That's where he's stuck and you can just move him off of that. If he can still see it, he can be moved off of it.

Well anyway, he thought this, and he said – the fellow said, „I – well, I don't know, back of a girl's head.“

„Well,“ Dennis says, „that’s fine.“ He says, „Well, let’s move into it now, and let’s move out of it“

And the guy did. He said, „That was kind of tough,“ but he did it

And „Well, what do you see now?“

And he said, „Well, I see a train coming.“

„Yeah? Well, now what do you see?“

And now he said – the fellow said, „Wait a minute; there’s another train coming now.“

All of a sudden Dennis got a terrible suspicion. And he says to the preclear, „Where are you?“

And the fellow said, „Sitting alongside the railroad track on one of the ties.“ And he said, „Gee,“ he says, „these trains,“ he says, „these wheels are terrific.“

Dennis goes, „Ulp,“ and called him back very quietly and gently into the room. He had put him in and out of an actual girl’s head and Dennis simply – he was very green at this at the time; the techniques had only been out a few days when he was trying this. And Dennis went around after that telling everyone, „Be sure and communicate with the preclear and get him to tell you what he is doing.“

This could be accepted by occluded cases as very, very difficult phenomena to assume, very difficult But it’s not difficult phenomena the moment you start working with it, because to see some fellow walk in who has had four years of psychoanalysis, who has even been pitched down Tone Scale with atypical procedure – somebody who has been really abused and so forth. And you see this fellow walk in, nothing’s ever been done for him, you know, and you say, „Be three feet back of your head.“

And he says, „All right.“

And you say, „Now let’s be across the street there where the sun is coming in.“

„Yes.“

„Now there’s a garbage can over there; now let’s be in the garbage can.“

„Well, yes.“

„All right, now let’s sit down on top of one of those passing cars.“

„Sure.“

„Wait a – what are you doing?“

„Oh, I don’t know; it was very funny. I made the bus driver scratch his ear.“

„No, no, I said on top of the car.“

„Well, all right“

„All right. Now let’s be over where they run their light plant You there?“

„Sure.“

„All right Let’s sit up on top of the generator housing, listen to the generator.“

„Sure.“

„All right, now, let’s step into the generator.“

„Okay. Gee, this is fun!“

„All right, that’s fine. Now let’s go over and stand in front of one of the arcs on the switchboards that’s snapping.“

„Yeah.“

„Bother you?“

„No. Used to. Doesn’t now.“

„All right Now let’s be in the center of the Sun.“

„Yeah.“

„Okay. Now let’s be up in the corner of the room.“

„Sure.“

„All right Now put yourself where you’d like to have yourself in relationship to the body.“

„Okay. Gee. Well, you know, life’s pretty good, and so forth, and that stuff you’ve got there is pretty fine. As a matter of fact, it’s been very good, and I thank you very, very much for the session.“

He doesn’t realize this guy has changed. All of a sudden his face is animated, he’s got good color, he’s got circulation, he no longer has arthibumpis or something.

Or when you get him back there, if he has some psychosomatic ill, this – in Dianetics we used to slug and slave and sweat over trying to get out this chronic somatic, and he’d come back Tuesday and he’d have it again, and you’d run out another engram and you’d eventually get him so he didn’t have it, but boy, it was work. All right, you say to this fellow – he has lunitis or something or persilosis, some disease. (That’s my only disease.) So we get him to reach over and touch the affected limb or area of the body, and he does, and you say to him, „All right, now, do you see any pinched nerves or anything there you’d like to straighten out?“

„Yeah. Yeah, you know, this is real interesting. I always heard doctors of anatomy talk about this sort of thing, but I hadn’t ever realized it was like they said. Gee-whiz, look at all these tendons. And, yeah, there’s a nerve, yeah.“

„Well, straighten it out“

„Well, I just did.“

„All right. Now let’s get...“

„There’s another little black piece of energy on here; let me get that off.“

„Okay, you got that, that’s fine. All right, now let’s straighten out the joint a little bit, and see if that’s going along fine.“

„Yeah.“

„Well now, is there anything else you’d like to do to the body?“

„Well, I don’t know, I always had headaches and there seems to be a little patch of energy here that’s causing the headaches. Just a minute.“ *(pause)* „Okay.“

„Now, is there anything else you’d like to do?“

„No.“

„Okay. That’s the end of the session.“

The guy walks out – he’s walking!

Miracle, just like that And it’s no tougher than that, and you use exactly the patter I was just giving you: „Is there anything you’d like to fix up about this body?“

„Yes.“

„Is there any pinched nerves you’d like to fix up?“

„Yes.“

„All right Well, go ahead. Fix them up.“

Do you say, „Now look, put out a beam and *wum-wum-zum* and touch the epiglottis on the spoololum.“

No, no. He knows more about his anatomy than you do at that moment, and the fact of the matter is he doesn’t have to be told; he knows how to fix up a body.

He can do weird things in fixing up a body if you don’t... He will, too.

The body operates on little anchor points around in various places, a very complex electrical anatomy. And he can make all kinds of things occur in the body that haven’t occurred before. Shocking. Boy, could he give the draft board a bad time.

So that’s processing of psychosomatic ills at its optimum. And all these 1 other steps of SOP 8 are necessary only because we can’t get this optimum operation instantly on all pre-clears. We can only get it on about 50 percent of them. And that’s that.

So you see, we’re actually dealing with a superior therapy. The most cases that a witch doctor, in terms of percentage, could expect to achieve an effect upon – some small, light effect – was something like 22 percent The same in practically any primitive tribe. The witch doctor, 22 percent of his cases had an effect.

Psychoanalysis achieved slightly less than that at considerable longer time. I tested it out one day. I tested out witch doctoring too, by the way. I’m a pretty good witch doctor – *boom, boom, boom, boom.*

I don’t know what the percentage is from country to country. The percentage is slightly lower in Great Britain than in the United States. It is a lower percentage if you’re tak-

ing certain age brackets. The percentage doesn't necessarily decline with rapidity with advancing years, but it is fairly safe to assume that cases below the age of eighteen are much, much easier and more responsive than cases above that age. These are just figures to give you an approximation; they aren't statistics. You can expect that somebody who is fifty years old, who walks in, you can expect there to be probably only a 10, 15 percent chance that he's an immediate Step I. But don't neglect the fact that he might be one. *Pam*, out he'll go.

Old lady, eighty years of age, walked in on an auditor one day, and he thought, „Oh, my, I – ohhh!“ She had lumbitis with complicosis.

And he says, „Well now, be three feet back of your head.“

And she says in a sweet voice, „Yes.“

„Well, let's go up on the roof and take a look at the city.“

„My, it's beautiful, isn't it?“

„Well, let's go up a little higher, take a look at the city.“

„Yes.“

„Now let's go down to the light plant and stand on the edge of the generator.“ Here we go, see.

Come back and – “All right, is there anything you'd like to fix up about the body?“

„No, I think it'll be all right now.“

„Well, that's fine. That's the end of session.“

She got up, she didn't have complicosis – zzzzz. About eighty years old – everybody knows you can't do anything for old people.

So we're actually into a field of astonishing phenomena which has suddenly turned up, *pam*, and which it has taken me – I am very sorry that it has taken me this long, but it has actually taken me over fifteen months to get these techniques – after the discoveries of Theta Clearing itself – to get these techniques evened out And that's an awfully long time; I apologize for it. Well, it's taken over three years to graduate the processing of engrams and grief charges up to a point where an auditor didn't have to work. I've been trying to save labor for you. I'm following out the general American neurosis.

So don't neglect that Step I and don't ever assume that a case is going to be immediately very difficult, until you've at least gone through those steps. It doesn't take any time to go through SOP 8: Steps I, II, III. And after you've gone past III, you know what's wrong with him: explosions.

But if he's real bad off, you don't dare give him an explosion, you have to give him mock-ups. But if he is real, real bad off, all you can do for him is to get him to contact a little reality. And these are the effective techniques, and you go off just on that level.

Now, you can go off on tests – one, two, three, four, five. A good test is can he mock up his childhood home. If he can mock up his childhood home with great ease, he's probably still there. One method of getting him out of there is – if you just want to cure up a thought

problem with him – is get him to reach and withdraw from the childhood home, get the childhood home reaching and withdrawing from him. All of a sudden he'll come away from home. First time he's ever been away from home. He's liable to look around with great surprise, find out he's been in Philadelphia or Keokuk all these years – without being in Philadelphia.

Most of your preclears have trouble, if they are in difficulties at all below the level of III, of „not here.“ That's another phrase that they're helped out on. „He's not all there.“ How true, how true; they think they're someplace else.

Now, I'll go over less ramblingly, immediately, why we are working with geographical location. Theta, according to Prelogic 1, places things in space and time and can create space and time in which to place things. And when I say place them, I mean place them. The precision of being able to place a point – only a mind knows what a point is – the precision of placing a point is a direct index of neurosis. A person's belief in the place where he is, is tremendously important to his sanity. Geographical locations. This is so much the case that a person can be evaluated for only by those people who have changed his position in space repeatedly and continually.

Take a drill sergeant. The drill sergeant with his "To the rear, hup; to the rear, hup," is changing the position of soldiers in space to a moment and time when he says, „All right, now, charge.“ And these guys get up and walk into a solid hail of steel. They don't do it because they're brave nearly so much as they do it because the sergeant said so. That's evaluation. And evaluation doesn't exist unless change in space has existed priorly. All right.

We have all evaluation on the part of parents, then, as important And your preclear is upset about his parents, simply because they have upset him about change in space.

Now, change in space is important, because that thing which he cannot perceive he has to think about. If he can't go to a place, he has to suppose about a place. If he can't go to a place, he has to mock up a place to go to. See, he can't go there, so he mocks it up as how he thinks it is.

And there is your first echelon of thinkingness, and there is your first picture, which later on begins to include and embrace all language. He can't go there, so he's got to think what it is – he supposes it looks like.

Now, he supposes it looks like, at level of Resistive V, to the degree where, when you ask him to exteriorize by scenery, all he does is pull around facsimiles. Well, that's all right Let him pull around facsimiles; he'll get tired of it after a while and actually start to pull places under him. That's in old SOP 8, Exteriorization by Scenery.

With what ease can we show this to be a fact This is demonstrable phenomena. We take any case that's occluded and we ask him to pull pieces of scenery on the face of the Earth under him, and the next thing you know, he knows he can't be there, so he's got to look at a mock-up of it. Well, you just keep him at this, and he'll get tired after a while, because what's he doing? Every time you say pull such a place under him, he pulls a mock-up under him, ha. Wonderful. He's had to mock something up. He's had to mock something else up, and he's feeding a starved bank energy. Eventually he'll get enough energy so he will move. See how that is? All right.

So Exteriorization by Scenery in original SOP 8 is very effective, but it has to be continued and on and on and on and on and on and on till all of a sudden it starts to occur on a really bad case. The case really isn't going these places. And he begins to think after a while, „Well, exteriorization and Theta Clearing and so on is a technique – one of Hubbard's wild ideas, because it really couldn't exist, because I have established conclusively and beyond any doubt whatsoever that every time I try to pull a place under me, it's just a facsimile. So that proves Hubbard's wrong, and I'm sane.“ Does it? You see how this is? He's feeding the bank, and it's just a handy way of feeding the bank – another way of doing it.

But he has to know before he can go. He knows he can't be in places, and one of his finest upsets is walking into a strange place. And you ask any person who is at the Level V, „Do you feel at home in a grocery store?“

„No. Every time I go into a grocery store, I sort of feel like people are going to tell me to get out.“

„Oh, is that so? Why, that's peculiar. Why do you suppose this is?“

„Well,“ the fellow says, „I don't know. Maybe my mother or maybe my father,“ or other Freudian reasons.

The actual fact of the matter is, it's a place where there are things to eat, you see, and that would be one of the things he'd be kind of nervous about Anybody who is eating is sort of debased, anyway. (That wouldn't include any of us.)

But here we have somebody expecting to be asked to leave all the time. That's his big worry. Somebody's going to kick him out – kick him out or hold him still.

And this person, by the way, if you start running on a very occluded case „I am under arrest,“ do you know, he'll get a terrific bang out of this – it's a big technique. Of course, it doesn't do too much for the case, but it sure does create an effect He thinks he's under arrest Of course, arrest is bad, because it means you're surrounded by a confined space, and you can't get out of that space, and if you can't get out of that space, therefore you can't have an explosion because explosions are not fixed spaces, explosions are moving spaces. All right.

Therefore your low-level case just can't be in various geographical locations. The truth of the matter is, he's been blown out of too many of them by explosions. Or he's blown too many people out of them with explosions that kicked back on him. He's been real active, and all these people, by the way, at that level are real, boy, they... I'd hate to tell you what the past and background is of a lot of Vs. I notice several fellows twist nervously in the audience. That's all right, I won't tell anybody. Not for a couple of minutes, anyway.

Now, there's the whole thing. He just can't be someplace, and so he runs out of places to be, even in his bank. You see how that is? He can't even be on his time track looking at his facsimiles, he's out of places to be to such an extent. There's a scarcity of places to be, in other words, a scarcity of viewpoints; the only reason you'd want to be in a place was to look from the place.

Now, he's run out of them in the material universe and then he begins to run out of them on the time track, and their general scarcity gets to be such that as he looks back into the

past, it's all occluded. And he's got a tremendous scarcity of past, because it's the one place he can't be again, is where he has been in the past. He knows that, he has agreed with the material universe to the point where he realizes that time sets it up so that he can no longer be where he has been, and that's the past.

If he can't be where he has been, he then has a tendency to go into the past, identifying the past with prohibited areas and spaces. But if you will send this person around in various prohibited spaces for a while, he will actually exteriorize then. And if he stays away from the body, he won't get trapped in it again. But the body is so mocked up with lots of energy that when he comes near it again, he goes into it.

You find many of these fellows, when they exteriorize, they're wearing black suits. They'll tell you all sorts of weird tales. Well, who cares how weird the tale is. The fellow isn't delusive. It's a remarkable conceit on the part of man that he thought and believes at large that out of this tremendous solar system, which occupies a tremendous galaxy, which is one of many island universes, that Earth has the only type of culture which can be, the only type of being which can live, and knows all there is to know about any way there is to go about living. I mean, such conceit!

When we have this problem of a person who can't move out of his body, we get all sorts of other manifestations we can immediately study, such as he thinks the room is full of lions. If you ask him real quickly, and said, „What do you think the room is full of?“

„Oh, nothing.“

„Well, are there any dark corners that you see in the room?“

„Well, that corner over there is kind of dark.“

„What do you think is in that corner over there?“ (*pause*) „Mother.“

He goes around all the time thinking somebody is around. Well, that's the level of delusion on the thing. He's too sane to know – to admit that this is the case. But here he is, then, in a state where he can't be in various places; I mean, various places in the material universe, much less make universes of his own. See, he's in a bad way. He can't be places, and that's the only thing that really is a gradient scale in SOP 8, see? Inability to be places.

A Step I? Cocky, able to be anyplace. II, *ahh*, not quite. III, well, he could be someplace if he had some space of his own, but he doesn't doubt that he could have space of his own, and so you use Step III just exactly as given in 16-G, without any differences there at all, to have some space of his own.

And he says, „Well, if I do get chased out of some space, I'm not entirely dependent upon the MEST universe for space; therefore, I could have some space, because I can make some space. Okay, I'll move out of my head,“ you see?

In Step II, he just has a little bit of concern, probably. Probably Papa and Mama and other people have told him he was ugly. You'd be surprised, by the way, where all these conditions are extreme in a Case Level V, that a V, he really thinks he's pretty homely. He's worried about his looks. He can look in a mirror, but he can't quite trust that mirror. It might be

telling him lies. He doesn't know for sure, he has never seen himself. He isn't quite sure. And he kind of believes he's real ugly. That's the extreme case.

Well, a II has this just faintly. He thinks, well, as long as he's in there pitching and making the body make nice, graceful motions, you see, why, he's all right. But if the body doesn't look quite right, and he's just a little bit uncertain about how the body looks – that's really what he's concerned about. If you just tell him to mock up the body a few times, he'll get the darnedest feeling; he gets the feeling of ridicule, mockery.

Of course, ridicule is the business of holding somebody's anchor points out away from him and not letting him have them back. See, you take somebody's anchor point and then won't give it back. Well, that's ridiculing him.

If you have a preclear who is just – oh, boy! He's just in terrible shape on the subject of, oh, I don't know, he's had a broken marriage or some other American custom; you just get the other man or the other woman – in case of a girl who has just been divorced – holding the former partner away. Just mock them up holding them away, and just let the mock-up stand there and hold. And this person will squirm, and they'll get embarrassed and they'll twist, and then all of a sudden they say, „So what?“ A lot of mock-ups. Their attention got fixed on one mock-up, that was their trouble. They don't realize there's two and a half billion human mock-ups in this world. Gee, that's a lot of mock-ups. And more coming along all the time. All right.

We have the idea, then, of that body away from him. Well, he's afraid he'll be ridiculed if he does something different or strange about going outside. There's enough feeling there so he has a doubt about exteriorization. So you just get him to put his body out there. Mock it up, mock it up. He has a slight body scarcity, too. So he gets kind of the idea, „Well, if I got this body, then I could have another body,“ so you have him mock up his body several times out there.

But don't keep this up and don't do it at all if the body that he mocks up is not brilliant in color – I mean, if it's not dear, brilliant and three-dimensional.

All right, he doesn't do Step I instantly, you say, „Just mock up your body now.“ He does. You say, „What kind of a mock-up is it?“

„I got an idea it's there.“ He's a Step V, skip it. Go on with III anyhow, but if he's just got an idea that mock-up is there, you're operating way up in techniques, when you should be very – sigh and take off your coat and roll up your sleeves and pull out the couch a little bit, and get a couple of glasses of water or a few Coca-Colas and set them down, because you're in for it, boy.

Now, the mock-up that he gets should be dear and should feel like it has some body to it. And if that is the case, and there's no great deal of blackness around or something of the sort, he'll mock up his body a few times and all of a sudden he'll be standing back looking at his body and mocking up maybe a body in front of it and comparing the two and thinking, „Ha!“ „What do you want me to do now?“ he'll say. Well, don't just go on to Step III, because the fellow will seldom tell you on Step II that he's just exteriorized. This will seem sort of usual to him, certainly – suddenly.

You say, „Mock up your body a few times now. Now have you done that?“

„Yeah. Yeah.“

Well, don't expect him to give you any due, because normally you'll be processing somebody that doesn't know what's supposed to happen. And he'll be outside looking at the body in a lot of the cases, so don't miss that one. You see, you could just pick up this beautiful slab of bacon you have just brought home, and say, „Well, that isn't bacon, it's just a mock-up,“ and throw it away. You've just done your job, you see, and you wouldn't know it.

All right, here he is: He exteriorizes. Now, if there's a great deal of blackness around and you just kept this fellow mocking up nothing but his body on and on and on and on and on and on, there is some possibility, some possibility that he would get kind of spinny, because you might be dealing with a very, very low-step case. And you haven't established it yet, see. You don't know what you're handling yet You might be dealing – possibly, in spite of appearances – you might be dealing with somebody that you have no business whatsoever giving any mock-ups to. You might be dealing with a „What wall?“

So just for caution's sake, just do it a few times. If he's not exteriorized, you say, „Where are you now in relationship to your body?“

„I'm in my head, of course. Where do you suppose?“

See, he isn't exteriorized. Well, don't force him any.

Your next step is to tell him to hold on to the two back corners of the room. The reason you say the two back corners of the room is this immediately hits him with everything that's in front of him. If you put out those two corners of the room, you see, that's holding it as his space. But if you put that back there, he's never held that space before. And it has a tendency to completely unsettle his thinking pattern.

Well, very well, what happens, then, to such a person that simply holds on to the back corners of the room and exteriorizes? Nothing, you just keep on going with the process of putting him in various places just like a fellow who exteriorized when he was – mocked up things in front of him. You just tell him to be in various places, that's all. That's real simple, isn't it?

And the therapy as far as chronic somatics is concerned is telling him what would he like to patch up about the body, „Well, go ahead and patch it up,“ and in a rare case, having him do mock-ups outside the body until he finishes all cycles of actions he's worried about Apply Mock-up Processing, but in particular when he's outside of his body, get him up to a point where he can get just beautiful explosions with full sonic. And boy, he's really Clear when he can really get those, because nothing can trap him after that

Let's take a break.

SOP 8: SHORT 8

A lecture given on 2 October 1953
by L. Ron Hubbard

62 MINUTES

Lecture number eight You've actually had an extra hour of lecture today. And I wanted to talk to you something about – giving you some idea of anchor points in the first hour. This is lecture number eight – is Short 8. The lecture will be the same length as other lectures. Ha-ha.

Now we have in SOP 8, really, a tremendous number of techniques. I've actually given you SOP 8-L, and I've given you a way to break down SOP 8. You can use SOP 8 just as written. The only change that you would make on 16-G is when it comes to Step IV, you would waste and accept in brackets.

You know what a bracket is? That's for self, and another for himself, and others for others. And that's a bracket And you would get the preclear to waste himself – something like waste peanuts, and he wastes peanuts by throwing them in the mud and so forth, and then he has somebody else waste peanuts, and he has this person – this person throws them in the mud and so on. And then he gets other people throwing them in the mud for other people, and that would be wasting peanuts.

Maybe he has an allergy to peanuts. This, by the way, would be the way you'd work it out. You find out he can't eat peanuts, that's because he can't have peanuts. There's a basic law concerning that, and that is that a person maybe can have what he has and is protesting about, and that he has to waste what he can't have before he can have it. He has to waste.

This tells you – this isn't a workable process, but it's just, this particular little thing I'm telling you just this minute – that you can actually cure a chronic somatic, because he's on a maybe about whether or not he can have it and whether or not he can't have it He feels he has it, but he doesn't have it, and so he keeps talking about it. You could run it, really, by wasting it a little bit and by accepting it a little bit and wasting it a little bit and accepting it a little bit.

An easier way to do that is just run it Something or Nothing, and an even much *easier* way to do it I demonstrated the other day, which is Q and A The answer to the chronic somatic is the chronic somatic. The answer to the question of „What is this somatic?“ is „This somatic.“ And so, that is the easiest way to do it.

But on Step IV wasting should be added into the material on 16-G. Wasting in brackets, and the other one is is when he's move – Exteriorization by Scenery – is just keep him pulling things under him, no matter how long it takes, until he actually pulls the thing under

him. He'll start in by pulling facsimiles under him quite ordinarily, and he'll pull more and more facsimiles and more and more facsimiles and more and more facsimiles and more and more. He can keep this up for a long time, and then all of a sudden he reaches for this other facsimile, which is Saint Paul's Cathedral, and, *galp*, he's got it. This is very startling to him.

But this, then, Exteriorization by Scenery, comes up here in Short 8. And you'll find that an awful lot of your people will simply exteriorize, and quite a few of them will just pull under facsimiles. Well, the ones that are pulling facsimiles under themselves will just have to keep on pulling facsimiles under themselves. So we could take Short 8 here as written, just as written in Issue 16-G. But as written, it requires a little expansion. And I would vary it a little bit and have been varying it on groups as I'm going to tell it to you here.

The first thing we have: next-to-the-last list in *Self Analysis*. The reason we give this is this is still one of the slippiest methods of breaking a neurosis of which I know. After all these years, every once in a while, somebody is working a preclear and he doesn't – the preclear doesn't improve and doesn't improve, and nothing happens and nothing happens and nothing happens. I come along and say, „What's the matter with this preclear?“ – like in a Foundation or something of the sort „What's the matter? We aren't getting anyplace with this case.“ And I say, „Well, let's start in on this case now and let's find out where this case is,“ and instead of going into SOP 8 – supposing, you see, that the person has been worked in various techniques, I always start in on a technique which everybody else seems to have forgotten about or never used or something of the sort And that is, „Now, let's have you remember something real.“

Gee, isn't that old?

„Remember something real.“ That's old. „Remember a time when you were really in good communication with somebody.“ „Now, can you recall a time when you felt some good affinity for someone?“ And you just ask them those questions; it's the next-to-the-last list in *Self Analysis*, and you just go over it easily, pleasantly, quietly.

But the very funny part of it is, is when I – all too often I have run into a really rough case that the auditor was having an awful time with. Calls me up at two o'clock in the morning and says, „Ron, I don't know what I'm going to do. This preclear has been over here since one o'clock this afternoon, and I can't seem to get this preclear anyplace.“

And I say, „Well, can the preclear hold on to the phone receiver?“

„Yes. Okay,“ (*sigh*) auditor says. No responsibility right there, see.

And I say to the preclear without asking anything further, quite often, just, „Can you recall something real?“

The fellow says, „(*pause*) Mm. Yes.“ And I might as well not even ask the rest of the questions, because something happened.

Cases advance when run on old procedures (not necessarily these new ones) on sort of little energy jumps. They actually sort of – something goes click. The case keeps jumping up Tone Scale, and they do these little jumps, and then they're a little better, and a little jump,

and they'll do a little better, and a little jump. And you won't hit these jumps in them very often, because these jumps are dependent upon energy accumulation.

But it's just like something arcs, or suddenly something is just a little tiny bit brighter. This, by the way, is a complete cure in *Self Analysis*, any one of these jumps. But these are subjective techniques, and that's the way a subjective technique works.

And every once in a while you ask somebody, you say, „Can you remember something real?“ And all of a sudden he realizes that he can't, and then he does. And then there's a little arc, and he says, „Well.“ He feels better, he feels a lot better. It's a shocking difference.

So if you're processing a group, you could be absolutely certain if you recruited this group from all over the map, all over town, and so on, and there's a fresh group, and you set them down and there they are, you can be sure that here and there in this brand-new group, you're going to have somebody that this will happen to. Well, don't miss that effect. Don't throw away all of the bright colored lights. Just start in with that and give them that next-to-the-last list. „All right Let's recall something real.“

Truth of the matter is that you could just keep on hammering at this whole crowd of people this way, just, oh, I don't know, fifteen minutes, twenty minutes, an hour, and they'd all feel fine at the end of the time. It's fantastic, but quite true that this does have this effect.

Auditors have a tendency to avoid „Remembering something real“; that's why I bring it up at this time. And that's why it's in Short 8.

Now, on this rendition of Short 8 in Issue 16-G of the *journal of Scientology*, we're going to forget about the time that was given in this write-up, and we're going to leave it up to the auditor strictly how much time he gives the audience on any one of these steps. And that is very easy for him to establish if he will look. I'm not going to go into despair about auditors who won't look. I'm not going to stand up here and rant and rave, and so forth, about auditors that won't communicate with preclears. Matter of fact, I don't feel any emotion at all about it!

But an auditor processing a group is actually processing an organism. And the group, to some degree, responds as an organism. And it's quite different than individual processing in the respect that you don't get so many individual differences as long as they're members of that group. But you process a group of people, and they're – we went into this, I think, in *Science of Survival*. Doesn't it mention the fact that the group itself sort of has a life of its own? And it's terrifically hard to destroy a group. You actually could subtract people out of it and add people into it, and so on, and it still goes on living. I know, I've tried to knock flat two or three of my own mock-ups, like Wichita. And they just don't knock flat; I'm too good at it now. Boy, do they kick back at me, too; they really bite. Well, anyway.

Really, this is the truth, if you set up any unit anyplace and it perseveres. That's one of the most beautiful lessons. In spite of what the public might think, that's one of the most interesting things I've learned in the last three years, is that an organism and a group have a great deal in common to the point where a group actually becomes an organism, and although you keep on subtracting people from it and adding people from it and to it, all that sort of thing, it'll go right on its own aberrated way. And you try to machine-gun it, and you've set

up something horrible. Truly, you have. Because there's nothing to shoot! There's strictly a hidden influence.

You have this company or you have this body of people or this Boy Scout troop or something, and if you really sat down as an auditor and breathed the fire of life into it as a group – if it had the various things, even a few of the things necessary to a true group, the chances of it falling flat are very, very faint. So you want to remember that in Group Processing you're forming a group. And it isn't true that a person separate from that group necessarily responds as he did when he was part of the group. So you're actually having a good time with Group Processing.

You see, you've processed this group and everybody is fine, everybody is going along fine, and you get a lot of – two or three miracle cases turned up, and everything is swell. And the next day after the last meeting that you had, one of the fellows in it comes up and says to you, „See, you so far *rahhr*, and I think *ruff-rahh-rrwmww. Ggrrrr-rrmmm*.“

You say, „Gee, is that the temper of this group?“

No, no, no. You've got the whole idea wrong. This guy couldn't exist separate from the group very well. And as long as he's part of the group, gee, life is wonderful, you see. He isn't thinking like that when he's part of the group; he's thinking he – going right along, everything is fine. It isn't that he's a slave to the group; he's just part of a bigger organism, and he feels comfortable about it He feels that's real good.

People sometimes will run into prenatals and stick in prenatals, just because at one time they were part of another organism. It's a certain level of dependency.

But you can't expect Homo sapiens to stand alone, because he can't stand alone. Try sometime, and going out in the middle of Sahara Desert, completely out of contact with any food supply of any sort or any water of any sort, and live for a few weeks. You won't do it.

Well, these fellows that are running „I've got to be the only one“ ought to have an experience of that for at least two or three days. The first Homo sapien they ran into, I don't care if he was an Internal Revenue tax collector, he would throw his arms around his neck and kiss him fervidly. „A human being!“

The warmth with which human beings greet each other on the frontiers of the world when they meet is, to a large degree, prompted by the tremendous scarcity of it, the realization that if one is a human being, he sure needs human beings. And it's when a fellow feels he no longer can have human beings and human beings don't need him anymore that a Homo sapiens starts to fall apart.

You just tell one Homo sapiens, „Look, you can help him.“ This Homo sapiens over here might be crazy, you see, but he says, „You can help this Homo sapiens over there.“

„Gee,“ he says, „can I?“ See, because he feels that he again is necessary, which means that he himself can receive and contribute, so we've got an interchange of anchor points. But if a fellow is trying to stand by himself, his interchange of anchor points falls to zero.

Well, this fellow who complains to you after your group session, comes around to you, and he can't talk with you. He can't make a group of two. He can make a group of twenty, he

can be part of a group of twenty; this is about right And he doesn't feel like that, he feels fine when he's part of the group. And he gets off from the group and he starts worrying about it Well, that's mainly because he really doesn't feel this group – he belongs in it too well, except when he's in it, and he can forget that Then he walks away from it and he knows he doesn't belong to it, so he goes around to the group leader and complains like mad. You see how this would work.

So, this is one of the things you will observe in Group Processing, that your group behaves as a group, and they actually will move on up Tone Scale as a group. They will also change radically as individuals within the group. But you're running the same process on a group of people, you're going to get a response which is tremendously interesting, but which is a different manifestation than individual processing. So you want to watch for that difference.

And remember when you are processing a group – just as long as I'm throwing this sort of thing in – remember when you are processing in a group, that if your anchor point is here, you look at them over the top of your little book, there isn't the same advantage to the group, nowhere near; because they're rendered unconfident of you, because you aren't confident of them. Why? It's because your anchor point is up too close.

If you're processing a group, doggone it, reach back to the back of the room and drop an anchor point in that corner and an anchor point in that corner and own that space. And it makes the difference between light and dark in the results that you will get with Group Processing.

I won't mention it, because a couple of people who are here present in the audience have written to me that Group Processing failed. They didn't know that they told me all about themselves as an auditor. Everywhere I'm getting from this chap and that chap and from this part of the world and that part of the world: „Yes, this happened and that happened, and we're getting along fine. And the group all came back and then half the group disappeared and the other half came back the next time and we're all set and we're going along fine and this group is continuing.“ These reports coming in. And then all of a sudden, *pang*, right in front of my face: „Group Processing fails.“

Well, I've made a couple of inquiries concerning how Group Processing was conducted, just to check up and keep my records. Now, I can tell you what it is. I didn't find this out in the inquiry, but this is the fact of the matter. It's just that the auditor was not auditing the group with an anchor point at the back of the room. That's all. All you have to do is put up a couple anchor points.

A speaker, by the way, doing what I am doing right now is somewhat confounded by a room which won't re-echo. See, the back of the room should kick to him a little echo. If it does, his voice has an anchor point back there. Now, I'm talking about a routine lecturer or speaker. And if he can't hear his voice, he'll gauge it soft, and he'll gauge it this way, and then he'll gauge it a little bit louder. And then he'll talk like this (talking loudly) trying to get his voice to come back and hit him. And if the room is so designed as this one is where there's no slap-back – the back of that room is just exactly zero, that's because of an asbestos ceiling – why, he goes kind of apathetic; he gets worried.

Well, of course, I don't do that; I'm not doing that. As I'm talking to you here, I've just pinned a couple of anchor points back in the back corners of the room back there, and I know how far my voice is going out. And one of the reasons I know how far my voice is going out is nothing esoteric. It's just the fact that I watch the neck tension of the people in the rear row. That's a very simple thing to do. You just coast over once in a while and take a look at the neck tension. And there are some very beautiful girls we have in this audience, and so we keep a voice monitored. But if I don't watch it, the GE will start dropping the voice right into the center of the audience, because there's where the slap-back comes from, because of this ceiling.

I'm not telling you this just to be interesting. I'm telling you this so that you can process a group. How do you expect a fellow in the rear row to follow your processing commands if he can't hear your voice? And if you've got a parlor voice, and you're talking like this (talking softly) to people all the time and so on (*whispering*), it's a fact that a fellow won't know what he's doing. A fellow won't know what to do when you tell him, „Remember something real.“ He won't know. That's because he isn't being reached by your voice.

Now as *Homo sapiens*, he doesn't know anything about anchor points or any esoteric, mystic connotations connected with this sort of thing, but he does know whether or not he can hear you talk!

I'll tell you how you should arrange a group if you ever have any trouble with it. And if you don't want to strain your voice, always tailor-make your audience formation by taking all the people who look like they have a hearing strain around their faces and put them right there, and put the kids way back in the back end, and you'll reach your group much better. But a better way to do it is simply to hang up an anchor point back there, to hang up an anchor point back there and take in that much space.

Well now, if you haven't processed yourself very well, and suddenly as you start to run a group, you suddenly hang up an anchor point back there and an anchor point there, you're right into Step III of SOP 8, and does it process!

You're standing there processing the group, see, going like this, getting your head knocked off by old facsimiles and things that are peeling on through. So, I would very, very seriously advise you before you'd do this to at least sit down and find out what will happen if you put out two anchor points. It's a word of warning. All right.

Now, you include the whole group, but you will find that your average will go toward a mass response. You can tell when the group is responding in its majority.

You're always going to have four or five slows in a group of twenty or thirty, always very slow. You're going to say, „Remember something real,“

and they're going to go (*pause*). Now, that isn't the person for whom you are operating the group. And it's just too bad that you have to operate faster than that. So you operate, not according to your stopwatch, because that puts your anchor point here, see. You don't want this anchor point up here. You operate according to the expressions on the faces of the people. That gives you some sort of an index. You say, „Remember something real,“ and you will see these people going around like this.

„All right. Remember a time when you were in good communication,“ and so on.

What are you reading? You're reading faces. You say, „Remember something real,“ and their face will be – you know, they're sitting there listening to you. And you say, „Remember something real.“

And they say, „Yeah.“

And you say, „All right Remember a time you were in good communication.“ You watch them; they're in action, they *move*.

It's a very astonishing thing when a person really starts to watch other people, when he starts to look. He finds they're all different and they all have certain character manifestations. It's quite an adventure. Look sometime. Anyway. But look particularly when you're a Group Auditor. You can't audit out of a book.

You actually impress them most by giving them material, and so forth, without looking at it; that's very impressive. The singer and so forth always holds his sheet music down here, you see, and warbles at high C and so on, never looks at the stuff. This impresses an audience actually more, because having something in your hands like that looks studious and learned. So it's all right to have it in your hands, but don't read it all over and move your lips at the same time.

So, the reason why we break down a group, as a caution here in Short 8, by a show of hands on the slows and fasts, and so on, is just to keep an auditor from riding roughshod over a large portion of the group. Because, believe me, if you have somebody who can't get something real in that group and you're going to proceed, if there are very many of those people in the group, you're going to be in a tough situation.

If an auditor's acceptance level, however, is such people, he'll have a tendency to close terminals with those people and neglect all the other people. So, a very good way to settle it is group process with two rooms and have a colleague in the matter. And get a show of hands, make whatever tests you like, to get these slows and then move them over into another room. They do not predominate in groups, unless you are processing in a mental home or something.

This is terrific, by the way, for mental homes. You wouldn't realize how much it is. You get a whole bunch of patients in a group, and they behave much better than they do individually. All right, so much for that.

Now we have here, examining and comparing two similar MEST objects or spaces and tell the difference. Now again, we neglect the time. Just neglect all the times through here. Give this until people look bored with it. They get the idea – “Get the difference between these two microphones.“ (*pause*) That's long enough, you see. It gives a person a difference. So you turn around then and you say, „Well, get the difference between the two legs of that table.“ (*pause*) „Now get the difference between the end two lights over on that side of the room.“ (*pause*) „Now get the difference between the two extreme corners of this platform.“ (*pause*) „Now get the difference between my two hands.“ (*pause*) „Now get the difference between these two sheets of paper.“ (*pause*) „Now get the difference between two stripes on that flag.“ (*pause*)

Extreme, isn't it?

„Get the difference between two stars on that flag.“ *(pause)* „Now get the difference between this corner of the microphone and that corner of the microphone, just from where you sit“ *(pause)*

Now, what happens to people while they do this? There is something interesting. A lot of your people start in by running class of difference. You ask them to get the two differences of the corners of the platform, and they'll start to get the difference of the class of two corners of platforms. And they actually will not look at the two corners of the platform at all.

What are you doing here? You're just providing a beautiful method of getting people to look and at the same time are getting a little charge off of the MEST universe, because you're match-terminaling. It's the universe match-terminaling. And the universe, when it gets too much charge on it, the preclear thinks it just keeps collapsing, so he finds out that it's holding itself apart. And he's going through this tremendous strain of holding everything apart, you see. And it's doing it; he doesn't have to aid this any, and it can form a considerable relief to him. So that's the process, that's its goal and aim. All right.

Now, you'd only keep that up actually long enough to hold the interest of the audience, but again, it brings people up in tone. But its maximal effect is probably, on an audience, three, four, five minutes, according to my more recent experience, because I actually have measured some people on E-Meters with regard to this. And they get a maximal effect on this three and a half, four minutes, something like that – short period. And after that they've come up as far as they can come up on that particular test at that time, until some more energy or some more things show up. You run out what is in the immediate vicinity of their minds in three or four minutes with that technique, and they'll show a little bounce.

Now, as far as running wasting, Step C, is concerned, then accepting, and so on, a heavier process is getting them to waste work in brackets. Don't bother to do any other one on that one round. The next time you come through, get them to waste fighting, just one time through on a bracket waste fighting for themselves, waste fighting for other people, waste fighting of other people fighting other people. Just one time round, and one time round on work. Now, that won't bog somebody down, just hit like that in one bracket, and it might produce a little bit of relief on some of your people.

If you start them wasting admiration in a bracket – I haven't tried this; this is too adventurous, because many people are just hanging on the trigger on admiration. And you suddenly say, „All right, let's waste some admiration,“ and *pam*, there they go. All of a sudden, a whole valence wall will go to pieces in their heads or something will explode. Darnedest things happen. Or suddenly they see the walls going this way. It's not that the technique is tremendously powerful, you see, so powerful that you just couldn't help but use it in auditing, it's that the technique is treacherous.

I wish I could define for auditors for all time the difference between a technique which simply has an effect, and a technique which makes the case take a turn for the better. Nearly every squirrel I've had any trouble with out across America has concentrated only on techniques which make an effect but which don't make anybody any better. Well, that one will make somebody better if continued out too long.

The only dangerous spot we have in Short 8 is right there: C. So if you feel at all upset about your audience, omit C. If you feel at all worried about your audience, omit C.

Now, the next thing you do would be, of course, run next-to-the-last list of *Self Analysis* for five minutes, if you have run C. If you've done this wasting proposition, then you'd better run the next-to-the-last list of *Self Analysis* for a little while, and get these people back to battery again. But if you feel that your audience is not that adventurous, they're not that high-toned or something, if there's any possibility of something going wrong with this audience, why, you just omit C, which of course means omit D, because that's why D is there. All right.

The next one would then follow, if you omitted C and D, would be the two similar MEST objects or spaces. It would follow with Duplication. And that's a natural. That would follow straight through. You start them in getting two corners and so on and two microphones, two pieces of paper. And then you would say, „All right You see this microphone?“ „All right“ „Mock up a duplicate.“ „All right.“ „You see this microphone?“ „Mock up a duplicate of it.“ „See that blackboard?“ (This is a dirty one, by the way.) „Mock up a duplicate of the blackboard.“ „See that figure on the blackboard?“ „Mock up a duplicate of the figure.“

How do you mock up these duplicates? They look at the figure, and they put right alongside of the figure – alongside of it over here, the mock-up, right where the figure is, at the same distance from them. And if it's just almost impossible for them to do it, still have them do it, no matter how pale, how thin, how scrawny this mock-up may be.

The first thing that happens to them is this thing gets tremendously solid. If they're really bad off, this really gets solid! (I don't mean bad off – if they're having a hard time with mock-ups.) Pam. You say, „Mock up this microphone,“ and instead of getting one here, this one goes *sprungg*. Why is that? It's because they've got the idea that the whole MEST universe is thirsty for energy. And their stuff goes straight into the MEST universe objects, because they've got the MEST universe object mocked up here, so two of their mock-ups are out here; not one, two. And of course, they just go together, *ptock*.

Well, you have a person do that for a while and the first thing you know, it's the strangest thing, he can start to get a duplicate. So that one you can keep up for a long time. But as long as you keep it up with MEST eyes, which is what – it's most favorable for groups, it's just with MEST eyes; you just do this, that's all. You say, „All right. Look at me.“ „Now put a mock-up of me alongside of me.“ „Look at the curtain – crease in the curtain back here.“ „Now put up a mock-up alongside of the crease.“

Now, you'd better explain to people exactly what you want them to do, to the end, you see, of going out here and saying, „Right alongside of this, put another mock-up.“ That's the optimum point. You point for the group, you make gestures; don't be afraid to move. All right.

The second part of it would be to get them to dose their eyes and then start to point to things as far as you're concerned, which you are fairly sure exist in the neighborhood. You say, „All right, now with your eyes dosed, and we don't care how you do this,“ you tell them, „we don't care how you do this, with your eyes dosed, why, take a look at the ceiling. Now

put a mock-up alongside of the ceiling, your mock-up alongside of it, of the ceiling. Put it alongside of the ceiling.“

Then you tell them, „All right. Now put a mock-up of the spittoon out in the hall alongside of the spittoon outside in the hall, see, with your eyes closed, sitting right here.“

„On the building next door, put a mock-up alongside of the building next door like the building next door.“

This is as covert as you can get as an auditor. This is a wonderful process; it is just dreadful what happens, because you have given him a certainty every time. The certainty is his mock-up. He doesn't know that he's looking at the building next door. You don't have to have any certainty on that at all. But you tell him to put a mock-up alongside of it, just like it. Well, he's certain of the mock-up. He knows that mock-up is there. And so you've covertly introduced Certainty Processing on exteriorization. And if you'll just keep this up and keep this up and keep this up, he'll be out there in the street looking at the taxicabs and mocking up taxicabs like them, and so forth, and being very confident and cocky, because you haven't asked him for an impossibility at any time. He can always mock up a taxicab.

And this is, by the way, the best method I know of curing somebody who, in Exteriorization by Scenery, keeps hauling facsimiles under him instead of the actual objects. If you started doing that, there's – the long way to do it is keep hauling facsimiles under him. The easy way to do it is just keep running Duplication. You show him things that – so on.

„Now, take a look at the Washington Monument.“ You just get further and further from home, see. You could take a whole group this way.

„Put up the Washington Monument now.“ „All right“ „Now put a facsimile – pardon – a mock-up of the Washington Monument alongside of the Washington Monument“ „Okay.“ „Put a mock-up of the Capitol alongside of the Capitol.“ „Now make that mock-up real good. Make it as dose as you can get it“ It's a dirty trick.

Now, let me go in a little deeper into this. Why does Duplication do what it does? And what is duplication an index of? The ability to duplicate is an index of the willingness or ability of the preclear to return to geographical areas, it's not that by duplication you're sending him into geographical areas where he's been. Now, don't get those two things confused. It's a person has to be as superoriginal as he can't go back anymore where he was at

If you really wanted to make a very, very original writer, instead of a guy like me – I ran out of plots very early and kept writing the same story a lot. The only time I ever got original was a story I wrote called *Fear*. That's so original, they tell me, it's still putting them into insane asylums, so I probably should include psychotics in work, so that overt act would get undone.

But it's interesting that *Fear* was written immediately after a rather horrendous accident. *Poom, bang* big impact, see. And a very short time later, I was maundering around and I thought of this lovely story called *Fear*, that Dostoevski should have thought of and done a good job on, and I wrote it. And the mood passed entirely away with me. I often had wondered what that transient feeling was of having to be terrifically, horribly original. That's it I

couldn't go back to that accident. It was just a big facsimile that was kicking my teeth in. All right.

There (if you'll pardon the introduction of the personal note) is the essence of what happens to people. They're at parallel 62, longitude 81 east, and something goes *boom*. Now, they don't know where it went boom quite, because they went unconscious right there. So they're kind of hazy as about where it is, so they just say, „I'm not going back to the Western Hemisphere anymore.“ It's a point they're trying to escape from, and to make sure, they just escape from this tremendous area. You see how that is? So impacts not only add energy to the bank, but they drive a person away from having been someplace. And someday we will integrate those two facts, I'm sure. But he can't be there anymore.

Now, you ask him in Dianetic reverie to return to the time when... Oh, no. Not him. He can't duplicate. A person who gets terribly bored all the time, who is nervous and fidgety by doing the same thing... It tells you, by the way, Spain is in beautiful condition, because they have bullfights over there which are just the same bullfight They have six of the same bullfights the same afternoon. They're just not the same bull, that's all; he doesn't live that long. And they just keep having this same bullfight, and it has its little innuendoes that change. They've just been doing this for ages, and the audience is enthusiastic, and everybody's happy – boy, can they duplicate. You get what I mean now by duplication?

In America, how far would you get putting on the same vaudeville act five times for the same show and running it for five years? You'd go broke very, very easily. And yet, England tolerates this continually. They're in fairly good shape over in Great Britain. They really haven't got as much country to duplicate as we have.

But the point is, we have here a system whereby we're at the lowest gradient scale of going back to where we have been. And a person is only trying to avoid, with his aberrations, being in a geographical area where he was hurt. So duplicate, and the person you – “Microphone, and we've got a big beautiful basket of flowers up here, with a white stand, and a waterfall of roses going off one side of it“ And that was a duplicate of the microphone. The person will say, „How artistic I am to have made that“ No, brother, how scared you are of a microphone. You never want to go back there again.

I dare say you've probably been in front of a microphone sometime or another that was talking to a large and visible audience or something. *Brrrrrrr*. No dice. If you're really completely relaxed about microphones, you could build the identical microphone right there, *pam*. And if you were all the way up Tone Scale, you would put another microphone there, and it would shock the sound man endlessly. So you see what we're doing with Duplication? And that's why it's really such a terrifically leading technique, because it'll exteriorize with the greatest of ease without somebody realizing it.

You'll want your preclear to get to a point where he can duplicate perfectly any place he has ever been before. That is your wide-open case. Your wide-open case is delusifying, because he can't belong where he was ever again, anyplace. He has run fresh out of all geographical areas. And so he has to dub in geographical areas, and there he's off on a compulsive level of building his own universe that he doesn't know he's building. He says, „This is the real universe, this is the MEST universe I am building.“ He's crossed the two utterly. And

you see what delusion is? The guy can't go back, so he has to mock it up. A guy can't have a place, so he has to build it in his mind. That's the first effort of mock-ups. All right.

Now, the next one – the next one kills them quite frequently. Sometimes you have an ambulance standing by, you will avoid the more hideous consequences. (No kidding, this next one is horrible.) It's have the preclear or group close eyes and locate the corners of the room behind them, and keep interested in those corners and not thinking for several minutes. Have any of you tried this technique?

Male voice: ... for about forty hours.

Well, the funny part of it is, I got a report the other day on somebody who had refused to go into the morass of a lot of things he didn't understand, namely these new techniques. He'd memorized enough techniques and he just put on the brakes, and he said, „All I'm going to do is hold up the corners of the room.“ Now, two or three people I know of have done this. They just sort of put on the brakes, and they found out that one was a workable process, and they're just hanging on to it And whenever they process themselves, all they do is sit down and find the two corners of the room and get interested in diem and don't think.

And according to reports, this one fellow that was doing that, he looks about eight, nine years younger. And he looks in beautiful shape, and he's been doing nothing else for a couple, three months.

You say you've been doing that for forty hours?

Male voice: That's right.

Feel any better for it?

Male voice: I used to do an awful lot of stiff, but I don't think it has quit coming yet.

Yeah, that's right, hasn't quit coming yet.

Of course, that has the limitation – you're making space, so it has a slight limitation on its technique. You're making space. But it's all right. If held long enough, it would run out all the bank – if held long enough. What it's really trying to do is get somebody into present time. And the usual course of events is, if a person is being audited individually, is that the preclear exteriorizes. He not only holds on to the corners of the room but he eventually finds himself sitting up in one of the corners of the room, looking, wondering what that silly body is doing down there. Has that happened to you?

Male voice: Yeah.

Exteriorization takes place. I didn't think you could go that long without it.

And here, you see, we've followed two methods: We've gone into energy with SOP 8-L, and we've just beefed up the bank, to be colloquial, to get enough energy in the bank so a person doesn't stick. The other one is just to get away from that particular bank. Just move out of it, move out of its vicinity and area. And of course, it doesn't matter whether it's thirsty or not It just doesn't matter. There is no mass to a thetan in terms of this universe. Doesn't say there's no mass to him in terms of all universes. All right.

That is quite a technique, and if you'll notice that is SOP 8, Step III, really, on the group. A group every once in a while will get restless after a little while, and when too many of them start to scream, why, knock it off and go to the next step.

Now, if I were rewriting this again, I would give them a little more Self Analysis after that process because some of them might have really come adrift. But it isn't tremendously necessary; just go on here to move MEST scenery under them.

Now, this scenery will be, for most of the members of the group, will just be facsimiles – mock-ups, but it's a beautiful way of getting them to mock up because this person is on a delusive sort of a mock-up basis. But don't let them start raving around invalidating each other concerning it, because you know darn well that a lot of what they're mocking up is just – I mean, a lot of places they are going are just mock-ups. You'll occasionally find somebody that you exteriorize, and so forth, and he knows he can't see. Things are so scarce that he has to mock up what he's looking at This is fascinating. He's exteriorized, but he looks at the floor and he knows he can't have a floor, he knows he can't see a floor, because it isn't there, because he can't have a floor, and he knows he can't have a ceiling. So he'll mock up a floor there and he'll mock up a ceiling there and he'll mock up a room there and he'll mock up people there, and so on. What he's doing is translating an impression. You get the idea? He's translating a perception impression of his environment.

Now, quite in addition to what he's doing with this sense perception is to get himself oriented cautiously. He probably isn't even in the room looking at it; he's probably way out in space someplace taking another viewpoint in the room, just to be safe. And he puts in all kinds of old rooms and all that sort of thing, and scrambles up his scenery, and so on. Well, don't call him to task for it, he's just trying to get used to it Just have him do lots of Duplication, and so forth, because there's lots of places in this universe where he doesn't dare be. And he doesn't remember where they are.

Give him a chance to find out Send him around in various places until he all of a sudden really starts to flinch. And you'll say, „Well, mock it up a few times,“ and then when you've mocked it up a few times, he can go in there. You see how you would remedy that and you see that manifestation.

Now another thing is, is there isn't any reason under the sun why he ought to see as dearly as the MEST body. He's not as convinced of MEST as the MEST body is; he's not that convinced – really, conviction on some of these things. But he really does see when he is seeing well. When a thetan is really seeing well, he's seeing much, much better and in much better color than with MEST eyes. Oh boy, real visio shows up and the things are quite real.

Of course, he's got to see something before he can move it around. Once in a while you'll – people will occasionally do very bad tricks with Theta Clearing. It isn't proofed against the occasional wickedness of a human being. But at the same time – at the same time, it's proofed in itself so that it doesn't just slide sideways on you as you're using it It's fairly safe to have around.

But the level, the comparative level of abuse of SOP 8 would be striking the preclear, see. So that we can guarantee SOP 8, just as we can guarantee people's conduct right up to the point where people occasionally strike people.

Once in a while, somebody will do something to a thetan like – they do it all the time in this universe. I heard of a case last night of somebody who hid things on a – exteriorized a girl and then started hiding things all over the house, and having her go and find them and then invalidating her. And she just went and kept going and finding these things, and it was a lot of fun at first and she found several of them, and then they fooled her on a couple of items, I guess, and all of a sudden invalidated her, and she was too shaky as a Theta Clear to go on, and she just went back in her head and stayed there. What a mean trick. I mean, just challenging a person, and so forth-setting it up so this person would fall flat on her face immediately. So you can't do anything wrong. I mean, these techniques won't slip. The knife won't slip in your fingers.

If you're real mean, however, if you're real ornery and you reach over and cut the pre-clear's throat without even giving him a basin to bleed in, why, of course, neither I nor anybody else can put out a technique that is proof against it. You see that.

But in Dianetics – rrrrrr! Oh, that could be real mean. The auditor can sit there in Dianetics – I've seen this happen; it really got me pretty discouraged after a while. I've seen an auditor sitting there pretending to help this pre-clear. I had a whole clinic one time that suddenly started – unexpectedly started to do this, „All right, what is that phrase? Roll that phrase again. Now, what did you get out of that phrase? What do you think about it?“ Ohhh. And I tried to tell these people that that was not the way to run an engram, and so forth.

„Well, it does them a lot of good“ – all their pre-clears walked around in apathy, see.

Oh no, the pre-clear is a bit too much at mercy of somebody running an engram. But boy, a pre-clear isn't at mercy with SOP 8. He gets meaner and meaner, a pre-clear does. And the auditor starts to go wrong, why – and so on. It is not a technique which would be favored in Colorado Springs. It doesn't put anybody unconscious. All right.

Again, we're putting in the next-to-the-last list in *Self Analysis*, mostly because we've just been running with Step G a somewhat limited technique.

Now, we come back and run a couple of present time objects, compared, again, as in B.

And here is another one which is very interesting. This is the only group step of getting a slant on somebody else's universe. Now, you can have somebody go to a window and look out in one direction or another, and just tell the group collectively to get the idea of what he's looking at. Or you can say, „Now“ – to the group – “now get the idea of how the room looks from this microphone.“ Or „Get the idea of how the room looks from that light.“ „Now get the idea of how the room looks from the middle of the blackboard.“

And you know what this breaks up? This breaks up almost immediately – or goes into, for some cases, and doesn't break up, so that you have to straighten it out – this one: „I don't know how that microphone thinks about things.“ You see, a viewpoint, or looking at something would be thinking to a lot of your group. And if you've got a person going to the window and looking out, and then you want the group to get an idea of what that person is seeing, a lot of the members of the group will say, „Well, I don't know how he'd look at things. I don't know how he'd look at life. I don't know how he'd think about things.“

You have to explain to them, preferably not with a very great and patient air, „We want to know what objects his eyes are seeing.“ People think of this for a long time. And you’ll have always several people in a group who will say to you, „No, I – but I don’t know what he *thinks* about it“ Thinks about it That’s their whole obsession.

They don’t realize that the only thing that’s important is that every person walking around this universe, in its finest level, looks and sees, looks at and sees the same things.

In colleges and other low-toned operations, they will very often try to convince people that everyone has a different viewpoint in terms of language. Where they teach general semantics, they will very often ring this in: „All things mean different things to different people.“ Ah no, that’s not true. Perfectly precise communication is possible. These microphones look like microphones to every person present, and they look like microphones. There’s no problem about this microphone; it looks like a microphone. And that’s the one thing which this technique lets a person grasp toward without you explaining what you are doing.

„What does the room look like from this microphone?“ „What does the outdoors look like from the person who’s standing at the window?“

And you get the third universe. And these people have all avoided the third universe so long and so perversely that if you do this a little while every time you go through these steps, and so on, it’ll click here and there throughout your group. „He sees the same thing I see, *hhuh-hhuh*. He may think about it differently, but he sees the same thing I see.“ And it’ll come home to him as a real reality. A big reality, that the third universe isn’t mean, ornery, plotting, betraying, this, that and so forth, necessarily.

One isn’t emotionally the same being as the other person, perhaps, but as far as looking at things is concerned, one has identical – of course, all thinkingness comes from an inability to look, so naturally viewpoint’s the same. Your viewpoint from this microphone would be the same as a thetan, as a body and as the microphone, if you were standing right here back of the microphone, looking in that direction. So this is what you’re trying to get through with that step, and that’s all you’re trying to get home.

Well now, the main thing you’re trying to do with all of this is just get a group to operating in such a way that their alertness and ability to look, their emotion, communication pick up. And any step that we have, in any process, then, belongs in any group process. Any step that can be applied to any group, any series of steps, because we’re just trying to do those things. So some auditor to write me in and say, „I have varied Short 8 to the point of only running ten minutes’ worth of some step or another“ – please don’t make me swear like that when I – it’s not polite to swear. I’ve been informed over and over in lectures these words, these crude words I use sometimes are very offensive to people, because – and so on.

I remember my tapes were being played at a Sunday school one time, and there was – the Sunday school principal left, or something like that. I used the name of God in vain the second time and he quit, and so on. Well, I don’t blame him, personally; I don’t pronounce the word right. But the main point I’m trying to make here is that any technique we have which is short, sweet and unlimited can be used on a group, and they can be used in any combination. And if you use a limited technique, which is to say putting them into thinkingness

processes, for heaven's sakes, follow it up exclusively, follow it up immediately with some technique which makes them look.

Whenever you throw them into the doubtful techniques, where they're not certain, then immediately follow it by one that makes them look at something certain, like „Remember something real,“ that's something certain in the past or something certain in the present.

Now, I hope that you'll be able to take a few of these remarks to heart And you can follow this list just as it is written here, and you'll get results. Or you can trim its time down to nothing, and you'll get results. Or you can substitute many other steps in this list and again, get results.

We're merely trying to make people more alert and to look. Now, that's all this afternoon.

Thank you very much.

SIX STEPS TO BETTER BEINGNESS

A lecture given on 3 October 1953
by L. Ron Hubbard

62 MINUTES

Today, the last lecture day of the conference, we have been taking up SOP 8 and we're going to take up Six Steps to Better Beingness, a technique I've been calling Triple SA. I find out it isn't quite as apt to call it Triple SA as Six Steps to Better Beingness, so I find myself – keep calling it Six Steps to Better Beingness. That's because, for heaven's sakes, it is not entirely relegated to self-auditing. But it can be used, this technique, or this combination of techniques, for that.

Now, as a preamble to this, let me assure you that any of these techniques – SOP 8, SOP 8-L, Six Steps to Better Beingness, Short 8 – are more or less fortunate combinations of techniques. These techniques were evolved in an effort to bring the preclear's (and this is the secret of all of it; listen very carefully) – to take the preclear's attention off of his body and put it on the environment.

Introversion: the preclear's attention on his body, in his body; extroversion: his attention elsewhere.

All that's wrong with anybody is that they get too introverted. Now in this wise, we use the word *introvert* simply to mean – gee, what does that word mean? Let's break it down and give it a nice meaning. Paging Mr. Webster. „Vert“ would be a line, direction, so that you have a direction into, would be introvert And in our sense here, and in the sense it has always been used in what has laughingly been called „psychotherapy“ in the past... Very often they didn't laugh though. I shouldn't say that. Many of the patients who have been through past psychotherapies are in bad shape. They can't laugh anymore; they have broken jaws or things like that

So anyway, „look into,“ so a person looking into self, that's introversion.

A person looking out from self to the environment would be extroversion.

All people are on a gradient scale of extroversion-introversion. It is optimum in this society at this time to have, I would say, about 80 percent of the attention on self to see that one behaves socially and 20 percent not further than two or three feet from the nose. And if one can assume this rather impacted state, he is then considered extremely acceptable socially because he's in apathy and can be handled by the environment.

Don't think that a 50 percent introversion and a 50 percent extroversion is optimum. Just because it's happy to break these two words down (they're two words so we break them

in half), don't think that's Optimum; it isn't We want a maximum of about 2 percent introversion and about 98 extroversion.

You want the fellow to keep enough finger on the body so that it doesn't run away. Bodies are very obedient. People have been made to obey and made to survive so much and with so much force that they've gotten the idea that they have to work very hard to make their body obey. Papa and Mama did, didn't they? They had to work very hard to make this body obey, so therefore people think they have to work hard to make it obey, too. And they also think they have to work very, very hard to survive. And they don't have to work hard to survive. As a matter of fact, the harder they work just to survive and nothing else, why, the less they're going to survive, and that's a certainty – the less happy they're going to be about it All right.

A technique, then, is at optimum, according to this definition, which produces an extroversion in the minimum amount of time. And by extroversion here, we mean an extroversion which is stable.

Of course, you walk up to anybody who has been processed, hit him in the face with a baseball bat, he will introvert. He will look at where he's been hit with the baseball bat, and that is the process of introversion. It isn't people standing around saying, „You ought to look at yourself; you ought to put your attention on yourself.“ That's what they're saying all the time. Mama says, „Now, don't touch that iron and don't do this and don't do that Think of what it might do to you and you don't want to get hurt,“ and so forth. This is all another way of saying, „Put your attention on yourself.“

In most arguments, people start in logically and end up personally. They start in saying, „Well I'm a Democrat because...“ and then they finally finish up (something logical, you see), „... and you're a dog!“ Not because of anything, you see. That is the course of an argument.

Well, the course of the argument of a life form and the MEST universe is just that course. He starts in and he has his anchor points *way* out, and the MEST universe starts to work on him. And it gives him the idea that his anchor points are in closer and in closer and in closer and in closer and in closer and... „What anchor points?“ That's the end of it „What anchor points?“

Now, the eight dynamics – never more useful than right now – the eight dynamics carry forward an expanding perimeter. Dynamic eight just happens to include all the space of the MEST universe! That's all the space of the MEST universe.

Well, you know that your anchor points aren't reaching out there now, even though you probably have some anchor points out there someplace.

Dynamic seven is anchor points into the ultimate or absolute of life, and of course includes spirits and all that sort of thing, and that's dynamic seven.

Dynamic six, again, is the MEST universe. And it, however, is the MEST universe in a little more specialized wise, since it includes all the energy and motion and matter and forms of the MEST universe. It just doesn't include dynamic eight, which is all the space in the MEST universe.

Now, we go back from that, we get five. Here is all the life there is in the MEST universe.

We get four, all the man there is; three, all the group there is; two, all the sex and continuation as children that there is and one, all of you that there is.

Now, if a person were all the way up on all of these dynamics, he would naturally have an enormous perimeter.

But you notice that you can fall off on each dynamic. In other words, a person could fall off on each dynamic, so he still had a little bit left of each one. Each dynamic has a reducing perimeter.

Now, this is an interesting thing. What I'm giving you here doesn't happen to be a theoretical explanation. You can ask a preclear how far he can reach from himself, and if he's – very, very terrible condition, he can't.

A fellow – he told me the other day about a lady who couldn't sweep, couldn't work, couldn't dean up anything. And the reason why: she couldn't touch anything, couldn't touch a broom. So her hands were sore all the time. Gee, she was in interesting condition, wasn't she?

And he was sharp enough to see that this person couldn't touch work; anything connected with work was untouchable. Work, an ability to handle effort, in other words, is a common denominator.

In this society, we have work and play mixed up. The handling of effort which gives one some pleasure is play. Right here on Earth there are much older cultures than the United States of America which find the handling of effort, in what you would call work, a great deal of pleasure – cultures where this is uniformly held to be true. They're in good shape. So there's something special and peculiar about the language or cultural pattern of the United States which saves labor, condemns labor and won't have any labor, and has to work forward toward a retirement, which is actually the center pin of what is, if anything is, destroying this culture – just effort, the unwillingness to handle effort.

Well, as the willingness to handle effort dwindles, one comes at last on the reduced perimeter which he finds in a psychotic who has his attention not even out as far as his nose. You ask a psychotic, then, to reach a couple of feet from him and you will begin the course of his upward line.

There is a direct relationship toward amount of space embraced by the individual and the alertness, ability to move, ability to act, react, think, create and sanity – there is a direct relationship between the amount of space that a person can occupy with his anchor points. The amount of space he can occupy is tremendously important, so important that one could phrase the effort of low-toned people in trying to take space away from other people. Low-toned people try to take space away from other people. They're „space hungry.“

Here you have an entire universe completely chockablock space – more space than you could comfortably walk over for a long time and actually more space than you could comfortably throw a dollar across. And yet, here they are, fighting madly to take each other's space. Well, this is merely because prepared space is so much more desirable than space

which has not been prepared – which is to say, space which has mock-ups in it is better space than empty space. But nevertheless, these people are just „space hungry.“

And you see somebody who can't handle space, he is certainly – at a certain level of the Tone Scale on down – he is certainly trying to take people's space away from them.

A psychotic in a very manic, emotional, mad state, simply acts mad and moves a great deal and moves frighteningly and horribly, in that last frantic effort to get at least a couple of cubic inches of space off the nurse or something.

Space is treated by an individual as a commodity, and when a person thinks he's running out of space, he gets in bad condition. This explains the New Yorker. The New Yorker has an awful time – your taxi driver up there and so forth, they have an awful time the second that they really confront and begin to think about the amount of space. And up to the time when they don't consider that their space is anything remarkable or that space is, they don't feel pushed around, why, they're perfectly happy, because it's ample space for them. They own all the space in New York. Then somebody comes along and says, „You don't own all the space in New York.“ One of the ways they do that is to run into them. Another cab runs into this cabdriver hard enough and this demonstrates to him that he hasn't got as much space.

The cooperative ownership of space is really the only solution life can have because the individual ownership of space is a very difficult thing.

Little children own space cooperatively with everybody in town. You have them go around, and they'll talk about „my city hall,“ they'll talk about „my this“ and „my that“ It's – all belongs to them because they're not thinking in terms of ownership.

Where ownership enters – the whole connotation of ownership – where this enters, a person has immediately begun to believe that somebody else can own space. And the second he buys the idea that somebody else can own space then he realizes that to secure his space he has to own the space which he already has. And so you get barbed wire fences – you get barbed wire fences in the end of the state of Texas. People are starting to nail down space.

Up to the time when the barbed wire fence moves in, a country is much freer. And after the barbed wire fences moved in – people begin to worry and worry and worry about more – more and more about space, space, space. And then, finally, somebody starts putting in county lines and roads and road markers, and they start surveying out small plots of ground-forty acres and so forth – and the tone of the country is coming down, coming down. And then they get to a point where they have towns and cities and big buildings, and the tone of the country is dropping further and further and further. And when the tone has come down to a point where they establish a university, they're gone.

Anyway, the little red schoolhouse is the big space robber. They take the whole big beautiful outdoors away from this little kid. You know, they speak of – they should be ashamed of taking candy away from the baby. Ah! Take all the candy you want away from a baby, but don't take the space away from a kid by putting him in school. He'll become like us.

By the time you have put somebody in a limited space for an awful long space of time (that was a terrible picture, by the way), by the time you put somebody in a limited space for a

long while, he's getting more and more fixed, more and more fixed, more and more fixed in his space relationships. But don't do this to him: don't put him in limited space and then make him suppress all white because he will eventually vanish out of existence what anchor points he has.

So don't put him in the position of small space and suppress white because if he gets into that kind of a situation, he'll become normal. That's exactly what you do when you read. You suppress white and let the black come in.

You can run after an explosion – if you suddenly had a big explosion out here in the street, you could run out in the street and just listen to what people were asking each other, and they would say, „What is the significance of that?“ That's all blackness is. And that's all the mystery there is, is „What is the significance of that explosion?“

The first space was formed by explosive anchor points. Now, we see how this is. We see, then, that we get a dwindling spiral because the more space suppression there is, the more a person has to think about it because he can't have the other space, he can just *think* of how it looks. So you get more and more suppression, and you get more and more thinkingness, and as you get less space, they think more – and less space, they think more and more and more. And then they figure, figure, figure, figure, figure, figure, figure, figure, figure, figure and they're – become a stockbroker or something. Figure, figure, figure, figure, figure. They become a philosopher.

Every once in a while somebody says to me – somebody says to me, „What makes you think up all this?“ Well, as a matter of fact, I don't think up all this. It's one of the remarkable things about it. There is no think-up, actually, in connection with this. If this were going on a figure, figure, figure, it would have taken an – many, many years and years and years and years and years – oh, I'd say another hundred years or two, to have gotten all this sifted out, if it was going to get sifted out at all.

But that isn't the evolution of it The evolution of this is: You know what it is, and then you don't know the language in which to express it, and then you don't know how bad off people are, and then you don't know how all this goes together. But here we have what? We have highly specialized applications and highly specialized communication systems.

So looking at it from freedom of space at a constriction of space, the problem is solvable. But believe me, and if you don't believe anything else I say, at least listen to this: Trying to solve a problem from constricted space to find open space is impossible, and that's why the problem wasn't solved in universities. They sit in constricted space and try to imagine what wide space is. It can't be done.

If they really had wanted to solve the problem of the mind, they would have gone off and sat on Pikes Peak for a while. The Hindu does that I learned that when I was a kid, the terrific effect of suddenly going out into the wilderness and talking to nobody and seeing nothing for just days and days and days and days – fourteen days. And your anchor points keep going out, out, out, out And after a while, you don't see any significance at all in life. There just isn't You're animate; you're happy.

Well, that is the direction from which we've been trying to solve the problem – at least, has been from outer space, trying to look into a constricted space and find out what was going on.

And this has been a problem, mainly, of communication. You will find, for instance, lectures in 1950 that talk about the reducing perimeter of the dynamics and so on. Well, it wasn't intelligible – insufficiently intelligible for application and insufficiently understood in application, as far as I was concerned, to make it intelligible.

This is mainly a problem of finding out what anchor points do or don't, but mainly – is there anything desirable in constricted space? Yes, yes, you can constrict space, but for heaven's sakes, as a person, as a being, don't get into a situation – don't get into a situation where you see everything as a constriction, and where everything has to be constricted or it has no value at all. If you get into that sort of an idea about life – that it's all got to be close up – you've got to have a small office; you've got to have a small classroom; that you have to be in a car all the time in order to move through space at all and so forth, watch out, because you're really hitting the roily coaster.

Every once in a while, why, take a look and find out how far away it is to something or other, but look all the way to something or other. Try to go out sometime and look at the stars. And just take a look at the stars and then put an anchor point alongside of one.

You know, traditionally, you're supposed to look at the stars in this fashion: You're supposed to look at the stars and realize how insignificant you are. No, you look at the stars and put out a couple of anchor points.

In the matter, then, of Six Steps to Better Beingness, we have a technique which doesn't entirely – its design doesn't entirely do this, but which will probably be changed somewhat here and there, and will do this – which alternates the attention from the mind to the environment, from the environment to the mind, from the mind to the environment. In other words, we invite an introversion and then go into an extroversion, see, and in such a way, try to knock off the things which are keeping the preclear from being well extroverted. You see, there's the modus operandi which should be behind any such technique.

And you can just put this down as the basic technique of techniques – is „Put your attention on yourself now.“ „Now put it on the walls of the room.“ „Now put your attention on yourself.“ „Now put it on the lamp.“ „Now put your attention on yourself.“ „Now put it on the sun.“ See, that would be the technique, I mean, that's... You know, I talked and talked and talked for three years trying to boil that down to a sentence, and I just did it.

Well, that alternation then pulls loose a person's attention units, both where they're stuck out there (remember they are stuck out there, you see) and where they're stuck in here.

Now, the one thing a person won't have – you know, you go around and you say, „I have been betrayed. My parents betrayed me and others-people betrayed me.“ You know, people will talk about being betrayed, but they don't talk about being ridiculed. Just put that down very significant to the whole problem. You have people all around who have their anchor points so close in to their noses that they can't see you. And these people would then perform – not because it's the dwindling spiral or necessarily the operation of the universe –

these people would much rather have their anchor points in dose than way out there because they know they haven't got force enough, they think, to guard an anchor point way out there. Well, what's that say then in terms of thought? They're more afraid of ridicule than they are of betrayal. Ridicule is much worse than betrayal, infinitely worse.

That's why your preclear doesn't laugh, that's why he doesn't line charge. He can't laugh. Laugh is a symptom of ridicule. Laughter gets perverted and ground down and smashed in and a few other things happen to it and has a nasty habit of becoming a ridicule. And this – he'll just lump this whole thing together. There's good, wide, healthy laughter and all that sort of thing, but he can't see anything in a laugh, let's say, but ridicule.

Now, if you want anybody to get the emotion of shame, embarrassment or being ridiculed – shame and embarrassment, that's the result of having been ridiculed – all you have to do is get him with the idea that somebody has some possession of his and is holding it out many feet away from him and won't let it come back. You can just get a preclear to get this idea, and after a while he gets terribly nervous, and shame and embarrassment and stage fright and all sorts of things turn on as a consequence.

You take somebody who actually has his anchor points way in – he tells you immediately that he has a terrible vulnerability.

But the reverse situation could theoretically occur, but I do not know that it exists. Theoretically, there could be the person who has his anchor points so posed that he won't have one in. You see, he wouldn't have an anchor point up close to him. Now, that person might exist; it might be the symptom at the bottom of the very, very thin person. He won't have an anchor point up dose to him. Might account for the lankiness of Texans or something of the sort. Now, I haven't explored that, but you may find that to be the case.

Well, he obviously is much fonder of ridicule than he is of betrayal. Betrayal is worse to him than ridicule, and you'd find that in his makeup. But betrayal is usually the favored one. They will talk about being betrayed, but they will not talk very much about being ridiculed.

Now, how do you get a person to feel the emotion of having been betrayed and everything connected with that emotion? Just get him to hold his anchor points insufferably dose to him or get him to feel that they have been driven in on him hard.

You wonder why a society which was moving fast over rather insecure roads would eventually become relatively paranoid and run into the „only one“ computation easily. A society which is moving around in large vehicles which do not themselves necessitate putting out any anchor points, rather than a glance at a road sign once in a while, would have a tendency to run into the „only one“ computation.

Why? Well, every town is coming up on them this way – every new landmark, every new circle, every signpost is coming right up to them, up to them, and if they claim those as their anchor points, it's apparent to them that their anchor points are being driven in.

You find somebody driving a vehicle who cannot easily keep his anchor points up ahead of him about a mile or two. That is to say, he can't include all the space in front of him. If this – you find this person unable to do that, he is getting in the direction of a bad driver.

One of these days he'll have an accident That's just because of this smash-in of anchor points. They aren't his anchor points, and he owns all of them anyhow, but he's restricted by the road. And the road is a great evaluator, believe me; it restricts a person into one channel.

Every once in a while you'll find a preclear who has, up in front of his nose, some kind of a long stripe. It goes way out in front of him. He's got this idea, see? I shouldn't say this is common; it's very, very rare – not over 90 percent of people have it (*laughter*) And this long stripe, if he'll just unroll it, is a road; that's all it is. It's not an electronic or anything else; it's just a road from this life. It's all the points off of all the roads that he's been trying to stop.

Now, when a person has an accident, he has already decided he's going to go down this road, and the road reevaluated for him; it stopped him. He stopped before he arrived. Then you'll find this person later on unable to get in a taxicab until it's actually there. You'll find them unable to get ready until the time has arrived that they should be there. You will find them unable to keep an appointment; they will always be late for the appointment Why is that? They can't arrive. There are people who cannot start and people who cannot finish.

And the common one in this society, because of its transport problems and so on is people can't arrive. They're tremendous starters but terrible finishers. They can't get there.

If, for a few days however one – this rights very easily – if one just for a few days made up his mind to be there every time, he'd find his whole mental aspect shifting on him. His whole idea is he can't arrive, that's all. That's because he can't get there geographically.

Also, if he can't arrive, he can't return, and, oh, it gets very complex.

Now, you see, then, what our goal is here. It's just to give the pc more space. Or sometimes, theoretically, you'll run into a preclear who has too much space and he can't withdraw from it But if he has that computation, the one where he doesn't have enough space is there, too, and is the more significant one.

Everybody, to some slight degree, is in this computation. He can't withdraw from a certain piece of space. Somebody has something of his.

The fellow whose emotions shut off the day the girl jilts him should be no mystery to you now. Somebody has got one of his anchor points, and he's occupying too much space in connection with it And when you've got too much space, you can't have an emotion. An emotion is actually a condensation of looking, and looking requires space. So he can't get his lookingness condensed enough to have an emotion because somebody has Bertha over in Hog County.

You see how that is? That would apply to a girl. She fell in love when she was sixteen, this fellow went off with his wife and got an anchor point She's lost an anchor point, one that was very significant to her. Now, she's got that space stretched there and so can't turn on an emotion again.

You get these people who have no emotion. In spite of every protestation, the E-Meter there will tell you that they have had a love affair which came to a very, very sad end, and

they got their space stretched and now they can't get it back together again, so they have (quote) no emotion (unquote).

So we have these two conditions, as I say, again. The predominant one is – the *favored one*, the one people like best is betrayal – anchor points driven in – and the one they like least is ridicule – anchor points out.

So you see, space is terribly valuable, and yet people can't have space, because if they had space, they'd be ridiculed. This is elementary.

Six Steps to Better Beingness includes in it nothing, really, more or less than what we have covered in SOP 8 and SOP 8-L, but is a technique designed and is light enough to be used by the individual upon himself, with this one little admonition. And that is don't give a person way, way, way, way, way down the Tone Scale – neurotic's range – Ten Minutes of Nothing. They go *psewwv*.

Now a person at first, when he starts to run this, gets an interesting manifestation. Give him Ten Minutes of Nothing, and it takes him quite a while, several sessions or several trials – in other words, several passes through Six Steps to Better Beingness – before he finally, all of a sudden gets nothing. The first moment he really completely gets nothing, he's really quite surprised. It's very, very satisfying to really get nothing. Before that, he's had something along with the nothing each time.

Now, you can run Q and A on Ten Minutes of Nothing. „Get all the nothingness around the body.“ „Now get that as a question.“ „Now get the nothingness in the body as the answer.“ And you'll peel a guy down, layer by layer, to a point where he can get nothing very easily.

Or you say, „Now get the solidity of the body.“ „Now get how solid it is as the question.“ „Now fill in all the space around the individual solidly as the answer.“ And you have, of course – you have immediately the situation which he is heading toward – his anchor points all just completely pounded in solid around him.

But Ten Minutes of Nothing, a person just lets go of everything. It is not ten minutes of no room, not just ten minutes of no body; it's ten minutes without thought, too, you see? It's just nothing. And you'll find your preclear or yourself, if you're self-auditing this, will achieve Ten Minutes of Nothing after several passes through if he doesn't achieve it the first time.

On some cases, not neurotic, you will find the preclear in the belief that he has just been ignited with a bomb or something of the sort because he just – *boom*. Ten Minutes of Nothing and he just suddenly lets go of everything. He gets somatics all over and so on.

Now, that doesn't mean that he's neurotic, because a neurotic, if you ask him to get Ten Minutes of Nothing just on the thought of the word, 'Ten Minutes of Nothing. Oh, no, no, no, no, no, no, no!' He's got to have something. He's just got to have something. And it's so obsessive that the thought of getting nothing is very upsetting to him. So you can monitor that technique. Actually, you won't get in a lot of trouble. So the fellow goes crazy, I mean, you can pull him out of it. Nothing to it.

Well, that's step number one in this. If you were to do this, you know, every one of these little techniques in Six Steps to Better Beingness, taken all by itself and just run – just run nothing else but this one little technique, and it'll finally produce the desired results. But you're not getting that introversion-extroversion shift, and that is a desirable thing to get because it changes the aspect of the case if done in that way.

Now, all of the techniques in here can be found elsewhere except Ten Minutes of Nothing and I think, also, the Opposite Pole. But the Opposite Pole is an extremely, extremely too simple explanation and activity of Q and A. And you'll recognize in Opposite Pole just what I've been talking about in Q and A. That's all that is.

Now, as we go down the line here with this, we find Step II is Duplication. And I described Duplication to you yesterday – how you duplicate. Well, you have the preclear do it the same way. You just say, „You see that table? All right Let's make a duplicate alongside of the table. Let's make another table alongside of the table.“

Now, if he makes a very, very fancy table, if he's not able to make the same table, why, he needs a lot of this. Or other way to – if he can only make the same table, having looked at it, he's in an obsessive duplication, you see. He's compelled to duplicate. He can't do anything else but duplicate. Well, you want him to be able to change things like that.

You find a lot of little kids in school, they look at the table and they can only make a table. Now you say, „Make the table bigger,“ *gng*. They can't because they have to have the model to do it Well, we're trying to cure people of needing a model is what we're trying to do here. And we're also, in this wise, trying to make it possible for them to go back to places where they think they can't go anymore.

Duplication goes right into reestablishing the ability to enter a geographical area. Do lots of Duplication, all of a sudden the fellow isn't any longer afraid of geography. This is – you work out why that is. A fellow can't go back, which is he can't return, means he must be something different.

He can't be the same thing because he can't be in the same place. See how it works out? He can't be in the same place so he can't be the same thing again. And this gets up to a hectic level where – do you know, people will not go down to the same movie time after time after time after time? Because live theater is so superior to that stuff on celluloid – people will go and see a stage play time after time, but then they know the stage play is different every time they see it, so they're led along a little bit by that And then stage plays are usually well-written and so on, unlike movies.

Of course, movies are getting better these days. They have to; they haven't any audience. If they'd only gotten better about ten, fifteen years ago, why, everybody would be a lot happier. But remember ten or fifteen years ago, Hollywood was giving us G-, H – or R-, S-grade pictures or X-grade pictures, something like that All ran on the same formula. They had this little guy and he was a tough guy and he was a nice guy and he had a girl and he went through some motion and so on. And it all broke down to this chase in the automobile, and then the villain got it, and that was that You know, and they just kept filming this. Well, they didn't film it artistically or well. They filmed it very poorly, and people got excessively tired of it. They got retchingly tired of it, not just wretchedly.

And Hollywood would just have to have a tremendous lot of steam on the ball right now to try to even vaguely pick up above TV. And TV is horrible! So Hollywood really smelled to lose its audience like that. And of course, TV doesn't require anyone to put out an anchor point. There sits the handy little jim-dandy set right in the house, and it keeps putting out anchor points at you. You haven't got a thing to say about it; it just keeps smashing home.

Now then, some parents – I'll tell you, some parents are really peculiar. I've known some people in my time who were very peculiar – they let their children sit there and look at it for hours. Do you know people really do that? They let their children sit there in front of that television receiver.

Now, don't tell RCA or anybody else that I told you anything about television receivers or tried to run down television receivers because I'd hate like the mischief to spoil any sales for them. But the heavy particle coming out of them is intensely destructive, and if intensified a little bit would amount to a death ray. Well, you can take it or not or believe it or not; they're trying like mad to correct it.

Now, I haven't any right to say that really; it's not been proven that a television receiver is always a death ray. This has not been proven.

Besides, I don't object to the death ray part of it, I just object to the way the programs smell.

So, here again is a question of anchor points. As long as there exist places in the universe where a person can't put his anchor points, there exist places in the universe where a person can't be. If there are places where a person can't be, then there are places which he can't duplicate. And you just start running Duplication and eventually places he can't be will start to show up, only you don't pay any attention to these. It is an internal effort to get out the anchor points, you see – mental, internal. And this, of course, is varied the second that we go to the next technique.

We're out again. With Nothing, by the way, you're really out. The person – just let him go out and in. And a person is not paying too much attention to where he is, so we have that solved.

Now, we go into Duplication; it's internal to a large degree. Although he is looking out and putting his duplicates out, he is also processing mock-ups in his head. So this is more of an introverted technique than you would immediately suspect. But then it gradually becomes an extroverted technique. That's Duplication.

Now, we go on to good old Spacation and, believe me, that's really getting the anchor points out with a vengeance and insisting they stay there. That's just „Reach out of your head,“ or just „Reach now to the two back corners of the room, and get interested in those two corners and don't think,“ and that's all. Now, you could probably do that for a long, long, long, long time. Very interesting things happen.

On Nothingness, by the way, people quite often get seriously sick at their stomachs. They just go into a major decline because of this, because that's the one thing a stomach can't have is nothing. The whole future of a stomach must consist of something.

So, we go into our good old friend here, Spacation, which is just Step III of SOP 8. Well, is there anything hard to do about it? If you did it all in running Six Steps to Better Beingness, it would really be better than just doing the one part of it. But in the Six Steps, it's sufficient to do the one part of it.

This is very easy. You just reach the two back corners of the room and get interested in them. Do you do anything else? Do you think about it? Do you figure? No! You ask the preclear – if you're doing this to somebody – every once in a while, „You got ahold of those corners?“

„Yeah, yeah, yeah.“ Well, you'll watch him and if he's really got hold of the corners, eventually his chin will start to come back. The truth of the matter is he's coming out of his head. Watch him and his chin will come back and back and back, and all of a sudden, his body will relax somewhat. If his body doesn't relax somewhat, he needs a lot of mock-ups of explosion and admiration to soften up that energy, because he's stuck. All right. By the way, if he comes out of his head very easily, his chin won't come back.

Now, after we do a spacation, here is Step VII of SOP 8. Well, if you did a total spacation, you would then go from the corners of the room to building a cube of space of the preclear's own, just like it says in SOP 8, Issue 16-G. It needs no further description than that. See, if you did that totally, if you did this for five or ten minutes, holding the back corners of the room, or even for a minute or two, and then went on and had the preclear put out eight anchor points, you would have your intermediate step whereby you've extroverted and then run the introversion step, see?

So your next step would have to be a contact, and so it is here, a contact. And this is Contact. Contact therapy is the brief name for Step VII of SOP 8, which is „What room?“ „What is the realest thing in the room to you? Reach out and touch it“

Now, it's put in here not because everybody is crazy, but because it's an exteriorization step. It's a step which puts a person's attention out on the environment again. So far we've gone out – in, out – in and out.

How do you do that? You just say to the preclear, „All right You see that glass on the table? Well, pick it up. Now set it down and go back to the couch.“

And he'll say, „That's a hell of a step. Wouldn't do anything for anybody.“ And if he thinks that's the case, the glass wasn't real to him. That's the joker.

A person who is in real good shape would just as soon pick up a glass. A glass has sensation. And so you should ask him then if he says, „Ah, that's no step“ – is you'd say, „Now, what in the room is really real to you?“ „Go over and touch it.“ „Now let go of it“ He's liable to go over and touch it and let go of it and some people will surprise you. It doesn't mean they're psychotic; it just means they've gone out of present time. They'll all of a sudden pick up the object and they'll say, „Gee, that's real. That's the first MEST I've had my hands on for a long time.“

Every once in a while a person gets a mock-up like that by the way. They get this one mock-up – boy, it's real! Boy, a real good mock-up. And then you try and make them get an-

other mock-up. No, they want to mock up that quarter or whatever was really real to them. So you go from there to Contact.

Self Analysis is self-explanatory in *Self Analysis*. If you want to improve on Self Analysis, however – you see, we're contact out to the room; now, on this step, Self Analysis, Step V, we're back inside the person's head again, we're internally storing it up – is you get him to put out two mock-ups of whatever he's doing. If you want to improve on Self Analysis, instead of one mock-up, put out two. That's two anchor points, don't you see? That's his own universe in operation.

Now, of course, we have worked – we're internal – introverted, extroverted, introverted, extroverted, introverted, extroverted, but where's the third universe? Well, we pick up the third universe with the step, Opposite Pole Processing. And you could do Opposite Pole Processing exactly as I was doing Q and A in the demonstration, and it'll come off but beautifully.

The other person's universe, the other person's viewpoint – one thinks more about what other people are thinking than about what other people are seeing. And as long as a pre-clear is concerned more about what they're thinking than what they're seeing, he's in bad shape, he's normal. So you want to run that out, and Opposite Poles, done just as I did that Q and A demonstration, is the best way to do it That's all it is, it's Q and A. This is another way – simpler, less effective way – of doing Q and A.

But remember that this little technique here does have its more interesting aspects. You take somebody who is quite afraid of life in general, and you start to get geographical areas saying, „I'm going to betray you.“ And him saying, „Nothing there.“ Not go into flows or anything like that, but just get the idea – just get the idea that Miami, Florida is saying to him, „I'm going to betray you.“ (No, nothing ever happened to me in Miami) „I'm going to betray you.“

The fellow was arrested or something like that in Montreal, and whether he realizes it or not, he's really afraid of the whole geographical area of Montreal. So just get Montreal saying, „I'm going to betray you.“ Get Montreal – gets the idea, „I'm going to betray you.“ He just does this in a mock-up. And then he says, „Nothing there“ and then, „Going to betray you,“ and, „Nothing there.“ Reaching and withdrawing, reaching and withdrawing from Montreal – what you're doing. Formula H is where it comes in. And the person all of a sudden frees up about Montreal and he'll come right on uptone. This is a handy jim-dandy little tone raiser, because that's what a person is really worried about, is not being things. He can only start being concerned about being things when he can't be places. Being places is much senior to being things. He starts to be things which can be places. One starts getting dressed for the part You see, the only way you could be in such-and-such a place...

The only way you could be on that street down there is to wear clothes. Well, I notice some of you look disparagingly, but that's the truth. As a matter of fact, it's a police offense to appear down in that street without clothes. All right You have to be dressed; you have to be a human being in clothes to appear in the street down there.

Another thing is to be acceptable in a hospital, you have to have a sick body. To be acceptable to the Navy, you have to be capable of twenty-twenty vision or something like that. You see, there's always these conditions.

Of course, the one way a fellow is tremendously acceptable is not to be anything, just be there. Nobody can even object to it. So you have your optimum condition. Of course, it's a lot more fun, we will admit, to wear clothes. And that's obvious to everybody. But...

You know, people seldom – people somehow or other have kept from realizing... A lovely little button, by the way, „I don't dare realize it.“ Another little button, the same line, „I don't dare let it happen again.“ The same thing which is, „I don't dare be there anymore. These as concepts and – very secondary processing, concepts. Any thought process is very secondary. A person has any one of these ideas – he doesn't dare realize how far into a complete artificiality he and the group with which he's associated have drifted. He hadn't any idea about it at all.

But if he were to sit down – this is therapy itself – and just start spotting complete, irrelevant stupidities (or he could read *New Yorker* magazine), he would be surprised because any reason that he finds anywhere will blow up. There isn't any reason about anything which will bear the test of fact. Interesting, isn't it? There are no reasons. A Q and A. The reason for the microphone is a microphone, unless you and I know that the microphone can do certain things and has a certain process and that this process goes forward. Once we've started it doing this process, we don't have to think about it anymore, it goes on doing it till somebody turns a light switch someplace. And so we get the mind entering in the problem to the thing.

Just so in processing. The auditor's mind can enter more problems into the preclear than the preclear can well solve in ages to come. You take some very sharp, extremely clever auditor who knows life, and he starts looking at this poor, simple, little kid that he's going to process. Well, they got this to a fine turn in psychoanalysis; they even have words there that the psychoanalyst can't pronounce.

But even here, this auditor, he knows so much about what is going on that he knows all these answers and reasons and problems and connections and all that sort of thing. And he'll look at this poor preclear, and this preclear is being – being what he's being, see? He just is – he's real stupid. (*laughter*) And the auditor is completely baffled! Case baffles him; he just can't get anyplace with this case.

Same way, every once in a while these techniques I give you, they baffle auditors. „Ten Minutes of Nothing? What's the significance of this?“

Well, here is your very clever mind at work. But remember, the man who is being clever most of the time actually isn't being clever out of his engram bank. You could actually beat somebody up enough so that he'll get smart in a certain stimulus-response way. You can make a dog this way. You can get a dog so that he will jump up and jump down and jump up and jump down if you beat him around enough. But this isn't really being clever. It takes a pretty good thetan to be very clever. And he starts tracing over the reactive mind, finding reasons for, and it's a very absorbing problem; he'd get tremendously interested in it. That's how he got introverted in the first place – it's such an interesting problem. And he keeps looking this over, and he sees the connections going this way and the connections going that way.

Oh, it's lovely! And then he looks up from it – you know, and then *be – bong*. He's looking back at it again.

When a thetan first contacted a body, I swear he probably didn't have any idea what he was doing; he just suddenly got interested in the body and more and more concentrated on the body. And there isn't one in this room, really, that didn't have this happen. *Pang*. All of a sudden he was tremendously interested in the body, and then all of a sudden, he was only a body. There he is, he's gone, nothing; he's forgotten how to be a thetan completely. He knows thetans don't exist; he's a body. This is real silly – real silly. All right.

There, in essence, is Six Steps to Better Beingness. Now remember, it's a Group Process. It is an optimum process, really, on groups, and it goes out – in: out to the material universe, in to the preclear's own universe, out to the material universe, in to the preclear's own universe and then finishes up with a step which goes into the third universe.

And people will exteriorize on this, and it can be run on oneself if one disciplines oneself to simply run ten minutes of each all the way down the line, or five minutes of each all the way down the line or something like that, and continues all the way through the list

But remember in auditing yourself, for heaven's sakes, please, please recognize this fact that you can get so interested in the reactive bank and so interested in the computation, that you don't extrovert again. So park this little piece of paper up in front of you, and remember that's all that's wrong with you is you're introverted about the reactive mind. Just park the piece of paper up in front of you with that list. There's a complete list here on the back page of it and it says, „Ten Minutes of Nothing,“ do that ten minutes, see? „Duplication,“ do it for three or four minutes. „Spacation,“ do it for ten minutes. „Contact,“ you'll say, „that's a silly one, I'll skip that“ You look around the room after you've been doing this corner of the room thing, find something that's real to you, pick it up and put it down, sit back in the seat again.

And then you pick up old *Self Analysis* and you just open it up at the last place you were, at random or something like that and it says, „Can you create a scene in which...“ and run over half a dozen of them.

And then go to the Opposite Pole and do just like it says here if you want to. Or put Papa's body on and turn it around, put it on as the question, turn it around as the answer – just do that two or three times.

Then get a point out there someplace, random, and have it say, „I'm going to betray you,“ or „I'm ridiculing you,“ and you've got it Or just run it just like it says here. You don't have to worry about it particularly; you can vary it And then start right on around again and get Ten Minutes of Nothing.

Now, you can go through with this with great rapidity. There are those agitated, nervous minds which would much rather do a lot of steps in a very little space of time. And there are those minds which will say – says, „Well, we'll do Ten Minutes of Nothing for the next two weeks now, and then we'll...“ They're thorough. Well, when this gets to Germany – when this gets to Germany, that's the way it will be done, (*laughter*) But right here in America, this is how you do it – just put it up there in front of you and run through it.

And if you find yourself coasting very far off of this technique when you've made up your mind to do this technique, you know what you're doing. You're just introverting and examining some more phenomena inside your own mind and that isn't going to do you a bit of good, really. Going to be pleasant but it isn't going to do you much good.

There are lots more techniques than this, but this is the handiest one to do an extroversion-introversion sequence that I know about.

Let's take a break.

THE USES AND FUTURE OF SCIENTOLOGY

A lecture given on 3 October 1953
by L. Ron Hubbard

57 MINUTES

This, the last hour of lecture of the congress has as its title, „The Uses and Future of Scientology.“ It should begin with a little bit of time track; that is to say, a little bit of past.

The use of Dianetics was, at optimum, the resolution of problems of existence. This is a goal of Scientology, but Dianetics stressed problems and you will find people who favor problems rather than action staying with Dianetics; they broke it off right there, and I left them right there, mostly because we are interested in a science which returns motion and action to existence.

These cultures and societies do not have to be as dull as they are, where everybody is forced down into a supercontrol mechanism, compressed to a point where he doesn't dare wiggle. It doesn't mean that a return of motion in a society is a return to viciousness. You will find that viciousness, unethical conduct, rapaciousness, cruelty, so forth, are the product of a low tone, not a high one. You'll find that people in high tone get into trouble mostly because they aren't really specializing in how to hate.

You can make quite a deal out of how to hate, and when it winds up, at the end of it, the person who's doing all the hating is putting himself into a nice, solid piece of MEST.

Now, where we talk about, then, broad „love,“ this mawkish horrible concept of: „You've got to love your neighbor, you son of a gun, or we'll beat your ears in and fry you for an eternity.“ No, let's not worry about love that dose to hate.

Admiration betokens in itself a kind of respect It borders on liking, admiring – it's a much, much better word than love. Love all too often is a compulsive passion which devours the very young, and they go and starve to death and blow their brains out and pine and sigh and learn ridiculous dances. And this is love.

They don't even see the person to whom they have attached their sentiment They don't even know that person is there. They're „in love!“

Admiration, a heavy level of admiration, betokens a sort of respect If you really admired somebody – if you really admired somebody, you'd have to have some understanding of existence and some understanding of him or her. And believe me, it would have a lot more pleasantness and a lot more duration than this thing called „love.“

And I used the word *love just* as it's used in the society today and also as it's used by the Christian church, whatever might have happened to that in the last few centuries.

Admiration: to admire existence, to find interest, pleasant interest or pleasant excitement in life itself, its motion and action; to be able to respect and admire livingness in a thing rather than to trap and cage that livingness for possession. And that would be the difference between love and admiration.

A thing which is loved has to be trapped and caged, and a thing which is admired is a thing which you would like to see free. There's all the difference in the world, then, between a top-scale emotion like admiration and a bottom-scale emotion like love. Love is down there with hate, so close to it that they flip like a gambler's card. Passionate devotion – very, very passionate devotion – where it does not include observation, is love; devotion, where it does include observation, would be admiration.

There's nothing wrong with loyalty, there's nothing wrong with honesty. Very strange thing, but in most men's minds today, they wonder how it is that anybody can see any advantage in honesty or decency – any of these things. It doesn't pay. One gets it, to be colloquial, in the neck for honesty, decency, fair play. If, in this society today, you go out on the line and you say insistently and continuously, „Let's be honest Let's try to carry forward as best we can. Let's help our fellows and let's keep going and give the best service we possibly can give to everyone,“ you wouldn't think that that attitude would be questioned or fought.

Too many men know that that sort of an attitude is immediately received by a slap back. People who are low on the Tone Scale are in cruelty, and so on. They're so thirsty, so hungry for admiration, for space, for anything, that they take someone who is acting like that, and they chew him up and spit him out *if* they can. The whole answer to the problem – believe me, the whole answer to the problem is just be too big a mouthful!

Now, when I say that a person has to be able to have control of force and to be able to use force in order to be responsible, please don't interpret that, that a person uses force. You have to be able to. To go up through all the dynamics does not mean that you have to be and run and address and consider every facet of every dynamic You just have to be in a state of mind which is willing to be.

Force is sitting there at about 20.0 on down. You get up above force, you don't need force. The second that you get into flows – you start running concepts and things and ridges and energy in its raw masses – you're getting into flows. And when you get into flows, you become the effect of flows, just as a person getting into too many engrams becomes the effect of engrams.

An effect is not cause; it is the thing upon which cause operates. A little while ago, I picked up a glass and moved it over here. That glass was effect It was responding perfectly and completely to a cause. It was the most effect that you can get, just about.

A person has to be somewhat an effect in the universe in order to be here at all. It's when a person is afraid to be an effect that he's starting to get into trouble. And so, in using the material of Scientology, the first step would be to get up to a consideration where one has a willingness to be, not that one has to be. He has to be willing to be.

There is a high level of tolerance. This can easily be mistaken at the bottom of the Tone Scale for abject surrender. When one wants to see life in a happier and higher state, it doesn't mean that he's propitiating all existence. He can admire the struggles that are going forward – appreciate them – and on the computation of the eight dynamics, try to resolve the problem in terms of the maximal survival for the maximal number of dynamics. And that's an optimum solution and always will be.

And it doesn't consist of very much hating; it consists of a lot of admiring. When you can honestly say you love human beings – not compulsively have to – you will heave quite a sigh of relief about the whole thing. They're bad, they're wicked, they have dirty noses, they carry diseases around, they fight back at you. You try to patch up a gaping throat that somebody has cut, and the first thing the person does whose throat you have patched up is to get up and bite you. Again, be too big a mouthful; that's the only answer.

Life acts like that It fights. It has tremendous strength and potentials. It is an enormously – enormously wonderful manifestation. And when one can see what it is doing, he can understand what it is doing – all he has to do is look at it.

By golly, once in a while you're walking down the street, and you see in this dirty coal-strewn walk, you see some green grass growing out through the crack, and you say, „For heaven's sakes, life, how did you ever get there?“

Well, once in a while you see something that has made good on a struggle of that magnitude, and you sort of want to reach in there and pick it up and put it over to a place where it can grow a lot better. That's actually the boat to some degree, I find myself in with man. He can sure grow a lot better. He sure can.

When some fellow who is all full of ginger – he's all set to go in life, and he's all ready to make a tremendous success out of things in all directions. And all of a sudden the army grabs hold of him and puts a rifle in his hands and tells him to go over and shoot a fellow he's not been introduced to – and he lives in the mud And he gets out of the army, and he's so used to people saying, well, „squads east“ and „squads west,“ that he doesn't know what he's doing. Here they've put all the youth of America today up against becoming-all the young men – up against becoming soldiers when they're eighteen. They're not good soldier material. Soldiers are born, and they're not in the highest percentage in the populace.

And there are many fellows who get a tremendous thrill out of being a soldier. They just love this idea of being a soldier; they like to obey orders. They go around – as long as this is running this way, fine – they like to be disciplined, punished. Doesn't matter to them. They're being a soldier, and that's what they're supposed to be doing. Nowadays, you only find that in the Marine Corps.

When you look at life, you realize that a certain amount of discipline, a certain amount of punishment, a certain amount of agony is bred to life – it's randomness. But when you have given your allegiance to a species or a culture, and it comes up against bumpers on the track, and it's slowing down, slowing down, slowing down, and it's starting to lose its sense of direction, you're sure entitled to do something about it.

You're sure entitled to disturb what it is laughingly railing self-determinism – you sure are. And that in essence (perhaps not too well thought out a concept because it isn't something about what you think), that's more or less what I envision a Scientologist is doing: getting the wheels turning, getting the show on the road and keeping a culture from falling on its face.

I've written down here a few things, it should be very, very exaltedly written in beautiful English or something of the sort, but it's not It's just a few things that I thought of in connection with „What is a Scientologist?“

I would say he was somebody who brought light and humanity to man and his sciences because man neglected to bring humanity in when he brought in science.

There's nothing at all wrong with physics, chemistry or mathematics, electronics or anything else, until some little slap-happy guy who doesn't even know he has a next-door neighbor, decides that the machine is far more important than men.

And when he decides that, the Scientologist, of course, has a perfect right to shoot him. Anyway... (*laughter*)

A Scientologist is a trouble-shooter – a trouble-shooter. Do you know that people get into trouble they can't get out of, with great... Suddenly, life's going along, they're doing all right, and suddenly the gates sort of drop across the time track, and they just can't get out of that much trouble. Well, nobody in the past could get a person out of that much trouble. Here's a fellow, he's going along all right, the baby is born, his wife has, all of a sudden, dizzy notions that she ought to kill the child. He's in too much trouble. His life for the next thirty, fifty years is going to be a burden to him.

Well, a Scientologist can very well do something about that But that isn't all. What about the fellow who just thought it was wonderful to go around and have big adventures and, all of a sudden, found himself falling into the traps of criminality? Nobody would let him have any adventure. And he found out he couldn't have any adventure, and he finally sunk down to the level of being a criminal.

What right does this society have to keep men in cages? Well, I'll tell you what right it has. None! A Scientologist can do something about that, very definitely.

He's a trouble-shooter for the individual, for children, the family and the political and economic group. He knows what life's about; he knows whether it's on its rails or it's off the rails. He knows whether a corporation is failing or not failing, simply by estimating its level on a Tone Scale. How simple. What's the state of internal communications of a corporation? Well, if you just look at that, „What's the state of your interoffice communications around here, boss?“

„What interoffice communications?“

You say, „Well, I'll give this company about six months.“ That's about it It'll drag along that way. Here will be a lot of guys out of work, suddenly. Here's management not taking its responsibility like it should. That's the economic group.

And what about a political group? Well, there isn't too much you can do about political groups because they come and they go. But, there is one thing about the world today which is intensely interesting, is that the two parasitic groups of the world are at war, one with the other. There are two parasitic groups in the world today which are at war with each other, and which are causing more commotion – everybody's so flabbergasted, they don't quite know what's happening. And one of them is communism, the other is capitalism.

Communism is a military aristocracy which depends upon the worker, and capitalism is a money aristocracy which depends upon the worker, and the guy who is going along and – is the manager. The manager, the worker and the people who service the managers and workers – that's the society. Those are three groups.

Everything just goes along fine; there's the manager – the entrepreneur, the fellow who manages things, the foreman. And then there's the fellow who's really got his hands on the tools and who's building things. And then there's that vast class of tradesmen and wives and motion-picture-show operators, and all these other people that service the worker. He won't get anyplace servicing managers, there aren't enough of them.

So you have these three operating groups, and they're just going along splendidly until a military aristocracy comes in and says at the point of a pistol, „We are now going to sit down and you're going to feed us, on account of we can shoot, and it's in the law that we can shoot and you can't.

And the other one is the fellow who says, „I control all the buying power of the entire community, therefore you are all slaves.“

Those are two political groups today that aren't letting us do too well on the world at large. Our income taxes today are directly attributable – this big mock-up between these two parasitic forces, capitalism and communism.

Who cares about either one? Karl Marx blew up capitalism in 1870 and unfortunately raised the standard of communism at the same time. Now, we read about it in the newspapers every morning. I'd rather read a good column of jokes.

The Scientologist can remedy and rectify conditions unfavorable to the survival of desirable life forms – conditions unfavorable to the survival of desirable life forms. He has to make up his mind what's a desirable life form. Well, he always has things that he's siding with. Right now, you're siding with man, therefore flies aren't desirable.

And he remedies and rectifies conditions favorable to the survival of undesirable life forms – favorable to the survival of undesirable life forms. They tell you if you had mosquitoes all over the place here or had them all over Jersey, it'd be a pretty good project to go out some Sunday with some kerosene cans and throw some kerosene on those ponds and, boy, the mosquito population would suddenly take a nose dive. That's well within your purview, because it's part of the contest of man and life against the environment of the MEST universe. And some forms of life have taken it into their minds that they must be the only thing that eats. And when you get a form of Me which takes that into its mind – that it's the only thing that's going to eat, and it's not going to let anything else eat, anywhere – that's bad, that's real bad. What's bad and what's good? Well, that happens to be bad.

When the capitalist says, „I am the only one that can have two Cadillacs,“ shoot him. (*chuckles*) If a guy running a machine press down there is producing good stuff, and so forth, let him have a Cadillac, too. What’s the matter with that? Nothing. Not a thing. But it wouldn’t be a distinguishing badge that somebody could wear as he drove down the street.

Understand, I’m not beating the drum for either of these two insanities; I’m just trying to talk about something that’s pretty good sense. And neither one of these are good sense, I assure you. I know both of them – and they’re just not good sense. I’ve been up to my ears in CPs and capitalists both. *Tck*. Too high; I almost drowned.

Now, a Scientologist is a counselor for problems of culture. Isn’t that a nice broad statement? Well, the funny part of culture is, culture consists of the productivity, the art forms. Here’s where you would enter that immediately. You might know of a Broadway stage starlet who was doing fair – just fair, you see, a little too self-conscious. You go to a show, you see this little girl; looks like she’d do all right, but she just isn’t up there anyplace. You got to have enough brass to go back of the scenes and pull her up the Tone Scale and make an actress out of her. You’re helping culture when you’re doing that

You would be amazed today, for instance, that there are forms of culture out across the world which are astonishing in their beauty, which still survive over many centuries, so on. Somebody’s helping them along. And they’re really all that’s left of an entire flourishing race – these forms of art are still there, and practically nothing else is. If you want to deal with survival in the raw, deal with art forms.

Another thing a Scientologist could be is a counselor for those responsible for the conduct and planning of political and economic groups. You know, there’s an awful lot of fellows around that are carrying a terrific weight on their backs. They just don’t think there’s anything at all could possibly help them out.

If they really thought you could help them out, your first interview with them would be, well, no, they didn’t want any of that „What is it? Soap?“ If they really knew you could help them out, boy, boy, you’d be right in there. These guys need help.

Somebody said one time, „The world is carried on the backs of a few desperate men.“ Very probably true. If you find any of these desperate men, why, give them just a little more back.

A Scientologist would be a teacher of doctrines useful in the tasks of survival – things like concepts of the eight dynamics, the basic drives of existence.

I had a fellow tell me one time – is, „You know, you have no idea what the impact of that first article was.“ He says, „I was in bed. I’d been sick for a long time, and I read the first article and I got out of bed. I said to hell with being sick.“ He didn’t get any processing. He just suddenly integrated life, and there he had something. He understood it better and he got well.

The doctrines all by themselves have a potency which you shouldn’t neglect. Somebody comes in and sits down, you process them for a little while and they go away. They think they know what Scientology is. No, they don’t know what it is. It’s a codification of an understanding of existence which is assimilable by man.

A Scientologist would be a social catalyst dedicated to the mission of raising the standards of happiness of man and bringing him to recognize his brotherhood with the universe.

A Scientologist would be a leader in man's conquest of his environment, and that's about the summation that I would care to make of it.

That's a lot of things. It's very easy – very, very easy to be or do many of those things. Let's look at the eight dynamics, and we find out that as soon as one is much more willing to be the first dynamic – much more willing – he gets interested in kids, he gets interested in groups, so on. And the truth of the matter is that this universe is a tremendously interesting place. One has to talk about it being a mean place once in a while simply because nobody will agree with him about anything else.

One can make – is capable of making a universe of his own, certainly. That's para-Scientology, that's something that's a little bit out of our ken when we're dealing with this universe alone. We needn't worry about that Because you'll find that *you* probably (and probably the majority of your preclears) will come upscale in motion – in terms of motion alone – up to the point where you are no longer able to stay disinterested. It's a tremendously interesting universe.

You get into motion; you get into action. You can remember times when you were a kid, when life just looked too doggoned deliciously beautiful to be left alone. So you could feel like that again if you worked at it And what do you think will happen to you when you find life is just too good to be left alone? You'll start living it Wherever you suddenly moved into that phase and stayed there, you'll hit it a few times and then miss it A little more processing, and you'll start to hit it more constantly and away you'll go.

And all too many with this knowledge will just sort of forget about it and go into complete motion and the dickens with it They won't say very much about it – all too many. But a great many of them will.

I don't advocate at any time that a person spend the rest of his life working other people through processing. This would be a poor prospect, to spend the next fifty, ninety, two hundred years (however long you're going to live, we won't go into that just now) spending – nothing but sitting down-processing somebody who is sitting down. That would be real rough.

It's not near as hard to process a number of people at the same time. That's a fact You can process a lot of people much easier than one person. That's why I say groups are very good. Yet one might very well find, for years to come, a great deal of interest and satisfaction in processing individuals. That's all very well, too. But remember there's a lot of other things that you can do. And if you start concentrating all the time upon the unable and the sick, you really won't be in there pitching hard for the culture at large. You should be pitching an optimum solution, and that's not working continually in favor only of those who are incapable.

The society is running because of capable people. There's a lot of things can be done for it – tremendous numbers of things can be done for it I have found man relatively deficient in imagination as to what to do, but it's a case of case, again. I found people unwilling to go out – most people are unwilling simply to stop somebody in a lobby or on a street and just

say, „Come to my office or come to my home tomorrow. I'm going to give you some Dianetic processing. I'm going to give you some Scientology processing,“ either one.

You'll be surprised what happens. You should do it They don't bite. They're tame dogs. Their motion is practically stopped. They can't even snarl.

You say to them – here's this fellow, he's a road foreman. And you see him out there, and he's been trying to build roads for a long time. Believe it or not, the fellow is scarce. There aren't many of the people that can do that kind of a job or stand up to it, and so on. Where, if you were to take that fellow and sit him down and run him through Six Steps to Better Beingness and a few other things, snap him back up to it again, boy, what a difference it'd make to his crew. And what a difference it would make to the continuation of that road, because they start fighting a road hard enough so that they stop them in building, eventually. You see how that could be?

It depends to a large degree upon initiative and imagination, but you have the tools with which to bring yourself to a level of such initiative and imagination if you do not have it already. Therefore, life at large, is actually waiting for you with open arms.

And who will thank you? You will thank yourselves; that's the only person that can thank you. As soon as you run Admiration Processing for a little while, you'll find out the horrible thing of it is, is you expect admiration from this environment MEST happens to be incapable of delivering admiration, and most men are so dried out when it comes to admiration that there isn't any flowing. And women specialize more in pulling their anchor points in than pushing them out That's because of the nature of the construction of the body.

Where are you going to get admiration from, from man anyway? From your own bank You're your own paymaster and you always will be. And yet it's a lot of fun at the same time to mock yourself up, complete with the MEST mock-ups, of being thanked. That's all right, as long as you don't suddenly start to feel you have to have it And that's like the drunkard who has to have another drink And believe me, all he ever becomes is an alcoholic. An admiholic, I guess you would call somebody...

So, on the uses and future of Scientology, one can look at an entire universe, but he looks at a universe not of speculation but of action. You don't have to think twice or give notice to people who are thinking about it People who are thinking about it are not dangerous. They don't handle guns, knives; they don't run fast; most of the time they don't even talk bitingly. You could sit and think about it for fifty years, and neither you nor anything else would be any better for it.

So when I talk about Scientology and its uses, please don't think about it – just do it Dianetics was what you could think about.

Now, what do you mean by action? Action is just motion. Any motion is better than no motion.

When I was a young writer they used to tell me, „Never under any circumstances write action for the sake of action. Never.“ Ah, if that professor weren't dead, and if I could find him today – I don't know where he is, he left no forwarding address. Thetans are discourteous that way. Boy, oh boy, I'd certainly like to give him something, because they teach an artist to

work with restraint *Rarrrrraw*. The one thing art isn't, is restrained, if you please. It is directed motion, which means a certain amount of discipline has to go into any motion an artist makes. But is that restraint? I've never seen Katherine Dunham make a restrained motion. And yet at the same time, I think you'll agree she's an artist All right.

What is, then, the optimum use of what you know? One of it is teaching it so that others can know. But how would you teach it? By going over it little by little? No, you could best teach it *by example*. You can give the rudiments, the integrative data which suddenly sparks another mind. But it would be unfair of you if you did not give him, as well, the techniques which, having moved him into thinking, would not again move him out You see? Action.

The difference between a young man and an old man is an old man knows he can be hurt, and the young man doesn't care. And the difference between a young girl and an older woman is essentially the same thing. When it comes to matters – esoteric matters on the part of a young man or the young woman of beauty, and so on, do you realize that animation always arrives at the finish line, while beauty is thinking about it I have been at embassy balls and dinners, time after time, to find the belle of the ball a young girl? Oh no, the young girls were over there against the walls hoping somebody would ask them to dance. Some old gal who really had a beautiful line, she understood and knew life. And all the desirable young men weren't over there by the wall. There was beauty, and here was charm.

What is charm? Charm is the ability to reach out, be and admire. Your personal appearance, outside of the fact that the society objects to a dirty shirt, doesn't mean very much when it comes to charm. Anything you build up on charm in way of a mock-up is that much more gratifying, of course. But you practically with an idea, with knowing what you are doing, with certainty, with poise, with the ability to laugh or the ability to be dignified, each in its place, you, to go out into this society... You don't know it sitting here; it's fantastic that people don't know this, but life out there is so far gone.

You just start walking through it, and it just goes apart like grass. There's nothing – nothing interrupting your line of motion. Nothing. It's fabulous. But life today has no great resistance in this society. Its pioneer period is at end. The vitality of the country is very definitely on the wane. There's no opposition.

People keep asking me – people keep asking me all the time, „Medicine – why doesn't medicine – why don't these things attack you?“ Ha-ha-ha! This is something I can't answer, because they don't realize it's like looking at a table. Why doesn't the table attack you? The answers to this – the couple of times that they have chopped in my direction, and so forth, I have written such tremendously courteous letters about their own habits of sexual perversion that they've unchopped quick.

And there isn't any fight All that has ever fought me are people whom I have brought up Tone Scale far enough so they could fight.

So don't expect anybody to fight you out there. You'll get bored after a while because nobody does. You may even wind up by going around processing a doctor so he'll be a little spunky.

That's all I want to say to you about the uses and future, beyond a word or two about what I'm doing, which you might find interesting. I'm going to open a clinic And in the first weeks of that I'm not taking any paying preclears of any kind. I'm trying to train some auditors way, way, way up. Because I found out that whenever I trained an auditor well, when he walked out into the society, there was a spreading pool of light going from him. In other words, more and more and more people knew what they were doing.

One boy, who was just well-processed and well-trained, appeared in a part of the country, and from that part of the country to date there have just been dozens of letters – dozens of diem. These people are flabbergasted. This couldn't have happened to the boy. And the last time I saw him, he looked like he was still in terrible shape, but he looked like a flaming beacon to these people.

And so we have a possibility by, you might say, supertraining some of those already trained, to bring about this condition in several parts of the country or the world.

As far as the clinic itself is concerned, I hope to go on and process children in the main and process lots of them, in the direction of someday putting together a children's hospital somewhat different than any existing today. And the only reason that I am calling it a hospital here is so you will understand what I mean. You can think of what a hospital would be that used Scientology. It would be a recreation center – well, where kids could get well and get oriented.

I hope to go out for a conference on the other coast, probably the last week in December. It may be after that time that I will do some lecturing out there, but that is very much in the future. Right here – the first six weeks after this congress – I am devoting to the training of a handful of auditors, trying to bring them way up and over the top. And the pressure of that has been sufficiently great that it may be necessary for me to start in another six weeks at the end of this six weeks. I will have to see how that goes.

But what I am going toward is better dissemination of information and better auditors – that even might mean fewer auditors.

In the past, I have been occasionally disappointed at the results people were getting. But believe me, I am responsible for those results. If the techniques wouldn't bring the auditor up, then I should have been thinking harder and working harder on the subject.

And so I hope, in the future, this problem will not exist with us, as it has in the past, of an auditor who is incapable of processing people properly. There isn't any point in it now.

Here and there through the country, where you have areas where there are auditors who have drifted away, it might be tremendously beneficial if you, as a little project, might go around and dig them out from underneath the rocks and put them in a group and process them, because honest, some of these people have practically slid under the rocks, here and there – poor guys. They got in there, and they beat their heads against preclears harder and harder and got their engrams more and more restimulated and started down Tone Scale. They got no processing, no processing, no processing, and eventually kind of went into apathy.

There isn't any reason for that It'd be a very easy thing for a Scientologist to pick up and process such auditors. He can still find people who know where these people are; he can

still find lists. Old bulletins and things like that of 1950, and so on, still carry lots of names and addresses. If he wanted to really do a good service to Scientology, he would simply get in there and browbeat – not argue about para-Scientology, you're not there to teach them anything – just get them together and process them, that's all Give them Six Steps to Better Beingness over and over and over and over. You might have to hire a gunman to go out and round them up for the second session, (*audience laughter*) but it'd be a very worthwhile project because, then, nobody would be arguing in your area against your auditing, and that would be optimum.

There isn't any such thing as a scarcity of preclears. The streets are full of them. The hospitals are full of them. All you'll have to do is reach out and take them by the ear and put them down in the chair – everybody's a preclear. Nothing to it You get most men to talking about their problems and they don't talk, they avalanche on you. They all got problems. And you can solve those problems. You should know a great many things about Scientology, but if you don't know that great many things, you still hold in your hands, even if you don't comprehend all of it, the answer in Six Steps to Better Beingness.

Now, typically, there was an argument in a seminar about Acceptance Level Processing. They didn't quite know how it was used. I put on these tapes how it was used, and you can always hear them again, either in your own area or right here.

But I asked this auditor if anybody tested it out in the group that was arguing about it, and nobody had. In other words, nobody looked; they wanted to think. And remember that it will solve any of your problems, any of them. If you find yourself really up against it sometime, the answer is look. That's all.

So this whole seminar could tie itself in knots over how you used Acceptance Level Processing. If somebody had just started them – they said they didn't have an E-Meter. Well, that doesn't matter. An E-Meter is an awful good thing to have around with a tricky preclear, but to demonstrate something like this, they would have found out all over again how you used it You just get people to accept things in brackets, that's all And you just start down Tone Scale with the items you're asking him to accept

„Can you accept, now, a nice bright cheerful Mama?“

„No.“

„Can you accept a very dull Mama?“

„No.“

„Can you accept a very cross Mama?“

„Well...“

„Can you accept a mean, vicious Mama?“

„Yes.“ That one starts going in.

„How about a mean, vicious, diseased Mama?“

„Yes!“ That really goes in.

Yes, that's Acceptance Level Processing. Because that's the acceptance level of the preclear he'll actually try to make his mother into that person as she lives, not just in a mock-up. But he'll really work to make her that person, so he can accept her, of course. And there you have interpersonal relations.

But, if you have a question about something, look, for you have all the periscopes and binoculars you need in these processes. There will be other processes, there will be other developments, there will be other news, reports, tremendous codification of data necessary in terms of what sicknesses are we really knocking off? How long can a man live? How old a preclear can you process? And all sorts of things. The whole horizon is open. So there's lots of material to be known.

Male voice: What's the record on age, now, Ron?

I don't know. I processed a fellow ninety-six once, with success. I imagine somebody's done better than that.

The point is that – here's a tremendous wealth of interesting material coming up, but it's coming out of what? The processes which you now hold in your hands.

And that is all at this time, except one thing, that I care to say about it I want to give you, here, the office address of both organizations here. The basic training in this area, which is to say tape and doctorate level training, is being given by the Hubbard Foundation; and that is 237 North 16, Phila 2 – Phila 2 – that's the Hubbard Foundation. That organization does the training in terms of fundamentals, Doctorate Course tapes, and so on. The publications unit of the HAS is the HAS of Pennsylvania, distinctly different than any other HAS. It is the organization which gets out the *Journal* and booklets. And that is the HASP: Hubbard Association of Scientologists of Pennsylvania, *Journal of Scientology*, and so forth. And it's at 1605 Race Street Philadelphia 2.

Now, the clinic where I will be operating is the HAS Processing Center and it is at 726 Cooper Street, Camden, New Jersey – 726 Cooper Street, Camden, New Jersey. And this, actually, is where my secretary will be sitting, although I have an office at the Hubbard Foundation, too. So this clinic – we'll call it a clinic, only it isn't – will specialize in the processing of children, but will also do very, very advanced training occasionally and clinical-type training (that's very advanced training, that isn't basic or fundamental).

The processing done here, however – occasionally I get requests from people to be processed. Why, this would be the processing center where such requests – which are addressed to me – would be placed, and that is the HAS Processing Center, 726 Cooper, Camden, New Jersey.

A lot of you, occasionally, are very flighty on the subject of sending me a letter, because you say it isn't going to get to me. Well, by golly, your letters even reached me when I was in the middle of Spain. They went to London, and they were flown down there, and so on. But they were so darn slow by the time they had come down there, and by the time I dictated answers and they'd gone back to England, and so forth, that I wouldn't be a bit surprised but what you aren't receiving replies to these things two or three weeks even from now. But I

hope to speed up that communication line and I'm trying to do so, and this will be the US communication address.

Remember what these various functions and addresses are – because people have a hard time in communicating – coming through. Basic training-basic training, and so forth, over at the Hubbard Foundation at 237 (and that's doctorate level training, actually). All I'm giving is clinical, very, very dose

training, dose up against the whole problem, and theory, investigation, axioms and that sort of thing and very intimate coaching of the individual on how to audit

Let's take a break.

PROCESSES FOR ROUGH CASES

A lecture given on 3 October 1953

by L. Ron Hubbard

63 MINUTES

Okay. We have here a very short talk I'm going to give you, which is not scheduled, in which I would like to give you some of the processes you can use on a very, very rough case, some variations on what I've been talking to you about and what the difficulty is with some of the cases you're trying to handle – why these cases do not move rapidly, why these cases do not accept advanced processes.

And it is very, very interesting to note – as I gave you in the last hour – that as simple as these processes are and as far as they will go, that you'll get many people who will not accept the simplicity of process. They *know* the mind is more complicated than this. They have such a terrific certainty on this that to shake them off this certainty is as much as your life is worth.

Such an impasse, by the way, was reached the moment I departed from running an engram. That's right. Sad as it might be, the second engrams were no longer there to be chewed up as energy, I started to have trouble, people started to pack up their bags and move across the state line. And it got worse and worse as I advanced deeper and deeper into causation. *Causation* instead of the reason why. Get the difference? Many people have these two things confused. They think causation is the reason why. Oh no, it's not Causation is the motivation of action or the motivation of beingness. Causation is motivation. The Greek has already defined it when he said the universe started with the prime mover unmoved; he said the biggest kind of cause, in terms of past, that really could be said.

But most everyone gets interested in cause as past They think cause is something in the past, and cause is not in the past And the second you come up against somebody who believes implicitly that all cause is the reason why, you have somebody whose cause is in the past It's very, very hard to break that loose unless your techniques are good enough to break through the case. And so your techniques have got to be good enough to break the case in order to break the computation, because that is the computation which is the aberrative computation. That's what you're worried about in trying to break-the fellow thinks the cause is in the past.

Now, actually the cause is in the future. You needn't bunk when I tell you that

But let me show you. Down there is a water glass. All right I'm going to pick up the water glass with a little Coke in it, show you that I'm not too mad at the Coca-Cola Company. The only reason I'm mad at the Coca-Cola Company is they put up signs in Europe and then sell no Coca-Cola.

Now, I'm going to pick up that Coca-Cola glass and take a sip of it Now, you will notice something here very, very much: What is the cause of that drink?

Audience: (various responses)

Well, I said I was going to take a drink, and then I took a drink. Cause was in the future of taking a drink. Cause was in the future of the action. Infinitely simple, isn't it? Cause is always in the future of the action, not in the past of the action.

The prime difference between Scientology and psychology is that psychology subscribes to the theory that cause is always in the past The difference between your processing and Freudian processing is that Freud subscribes utterly and entirely to the idea that cause is always in the past: your behavior now is motivated by what happened to you before.

Well, you can vary your behavior now by varying – by Dianetic processing, not by psychoanalysis – Dianetic processing varies what happened before simply by eradicating its impulsive moments in the future.

That piece of energy, in other words, floats up here in present time and then it says, „Do something!“ So a fellow then does something. So that is compulsive cause which is still in the future of the action. You should see that very dearly.

Well, it's just that engram floating out of place. Why does it float out of place? Because of energy and space starvation in present time. And then that it says to do something is not anywhere near as harmful as starving to death for space and energy. So it says to do something, so it's painful, so it's aberrative. A fellow says, „So what? I've got to have that energy.“ And there sits the energy. All right.

The energy says, „Jump out the window,“ and it is in the present It isn't a piece of the past, it's just a piece of energy. Well, that is compulsive, reactive causation.

Now, let's look at sane causation. I said I would take a drink of water-Coca-Cola, and took a drink of Coca-Cola So, my statement that I was going to take a drink of Coca-Cola preceded that Now, it looks like the second you start to take the drink, that cause was in the past You see how that would look? As you take the drink, you say, „Well, I'm taking a drink because I decided to take a drink there in the past, so therefore cause is in the past. Cause for the drink is in the past.“

No, it's not. No, it's not You're taking the drink. The cause, all right that was postulated first, has now drifted into past tense. So, after the fact, the cause can be said to be in the past And so you get people who are incapable of action drifting into the past.

This is not very hard to assimilate. He has to consider that the reason he is taking a drink is because he said so at some time in the past He doesn't have to have any reason to take the drink, it didn't matter. So, on a very sane person, his postulate evaporates immediately with the action and isn't in the past anymore at all.

You'd say, „Well, what happened to memory? Then you wouldn't remember what you said, and if you couldn't remember what you said, why, then you'd be crazy.“

Oh no, you wouldn't, you'd be very sane. You just wouldn't be able to get into any arguments. Now there is a difference.

Any cause, at the moment it is being cause, is in the future of an action. And when they drift into the past – let us define it this way – they become the reason for. Now, get the difference between „the reason for“ and cause.

Now, the cause we're talking about is always with us, always actionable, can always demonstrate immediately after it, an action. And the cause somebody else is talking about is what has gone before, because he's so tremulous about what he's doing in present time that he has to assign responsibility to something else. And so he assigns it to what has gone into the past. He can't take the responsibility for taking a drink at the moment he's taking the drink. He says, „I'm taking a drink because / said so.“ Well, „I“ in the past is another person. And this becomes so marked on a lot of cases that they can't see themselves in the past; they're other people in the past. You try to get them to get a facsimile: they can never fit themselves into the fellow in that, that was them. Their facsimile is way out of valence and in beautifully fouled-up condition.

Why? Because they can't be responsible for having been cause, so they assign cause to something called the past and then they say, „This is the reason for.“

A fellow taking the drink merely says, „I am cause drinking.“ Not „I'm taking the drink because I said I would take a drink.“ Cause is always, therefore, with you at all times and in the future of any action you care to make. And there you're in a good situation, you're – very, very good shape.

And if you're interested in a culture, something like that, why, your adjudications about the culture will be constructive on the eight dynamics. It just follows that way. It's only people who are halfway up or just picking themselves off their faces that want to knock everything to pieces.

So cause is not in the past. What is in the past is „the reason for,“ which is a different thing than the cause we're talking about. We're talking about action motivator. And an action motivator can only be in front of the action, can't be behind the action.

A person is motivating action at every instant. If he's in real good shape, he's motivating action each instant and although those instants float away and become the past, he doesn't care. That's how life gets spread out on a time track: by the breakdown of its causative impulse.

Now, you can adjust that one any way you want to philosophically, it happens to be true. In other words, you wouldn't have any time track if you didn't keep up this trick of „the reason why,“ and you'd just float all over the time track, and very little randomness. All right.

Here we have something less puzzling and less upsetting. The fellow who has to admit his blame or fault has, of course, said, „I'm cause.“ But fault for what? He said, „I am cause for what happened in the past,“ but he can't go into the past to pick it up, so he brings the past to him, and he brings the whole causative package here. „The reason why“ he brings up into the present, and there is a person's – getting an engram stuck in present time. He doesn't stick in the past; the engram sticks in the present.

Here is the whole question of responsibility. Responsibility is the ability to handle force or the ability to respond, according to its own definition. Responsibility is the ability to

handle force. A person who cannot handle force cannot take responsibility. You cannot give somebody responsibility of running the city of Philadelphia and never give him a cop.

You follow that? Without force one cannot have responsibility in this universe. If a person cannot use force, he cannot be responsible. If you give a person responsibility, according to the military services, you must always give him authority. What is authority? The right to knock somebody's head in.

Well, what is authority when it comes to a university? The right to be pompous. A very different thing, but more or less the same thing. A person who is being pompous is merely advertising the fact he doesn't have any force. All right.

Where we have, then, responsibility, where we have a responsible person, he can with ease hold his engram bank off himself, he can handle force. Where he can't hold his engram bank off of himself, he's having a hard time of it.

Well, now, you get a complexity of situation there where the GE is sort of caved-in, and the thetan is trying to uncave him. The GE can no longer handle force. See, he can't handle his own body facsimiles and so forth; he's having a rough time. And the thetan tries gently and persuasively and sympathetically to do something about this. Can't do it He can do it, with certainty, positiveness and the rehabilitation of his own force.

Three years ago Book One talked about the analytical mind and the reactive mind – very little were known about these two factors, very little. Now, at that time the only solution available I could dream up was to knock down the potential of the reactive mind until it was sufficiently calm and tame to be handled by the analytical mind. Well, what a much better solution it is to enforce, strengthen and mobilize the analytical mind so that it can handle any reactive mind. But both things would have the same end in view: a stable, sane person. But we would have just a person in view, if we were simply trying to knock to pieces the reactive mind to make it tame enough so that the analytical mind could handle it.

But there's this matter of validation: the more you validate the reactive mind, the tougher it's liable to get. Got to handle it very, very – very, very carefully, very slippily or it just gets tougher and tougher. In other words, the person introverts and starts feeding, as a thetan, all of his force into the reactive bank. And instead of the analytical mind then getting stronger and stronger, it gets weaker and weaker. So, in all too many cases, this solution, particularly in the presence of poor auditing, was an unsatisfactory solution; therefore, it was necessary to get the other solution.

Quite fortunately, very, very fortunately, it was discovered, in my work, that the analytical mind – all the beingness of a person – was detachable. This package was a package. It was not an item called „a man.“ It came to pieces.

At first, I was somewhat like the small child confronted with a dock which he has just hit with a hammer. There were parts all over the place and I couldn't get them assembled. And in the early investigations of this it was most wonderful, just wonderful, how many parts could turn up that seemingly were irrelevant They just didn't have any place in the problem at all. But gradually, little by little, I found out that they were very dearly detachable. And finally settled to my own satisfaction, to those preclears with whom I was working, that the

personality, the analytical mind, the beingness (colloquially, the guy) was detachable. And the rest of this stuff was just the dock case. That was a wonderful thing to discover.

A lot of preclears even today get exteriorized and then they got so much attention left on the body that they think all the personality there is, is on that body – is in the body. They don't think there's any other personality or any other emotion than the body can show up.

One person (now talking about specific techniques) invented a technique whereby he had somebody – held on to the body, and as a thetan, turned on a whole bunch of emotions. And all of a sudden the person would find out that their emotional bank was with *them*, not with the body. They could be themselves. They could have as much and *more* personality as a thetan than as a body, because naturally, everything in the body is limited as to space and limited as to mass.

So, this was the problem: how to get *everyone* exteriorized.

Now, the various techniques which have come forth since have sought better and better to furnish an answer to this. There are very many complications to this problem. Don't think there aren't. Given you here with Six Steps to Better Beingness, with SOP 8, SOP 8-L – what today I have found auditors capable of using. They *aren't* capable of using running engrams. They're not. They're not capable of using Postulate Processing, running of emotion – light emotions, sympathy – because they themselves tug and haul before they're exteriorized, in the body versus body war, to such a point that their preclear will come up just so far and then they start bashing him in, whether they know it or not. And this is a very rough deal.

It took a terrifically high-toned auditor to run engrams. And the next step up, it took a tremendously high-toned auditor to use SOP 1,2,3, 5, 7. Guy had to be high-toned. Anybody can run Six Steps to Better Beingness and therefore it not only becomes tremendously workable, it's very fast, but it becomes very safe, and that's important.

Now, let's examine once more this factor of causation. If a person is going to be cause he has to be able to generate force – the two go together. You will find that the thetan can be quite responsible and act responsibly in all ways, shapes and forms, and he's got a GE bank that just can't take any responsibility, and so this poor thetan jockeys back and forth and he can't make out what is going on here. And he has a dreadful time about it – just continuously a dreadful time. The thetan *would be* but can't be cause, and he keeps drifting into the past and into the future and so on. Well, that's because his attention is upon the GE. His attention is *solidly* upon the GE. If you could just get his attention off of the GE, he would again be able to assume the role of cause and responsibility.

Coming along the line of development of techniques, we found out rather consistently and constantly – rather constantly that people fell away in direct ratio to the amount of responsibility they were willing to assume.

Book One was a gorgeous, wide-open sesame to the „no responsible.“ You didn't have to be responsible for a thing with Book One. Mama did it and Papa did it, and you didn't do a thing. Now, as you came on with tougher and tougher techniques, we all of a sudden swung dear over to the other side, the Aristotelian pendulum of complete and entire, utter responsi-

bility called *self-determinism* and its processing, with the concept of full responsibility, as you will find in *AP&A*.

Now, that's too tough. Because the very, very aberrated ones say, „Well, full responsibility is that if there was a...“ Why, I had one of them come in one day and say, „Well now, there's a ball in the center of the floor“ – said, „there was a ball sitting here in the center of the floor, and you reached for it and I reached for it and I wanted it and I was stronger than you are, I would simply kill you. And that would mean that I was entirely self-determined.“ On what dynamic, brother? The same dynamic of the boys that peeled off away from Dianetics and Scientology early in the game – it's first dynamic. All right.

Let's take this problem and find that as the arrow swung from complete no responsibility, we were at a level mankind at large could understand with ease, weren't we? He could understand no responsibility. Who's responsible? Well, the cops are responsible or my car is responsible or Mama or Papa – no responsibility for self. Everybody kind of agreed on that one.

Well, to fight up from that point became tough. Got over here to this terrific extreme of „be self-determined.“ You've got to be responsible before you're anything. And boy, they left me about that time like they were going down chutes! Oh, that became very rough. This is true. This was too tough to take. You had guys going around, say, „You don't need processing. All you have to do is make up your mind to be self-determined.“

I gave a lecture one time (November the fourteenth lecture, Wichita) – I said, „All you had to be was self-determined and that was really all there was to it“ I spent an hour explaining how this was all there was to it and then spent the succeeding hour in explaining how this was completely impossible, that you couldn't do it Everybody bought the first lecture and they forgot the second one. All right.

Here we have – here we have this problem. You got a therapy there, up to that level, that nobody – not that nobody *will* buy, but nobody *can* buy it unless he's practically a Theta Clear. He'd have to look out across the universe in his pristine purity and say, „I'm responsible for everything and everything that's going on, and everything is fine, and they're killing and murdering each other. So what? Nothing to me. Because it's everything to me and I could start and stop it at will.“ That's all that responsibility would be. Very well.

We had to go someplace else. Well, fortunately, I moved into the field of Theta Clearing. That's only possible to a thetan in a very advanced state. But people can recognize that for some things you are responsible and for some things you aren't And when you do processing along that level, it's quite workable. But it's much better just to forget about the whole thing, about who's responsible for what – except the auditor. And he'd better know that his preclear is responsible as he can generate energy as a thetan. And that's the test You can ask this person to put out beams and do this and that, so on.

Incidentally, some Operating Thetans are very interesting when it comes to E-Meters. The E-Meter is fair game for a thetan. One of its tubes – I don't know – what tube is it? Which tube is it in there?

Male voice: It's SJ.

Okay. It's that little tube you – a thetan gets in there and goes flick-flick and the E-Meter starts bopping around, it's very interesting. And if you put the two cans together, very close together, by the way, and put a good solid beam between them, if you happen to be up toward Operating Thetan, you'll get a (*snap, snap, snap*) on the dial. And this is very provoking. Do you know it means there might be ghosts?

And when we have a person responsible or capable of taking responsibility, really, we have a person who is capable of generating force. And when we have a person who is capable of generating force, we have a person who is capable of being cause – real big cause – and these things more or less go together.

Well, does that say that your thetan ought to be putting out force? No! But mainly what I'm talking to you about in this extra lecture is just this: The way out of it is through. We said that with engrams, we can say that today with dynamics. That gives you some small idea how this subject has expanded. We could say it one day with engrams and we say it now with dynamics: The way out of this universe is through it.

The way to take the first dynamic apart and handle the first dynamic utterly is to *be* the first dynamic completely and utterly, and then all of a sudden you no longer have to be the first dynamic. And it's that way with each dynamic in turn.

And if you were to draw a map of the way to go all the way up to Operating Thetan, it would be this way: [marking on blackboard] and the preclear would start in where he is normally found at the lower end here of numeral one. That piece of chalk dust there is about it

And he goes up through one. He's got to become everything there is to be about one – as far as a body is concerned, Homo sapiens is concerned-he goes through one.

And when he gets through one, two, three, four, five, six, seven, yes sir, about that time he could sure set up shop as God.

He could actually set up shop as a god to something or someplace. You hear about it in Frazer's beautiful book, *The Golden Bough*: the King of the Wood. Frazer – he doesn't know why he's writing this, Frazer doesn't He doesn't know the terrific compulsion that's driving him on through this book. And he's just going on – I think he goes on for some twenty-eight volumes, doesn't he, really, only you wouldn't ever see anything but one volume of it which is the popularized edition, not even a condensation. And he's talking about the King of the Wood and the god of the place or the king of the place and he just goes on and on about this. He's trying to get back to the time when a thetan will actually inhabit a wood and be proprietor of a wood and you can run that in preclears if you want to. We're talking about para-Scientology now, but you can run that in preclears. Fascinating!

We don't care in Scientology about evolution or we don't care about why. But I'll just give you some reason why. If you want one, you have to go through all these dynamics and what I mean when I say eighth dynamic, so that you won't get puzzled. You have to get up at least to a place where you could be the King of the Wood – at least up there. Gee! That's just noplacement.

Conquer this one, not conquer self by denying it – that's the way the mystic did it. He said the way to live was to run away. And the faster you run away – vectors being in reverse –

the quicker you collide in this universe. It's booby-trapped. The faster you run away, the quicker you collide. So the thing to do is just sort of roll up your sleeves and decide to live because the only way to get rid of living is just by living.

You can't say, „I'm afraid to live. I'm afraid to insult somebody. I'm afraid to do this, I don't dare do that. It would be aberrative if I were to go out here and do this.“ You can't keep saying those things to yourself – that's running away.

So you found out that very many things were aberrative – tremendous numbers of things. If you're afraid of those things, and you keep shying away from them and monitoring your conduct simply and solely because something might be aberrative, good heavens on earth! You're running away from „one“ so doggone hard that you'll never get through the woods. You see, you only have to be afraid of something as long as you haven't anything with which to overcome it. Six Steps to Better Beingness will actually knock apart all the PDH, all the talking during the dental operation and so forth, that anybody ever got mixed up with. We have entered in so deep with technology now, we don't have to be afraid of those things. We've left the control boys far behind.

I could take a prisoner today that had been beat up by the OGPU, the NKVD – a Russian military „mercy service“ – almost anybody across the boards, and snap him out of it entirely, probably in a matter of an hour or two. I don't care what shape he's in. Take a little while for the broken bones to heal up and to cure up a few of the diseases they gave him also, but that's that I mean, this guy is out of the woods. *You* can do it too with Six Steps to Better Beingness or SOP 8.

Six Steps to Better Beingness (let me interject there) is run on any case, but you should favor that on a tough case. It's the answer to any case, but the answer to the tough case, particularly. SOP 8 is the answer to any case, but the first three steps of that, if unsuccessful, just fly into Six Steps to Better Beingness and your mind is fairly comfortable about the whole thing – unless you think he's psychotic, at which time you simply go to VII. You don't have to make any choice about these things particularly, but you understand it's better to theta dear somebody who just can be theta cleared immediately *pam, pam, pam*, than it is to fool around with Six Steps to Better Beingness.

But you go through the first three steps, and he can't do any of these three steps and he's still adrift, you just say, „Give him Ten Minutes of Nothing, Duplication, Spacation, Contact, Self Analysis, Opposite Poles.“

Ten Minutes of Nothing – *pong, pong, pong*. All of a sudden he says, „What am I doing up here in the corner of this room looking at you?“ Maybe it takes you two hundred hours of Six Steps to Better Beingness – he'll get there. I don't say it will take you that long, I'm thinking of the guy that's practically dead.

It's fairly fast as a technique on nearly all the cases you run into. But there are rough, rough, rough cases – cases with their anchor points all the way pulled in, terrified of ridicule and they're not going to let go of a single phrase they think will get them in trouble. All right.

What does all this add up to then? It adds up to the fact we sit here with techniques which will resolve cases sufficiently so that you don't have to be afraid of what you do to

living things. That's quite interesting. You could pull them out so fast that you don't have to worry about pushing them in. I'm not advocating, now, the use of force or anything else, but you'd be surprised how cocky you will feel after you've worked this a little while, both on yourself and on somebody else and a few other people. And you've fished a few people out of the ragbag with these various techniques, you'll all of a sudden become extremely relaxed about what you do in life. That's the way it ought to be.

So, in the matter of techniques in general, SOP 8, SOP 8-L – you got somebody who wants to understand about life and he can't understand about life, well, don't just run „I've got to make them understand“ as a concept, and so forth, that's too easy to do. It doesn't do too much for a case either. Let him understand about life, run SOP 8-L. In other words, run Acceptance Level Processing in the place of Step IV and get him down there into explosions and some admiration on Step V. He'll learn all about life, you bet you he will. All of a sudden he can feel relaxed about what he did to Mama and Papa and even admit, at last, that he *did* 6.0 something to them.

Well, now SOP 8, all by itself, just as written up in 16-G, will produce results, with that slight change of wasting in brackets – Step IV in brackets – those words are *missing* in the text of it.

You can do a great deal with these techniques. You'll find the only people who are fooling and monkeying around with these techniques now and trying to understand desperately, are people who need auditing but bad – but *bad*. Oooh.

You get some guy who's on a figure, figure, figure, figure, figure, figure, figure, figure basis and, boy, he'll have to understand before he is. He has to think about it before he can be, and so he never gets his chance to be, he always thinks about it. These techniques break that cycle, fortunately. There's too many good men who are stuck in „have to know before you go.“ They have to see in their minds before they can look. And the more they see in their minds, the less they look, and there they go.

It's a force universe, but you are a force-admiration being. This universe can't admire anybody, but with admiration you could admire it all away. If everybody just sat around and said, „What a beautiful universe!“ and really admired it with lots of ergs of admiration particles, it would actually start falling apart.

Now, let me give you there, what technique – a technique, a little tiny lonesome technique, all by itself, for the guy who won't accept responsibility for his own case or for anybody else's. As long as he's not psycho, you bail him out of that neurosis or psychosis a bit. Just get him up there with Step VI and VII and then you do this to him. It is a horrible thing to do with him: He's a man. He is in a body. He is stuck in a body. He can't get out, and he won't accept responsibility for anything. You know where this guy is? Now, none of those are present, so I don't have to be accused of evaluating for a preclear – nobody like that is present in the audience.

He's a man, and all you have to do is solve his tremendous concern about being a man. We're not trying to gunshot this bank. So, you just get him... This technique, by the way, is a border technique. This technique, it's *not* dead center, it's not one of those sharp, sure-fire, you-can-run-it-forever techniques. This one has to be handled with kid gloves, and I'm giving

it to you as a small bomb however which you can carry around in your pocket. It takes a lot of hours of running for this technique, but it will break through a case that is just – oh, my God!

You get him mocking up vast numbers of women and men and parents below him, looking up at him, admiring his having become or stolen a baby. End of technique.

Now, all you're doing is solving his being a man. But some guys have been badly enough treated by their parents and have treated their parents badly enough, and have been so thoroughly unwelcome in Me, and have been told to get out and go away so many times that they are in thorough restimulation on the Assumption as the most significant part of that blackness which surrounds them. You see how that is? It's blackness. And it just happens... It's just one of these techniques – you don't have to believe this. You don't have to believe in Assumptions or thetans or – you don't have to believe in anything. I'd rather you didn't. Because believing means that you're *convinced* and the most convincing thing I know is a bullet between the eyes and I don't want any of you shot. Not even you.

So here we have conviction and we don't want conviction, all we want is a little technique which I empirically discovered was tremendously workable when you started running it on a V. But, believe me, this thing teeter-totters on the edge of madness itself, so let's not run it and forget all the other techniques we know. For heaven's sakes, let's vary it with Six Steps to Better Beingness. Let's get that fellow introverting-extroverting and so forth, too. Let's not just go away and forget this one. That's just *a* technique – this is a wonderful introvert technique.

You just get him to admire [marking on blackboard] – here he sits, a solid lump of black. And you just get people here – you just get him mocking up people, thousands and thousands of mothers and fathers and thousands and thousands of facsimiles of his body, looking up.

Now, does he have to put the particle admiration in looking up? No, he doesn't. All he has to do is mock up those people down there looking, because that in essence is admiration. *Any* kind of attention is better than no attention. He may get them sneering at first. He may get them hating him at first. He may get them ridiculing, but that doesn't matter. We don't care about their emotion, eventually it will start to come through that they're admiring him.

Now, what are they admiring him for? You get the feeling coming from these people that they're admiring him for having stolen a baby. I'm sorry that – I'd love to go on and on and explain this technique by the hour. It happens that there's a technique called A-B-C that you will run into. A – level A, level B, level C. And if your preclear is on this center plane here, he can mock up people looking up from this lower plane – he can mock this up on the wall, by the way, this chart, and get therapeutic results from it. These people looking up at this level bring about the condition known as admiration. That particle... Your preclear will all of a sudden (this is empirical data) – just sees black things and black – pieces of this blackness. They get hard and soft and flow away, and all of a sudden one's piece of it is liable – if you're just starting this out on a case, my god – a piece of it will fly up to the corner of the room and go *brmmmmmm* like that. And he'll feel like terrible winds are blowing through him, and it's very interesting. He'll also feel like he's going mad – he's going mad. Well, tell him to hold on to the two upper corners of the room and he'll feel less like going mad.

You can get a preclear in trouble with this. It's very much of a professional technique, but you could do this to anything, anything.

Now, if you have a bunch of people up here looking down at the preclear on level B, you get him feeling a blessing. So looking up is adoration, admiration and so forth. That's why they put altars, and so forth, in churches, very glitteringly, way up high and that sort of thing. All right (That's why I seldom lecture on a platform – there's something to it) Okay.

We have this A-B-C, these three levels, and from here down we get a blessing and from here up we get admiration. You're only interested in from C to B.

Now, how do you change the characteristic of a preclear's mock-ups? You admire their imperfections. A preclear says to you, „I can get mock-ups but they don't have any heads.“

You say, „Get a lot of people underneath the mock-up admiring the fact that the mock-up has no head.“ A head will appear.

There's several ways to change mock-ups, but none of them are certain like that one. Why? The force of the bank starts to dissolve under the impact of admiration.

Now, if you're going to start running explosions, which are essentially force, you have to interlard your processing with running admiration. In other words, you can't really just set out and run five hundred hours' worth of explosions without somewhere on the line running this A-B-C admiration.

This is awfully simple processing. So the guy has an engram, and he's got this engram and it's spread out in front of his face and he can see it and he's always looking at it and so forth. Well, there's lots of ways to get rid of it, but one of the fastest ways I know to get rid of it today is not run it. It's simply mock up a lot of people below it admiring him for having it. And *pshew*. Maybe take five, ten minutes for it to go away.

But the center aberration as a man, just for some reason or other, a man or a woman, their admiration of having stolen a baby or taken a baby is *tremendously* effective, particularly where their parents have not felt – well, have felt they should have gratitude, that sort of thing. But it is the center of one of these black cases.

Once in a while a black case will suddenly – you start running a little admiration on the case and the first thing you know, why, it's flying all over the place and he's flying through space and doing things like that. Well, I'm very sorry about that, because it offends people to think they've lived before. They know what dogs they've been in this life, and they sure don't want to have been a dog in two lives consecutively. But we – doesn't worry about that – the pictures that show up, you should not consider delusive.

We have made a grand tour – ever since I found that the package would come to pieces – we have made, really, a rather grand tour of psychotherapy, an interesting tour. Even today there are people who pick up a little paragraph or something of my stuff and rewrite it so that people can understand it But they haven't arrived at the end of this tour yet, because when they get – when they realize that they're at the end of the tour, they're at the end of the

tour, that's all. I mean, you get to the end of the railroad track, you get off the train – you don't keep sitting there in the train. That is, most people don't.

Let me give you a rapid rundown here – a very rapid rundown. This doesn't include ^//that's taken place, but this is just a rapid rundown and you needn't even take a note on it, it's not particularly... What I've done here for the last few years, where we got on this train and why we're getting off of it, as far as research and investigation is concerned, and understanding of existence, why, there isn't much point in an investigator staying on the train. There's all that beautiful action, all those beautiful groups that can be processed, all those wonderful preclears. There's just that big, beautiful MEST universe out there and there's no sense in sitting up in that ivory – ivory is cold, you know. And besides, people have a habit of snarling and quarreling with you when you're investigating. They think you don't know what you're doing.

So anyhow, in the past few years, the first thing that came to view as a discovery and was explored – all these are just consecutive discoveries and explorations – was the establishment of the mechanism of stimulus-response in workable terms. In other words, I studied in the field of hypnotism, stimulus and response, in workable terms, seeing how you could create stimulus-response situations and seeing that that compared to life, and that was a new front foot forward in the field of investigation of the mind.

Immediately after that, I discovered and took apart, by observing hypnotism and so forth, the aberrative character of language and found out how synonyms worked and homonyms and how these things became identified. And we had a therapy there. A lot of that is Book One.

Immediately after that, I started to run in very heavily, into the character and composition of image pictures. A lot of that is in Book One. That's all pretty new stuff. You'll find the psychologist said that idiots and morons and small children occasionally saw pictures, and then he dropped the whole package like a hot potato, because his pictures were sure kicking his teeth in. He wasn't tough enough to go on the line beyond that point, as a being. All right. (He said.)

Now after that, got this thing called the time track – very interesting mechanism – developed the dynamics, and the basic principle of existence of survival. Actually, that was located much earlier, but came back into this work about that point with tremendous importance.

Then the next thing we had, of course, was this encroachment-continuous encroachment of the idea of self-determinism and responsibility. And with that came the first workable organization of psychotherapy. All those doggone axioms – about what, 198 or 209 of them or something like that – they're all stretched out And that was when psychoanalysis itself actually started to wake up. A lot of people started writing me when they saw those axioms, and that's what they uniformly called it Said, „It's the first time anybody ever organized this stuff so that we could look at it We knew it all the time.“ Uh – yeah, they all did.

And then, suddenly, preclears started falling apart in my hands and we were in the horrible period known as the early days of Theta Clearing. People kept falling apart They would not be in a chair; they would be over sitting on the other side of the room. And this was hap-

pening because I was investigating responsibility. And I would bring up a person's responsibility level, and their responsibility level would keep coming up, up, and the next thing you know, they would be sitting out in the other side of the room.

And the *first* time I did this I said, „This must be an accident or this fellow's crazy.“ And I knew I was never in my body, but I didn't know that other people knew that. But anyway. That was the technique – interesting to remember it – that was the technique which triggered Theta Clearing. It was dichotomies on responsibility run in brackets. And anybody who discovered the character of responsibility and brackets and how to run concepts that way would have discovered Theta Clearing the same way, because he couldn't have run very many people without people exteriorizing on him.

The first person I did this to, a long time ago, two years ago now, was a lady – very bad shape really, and she – I ran her for a little while, and so forth, and I says, „Now move back on the couch,“ because she was getting off the couch that way and so forth.

And she says, „It won't move.“

„What won't move?“

„The body. Body won't move.“

„Well,“ I said, „shove it back.“

„Won't shove.“

And so I began to communicate with her to find out exactly how and where she was. And she had been sitting up on the roof unbeknownst to me for the last hour running these dichotomies! She had started to run them and had simply exteriorized. So I got some other people and the same thing kept happening, and we were off into Theta Clearing.

But simultaneously, a tremendous research on the evolutionary track took place, and the doggonedest amount of stuff had been showing up, so on, about what was on the evolutionary track and I went ahead and investigated. There are people who thought I shouldn't; they thought this knowledge would be dangerous or something. But I went ahead and cataloged it and, boy, that old Mathison E-Meter stood right in there and pitched.

There's the darnedest things can be found in any preclear as he comes along. But you don't have to worry about that, that's all para-Scientology, that's over the dam. Somebody, someday, might want to know something about the subject of anthropology or something of the sort, and if he wants to know the subject, he'd certainly better pick up that *History of Man* and go to work with an E-Meter. I advise that very strongly, because it confirms Darwin in spots and condemns somebody else and – oh, it's wonderful, but just fun.

But you should know something about it. Every once in a while one of those things shows up: The guy is going down a big highway which is floating in the sky, riding a motorcycle. You say he must be crazy. No. He's probably a lot saner than you are. He just got a facsimile and found himself on this facsimile and here he goes.

That's why people write science fiction; they get this stuff into restimulation. They're worse off than the rest of you, by the way.

Male voice: Think so?

I know the days when I was writing science fiction I never could understand why I always finished up with headaches. In processing one day I took off the space helmet, haven't had one since.

Now, finding that a composite nature of man – it was very, very necessary to go out and discover a lot about how it got that way, which was more evolutionary stuff and so on. And tracing it back, I found a lot of data about thetans and about beingness, so forth, that might not have been available elsewhere. That's also in, to a large degree, in *A History of Man*. And found out what is the characteristics of the thetan, from the bank.

And then found out that I was looking at what everybody laughingly calls data. That's data I was looking at, and I ought to just start looking. So I just started looking, and the devil with the data. And, by golly, from there on we started picking up speed. Because the whole study of a thetan – all you had to do was observe what thetans did and get thetans to observe what they were doing and do what you did and work with it that way – and how they got stuck and came out and... You didn't have to know why, you just found out that was what they were doing, and you did something else. So that man started coming to pieces.

And the second he started coming to pieces, for the first time we could get rid of chronic somatics with ease. So we buttoned up the subject of chronic somatics, just in passing. The second you can exteriorize somebody, you can get rid of their chronic somatics. That's easy. You just tell him, „Patch it up.“ How? You don't care how he patches it up. He can. Exteriorize, reach into the body, and patch himself up. Bye-bye chronic somatics. Fantastic! Great speed!

I don't know what Christ was doing a couple of thousand years ago, but it was probably reaching over and knocking out a few ridges or something. It must have been. He must have been able to do it with great speed. Although my boy's been doing that, and he finds out the preclears don't stay stable.

They get well for a short time after he's knocked some guy's ridges out and so on. They don't remain that way. He's young and foolish; he'll fool around with somebody else's ridges. I'm an old dog; I won't do that.

Now, the behavior of thought-generated energy then had to be cataloged, and some hazards as to how the universe came together in the first place were there, but that doesn't matter to us. And we had run into and run through by that time – astonishing to me – but these missing definitions: definitions for zero, statics, mathematics, space, time and all these, as defined in usable form, so a man knew what he was looking at and knew what he was doing with it. It was just redefinition of things that everybody knew existed, and when we did that, all of a sudden we ran into these processes about space, about the three universes, about certainty – what certainty was. High on the scale, it's the ability to have any space you want or no space at all and be perfectly free just the same. Low on the scale, certainty is a good kick in the shins or a sock in the jaw or something – it's an impact, is what certainty is, low scale. Somebody says, „I'm absolutely certain of something or other,“ with a starey look in his eye, it's been beaten into him.

Now, with the arrival of techniques to remedy these above errors – with SOP 8, SOP 8-L, Six Steps to Better Beingness, these techniques – you can do these things. The number of hours that it takes to process a case at this time is quite variable. It always has been variable, but it isn't as bad as it used to be – nowhere near. It doesn't go up into the same order of magnitude.

But auditors are liable to get nervous when they start processing a rough case and they want to hit that line harder. They don't realize that they're up against a problem of *quantity* of energy or quantity of absence of energy. They don't realize they're up against a problem which is simply one of how long does it take to fill a tank car with a pitcher.

Or if you went down and started filling a tank car with a pitcher, halfway through or a quarter of the way through or the second time you climbed the ladder, up that big ladder up to the top of the tank car and climbed all along the top of the tank car and bent over the manhole on the top of the tank car and pulled that small pitcher of water in. And then climbed all the way back down along the level of the tank car and all the way down the ladder and went down the road a quarter of a mile to the well where you're getting the water, and went down in the well and got the pitcher and got up again and climbed on up, ran one up in the tank car, and to the manhole and empty your...

By the time you had been doing this two or three times, you'd say, „There must be some easier method! Let's run concepts, let's gunshot the bank, let's do this, let's do that. Gosh! We've got to get in there. It's got to be faster.“ And what do they do with this? They waste all their processing time. That's the hideous part of it; they're just wasting processing time. Wasting time.

It's faster to go and fill the tank car with a pitcher, because that's what they're doing anyhow. They can think about it forever, but that's an auditor who only wants to think and who won't act!

You might as well just start in with – you say, „Well, all right, this case is real bad off. We're going to run that thing Ron was talking about – we're going to run – he can't see – he's real – I mean, he's terrible black. And we're just going to run up all these mock-ups of people looking up and admiring him for taking a baby. Then to vary it, we'll have somebody else admired for taking a baby.“ (We don't have to do that, by the way, with that technique.) „Oh, he's sure *lonely* in being the only one who ever took a baby.“ Anyway.

We just have that run. And we just run it for a while and then we decide, „Well, that's getting kind of boring and he's getting kind of loused up. We'll run through the Six Steps to Better Beingness.“ Do that And then you say, „Well, he said there was another technique that was a big technique and was very informative and that the cycle of action of the MEST universe was the cycle of action of an explosion.“ Then you'll run explosions on him in brackets. So we run explosions for a little while, then we can run Six Steps to Better Beingness and then we come back and we run Admiration Processing of having stolen a baby. Then we run Six Steps to Better Beingness, then we run some explosions, and that's actually what I myself would do today to a rough case. That's everything I would do to him.

I fooled around the other day with a preclear who looked like he was half-exteriozied – pretty good shape, but not real good shape. And I thought I'd fool around and

see if I could do anything for him, one last time, by running concepts. So I ran concepts on him for about two hours and then I ran explosions and his perceptions picked up and he was on his way.

I've run so many cases that I figured out I might as well do it one more time and find out if there was any use, when you came out of the well, pouring the pitcher down in the ditch. There's no use throwing the pitcher in the ditch.

The number of hours it takes to process such a case varies directly with the amount of mass of residue to be – left on the case.

Thank you very much.

QUESTION AND ANSWER PERIOD, PART I

A lecture given on 4 October 1953
by L. Ron Hubbard

60 MINUTES

All right I usually just read these things on that sort of thing. Once in a while I get halfway through them and get embarrassed, but not ordinarily.

The first ones we'll go into here – I won't say I'll get all of these but I'm going to give the earliest ones which I received first.

Says, „Has the importance of assessment lessened with the latest techniques?“

Well, no. No, pathetic as it may seem, although you may gunshot a case very easily. I well recall about five months ago, more or less with the techniques which you're using now, me processing a lady for four hours. I don't want to talk about my auditing, but processing somebody for four hours is a long time unless I'm doing just research processing.

And at the end of four hours I suddenly found out that although she could mock up everything in the world with great ease, she could not get a mock-up of her mother. And when asked to get a mock-up of her mother, she broke down and wept, I mean, just *ping-pang*. We blew the charge and that was the end of the case. But I would have picked that up on an E-Meter in the first five minutes of play if I'd done an assessment and if – merely asked her on the subject of creating and destroying, list of people, the standard people: Papa, Mama, so on. So I should have done an assessment on the case.

An assessment practically will always save you time as well as letting the preclear, possibly for the first time in his life, put out an anchor point He can say to somebody who's fairly – who at least looks interested, so on, he can say, „Well, my family was mean to me.“ And the auditor doesn't say immediately, „Well, my family was mean to me, too.“

The importance of assessment has lessened to the degree that you can proceed on groups and on individuals without assessing. But if you want to save yourself a lot of time, a lot of energy and a lot of auditing, you will assess people still.

And the best method of assessment I know, by the way, is the one which appeared in the *Journal* which is simply – goes down create and destroy on these various dynamics and that's all *hid* out for you there in *tine Journal*.

When you get to the point of destroying Christ, most people hardly quiver. But once in a while a person in very, very bad condition (a condition you wouldn't suspect otherwise) will jump off the pin on an E-Meter. And just the idea of destroying Christ, they practically faint. You see, Christ actually is a method of – this is – I mean, this is therapy I'm talking about, the hell with religion – Christ is a method of wasting admiration on spirits.

People are trying to waste in the MEST universe what they can't have in their own universe. And if they can't have admiration, they'll waste it in various ways and they'll finally get up to a point where they waste it on Christ and God. That means that they, as a thetan, are in *terrible* condition – I mean *brutal* condition. It just shouldn't happen to somebody.

That's why I sometimes smile on the subject of religion because it's such an accurate index of exactly what's happening to this poor preclear – this poor citizen, you see? He's got to waste admiration on a spirit Well, boy, if he's got to waste admiration on a spirit... And you start running this, by the way, on preclears and you'll find very interesting material suddenly start to fly up.

Waste ghosts. Nobody in this society today can have a ghost Science's main throat-cut to the whole society is to say, „Now that we are scientific, we of course don't believe in ghosts.“ And the preclear goes *neyeaw*.

One of the main things wrong with science today is the fact that it runs a „We can't have,“ because it's got a set communication system. And this very rigid, set communication system forbids many things, but the most important one is ghosts. You can always get a bang out of a preclear by wasting ghosts.

But when somebody is trying to get bade to battery, they go down the dynamics and they start wasting first themselves, and then they'll start wasting the second dynamic and then the third dynamic and the fourth dynamic and the fifth, sixth. And you can run this case on an E-Meter and you'll find out he went just in that progression. And when he gets to the point where he's got to waste the seventh dynamic, he's practically ready to be shut up in a small box. And that's where religion enters.

And when they're real, real, real bad off in sanitariums and so forth, they go around reading the Bible all the time – reading the Bible, reading the Bible hectically. They're trying to waste that last fragment of admiration that they can waste. But the horrible part about it is, is you can't waste admiration in that fashion therapeutically. If you try to waste it in real life, it doesn't solve the case subjectively. And you see, it's the more they waste, the more they want. You can't waste it out in the MEST universe.

Perhaps this tells you immediately why or gives you some inkling of why you see so very much religion in a sanitarium. And religion is all right in its own place, but it doesn't belong in a booby hatch. I don't know if they're capable of embarrassment, but I think it possibly might be embarrassing to some churches if they knew. There's one church in particular, one in particular, that just lists the majority of the roster in sanitariums.

That's not a condemnation of the religion. It isn't the religion doing this the way that we used to think Religion isn't doing this. Religion just gives them a method – and somebody

always invents some method – gives them a method to waste admiration of a thetan. That's all there is to it.

So, if you start doing an assessment and you start running down the line on it and all of a sudden the idea of creating Christ or destroying Christ suddenly knocks that needle off the pin – you take it awful easy with that preclear. And if the biggest charge is on God, oh-oh, he's got to waste the whole MEST universe, all the space and everything in it.

Now, here's the kind of a question I like to see: „In the beginning I was full of questions. I faced myself, Q and A, and found the answer is 'Thank you.' „

Here's how to run a bracket, the basic way to run a bracket.

There are several progressive complexities of bracket. The first part of a bracket, the most important part, is to run it for yourself, and then somebody else running it for himself, and then other people running it for other people. How would you do that? People have a little trouble with this bracket once in a while, but it's essentially very easy.

You have your preclear – let's take admiration for stealing a baby. That's a complicated one a little bit, more than other ones. Well, you'd have the preclear mock up below him and looking up at him, just hordes of people, no matter how poorly these mock-ups were, these hordes of people looking up at him, admiring him for stealing a baby.

Then you'd say, „Now get somebody else in front of you. Now have them mock up hordes of people admiring them for stealing a baby.“ Now, that's the two basic points.

Now, the next point would be „Get two people out in front of you or a lot of people out in front of you, and have half of them admire the other half of them for stealing a baby, or have one of these people mock up a lot of people admiring the other one for stealing a baby.“ You follow that? You've got two people out here and you have this person mock up a lot of people admiring the other person for stealing a baby.

Now, you go over on this side and you have this person over here mock up a lot of people admiring the other person for stealing a baby. This is the most complex bracket there is.

Now, I'm going on with that bracket. We really want to extend this bracket out to the end product of all brackets. All right. We have the preclear then mock up a lot of people admiring somebody else for having stolen a baby. We then get the preclear to mock up somebody else who is mocking up an awful lot of people admiring the preclear for having stolen a baby.

And then if you want to really finish off a bracket and knock off all this manifestation in para-Scientology that we call bodies in pawn and so forth, you get somebody way out there running the same whole set – the whole bracket – somebody sitting way out there. First for himself, then mocking – this person way out there setting up somebody else who sets up all these people admiring himself. You get this backwards bracket?

That's a mirror effect. Now, that's very fascinating. Every once in a while somebody's got this spooky notion that there's somebody out there. And the joker is, of course, there is.

So he can get that somebody out there identified with people in the MEST universe and so he feels in ARC with these people.

That's the only reason people stay in the MEST environment, is they get split in half, or that is to say, there's somebody else that is them, too. This is an interesting manifestation that you needn't bother with. It's not terribly important; it's not terribly interesting.

But you'll get preclears obsessed with it There's somebody out there. This witch doctor that ran this patient's life all the time. That was just a mock-up of a something else out there. Bodies in pawn as they show up are just that sort of thing. You see how that is?

You want to run a bracket, a simple bracket that just runs, have the preclear mock up a lot of people admiring him for stealing a baby. Have him mock up somebody else who then mocks up a lot of people admiring this mock-up for having stolen a baby. And then other people mocking up lots of people admiring somebody else for stealing a baby, and then reversewise, out there, a lot of people being mocked up for the person who did the mock-up first And that's a bracket That takes care of all flows and adjustments. You don't have to worry too much about that.

But, by the way, a case will hang up – speaking of brackets, there's probably a lot of questions in here about brackets – a case will hang up if self is run *pam, pam, pam, pam, pam, pam*, and all of a sudden the case goes *chug*. And you wonder what's the matter with this person? You're just getting a worse somatic and a worse somatic and a worse somatic, and nothing is happening. Well, you just haven't run the rest of the bracket.

And it's very interesting that you'll run this case for a while, and „Well, we'll have somebody else run this out in front; we'll get somebody else mocking up this and that,“ and so on. *Pam, pam, pam* – all of a sudden, it'll go *chug chug, grrrrr*. And so you get others mocking it up for others and all of a sudden there's a complete relief along the line.

It's an empirical datum; it merely follows the pattern of flows. I figured it out from – just sat down and figured out pencil-lined flows, where all the flows would be, and then can – didn't think about it after that Noticed preclears were bogging, then just tested it out and ran another part of the bracket Noticed they still bog and figured out the other part of the bracket, ran that and they stopped bogging.

You can run practically anything this way because it takes care of the overt act and the motivator, the DED and the DEDEX. And it takes care, more or less, of two – the other fellow's and one's own – universes.

Don't comprehend this one. It says something about a European degree setup. That is very definitely in the works. Matter of fact I'm back here getting the wheels under it but I am not prepared to announce anything about that now.

„Now, on Expanded GITA: Is wasting, alone, run in brackets, or is accepting under duress, wanting, taking and so forth run in brackets also?“

Yes, everything is run in brackets. You have Waste in brackets, Accept in brackets. Now, I'll give you another little one in there. There's another little one in there: Save in brackets.

Save is a lock-up that comes between wasting and accepting. A save is, „I can't accept it and I can't waste it“ I wouldn't say that your grandmother or somebody like that was loopy for saving everything, but she sure was hanging up on about the biggest maybe there is which is: „I can't have it,“ see, „and I can't accept it, I can't waste it and I don't dare give it away.“

Something for you to remember what saving is. Go down and look at these big banks. They get people to saving money. I haven't the least idea why anybody ever saves any money – really don't.

I was raised in the hard school in the US – the real tough school. That's just to say, one depression. And I saw people who had worked and worked and worked all their lives up till 1929, Black Friday – crash, all their savings gone, and then we entered the Great Depression. And Frankie, that was a fellow we had back then – a fellow by the name of Frankie. He fixed it up so that all the little banks in the country that were sound could be bought up by all the big banking chains which then went crash and there, that was the rest of the country's savings – 1932. And people who had saved all their lives were destitute.

Oh, they just got their savings at first, by the way. The second big sweep was what was known as – they got big casino that time. They got their checking accounts. Ah, that was a great swindle. That was a great swindle. They really had boys back in those days – Scarface Al Capone, so on. There were a lot of them – FDR. Anyway. They really took a beating.

And I, ever since, have looked at this business of saving just in an effort to find out what was happening. I find out what happens: They get people to save things and then they get this big pile of masonry and they get bigger piles of masonry and bigger piles of masonry and fancier front offices and more people save and they get bigger piles of masonry and bigger front offices. „Saving is security“ is a motto that they put up in front of these buildings, and boy, it sure is, for the bank.

And Philadelphia is quite interesting this way. The only nice buildings they have in Philadelphia are erected by the pennies that are saved in savings accounts. So I don't see any beautiful homes erected by savings accounts but I do see a lot of nice banks. So saving isn't bad; it's just bad for people.

But a man's security in the future, his security, is dependent upon his own ability to continue to use effort, and that's his security. And really, when that fails, he gets an emotional insecurity within himself which hasn't really anything to do with the financial problems with which he's faced. His bank just starts collapsing.

When he becomes unwilling or unable to use effort, he can no longer feel secure, of course, because security is based upon the ability to use effort And you'll see this working out numerous ways. The „can't work,“ as I said often, is the common denominator of neurosis and psychosis. They can't work.

Well, when they answer this – when they answer this with this relatively weird computation of „We will save,“ they're just working it all backwards again. If you were to have saved ten dollars in 1938, and you took it out of the bank today at 2 percent interest, you would find yourself with ten dollars which would buy about one-quarter of the commodity or one-eighth of the commodity and you've made 2 percent or 8 percent or 12 percent or, I don't

know, you might have made quite a bit of percentage. You might have made twenty bucks out of this ten dollars in 1938. But now it costs you a hundred bucks to buy the same commodity. Why didn't you buy a diamond ring or why didn't you buy a watch or why didn't you just go down to the corner and give it to a beggar and think of all the time you would have saved yourself.

When you start to save, you begin to worry about the fact that you might not be able to work someday. You can always work. They need switchmen down at – they need train watchers and so on. The streets are dirty and there's all sorts of things a guy can do, actually – probably much more interesting than you're doing now.

You'll find the entrepreneur is an interesting character in the society. He's the manager who is the promoter – the entrepreneur. Society really hasn't taken a good look at him. But it's the entrepreneur usually who has the beautiful home and the fleet of cars and the warm – and hot-running secretaries. These people will look at this person and they'll say he's a capitalist And the poor guy really hasn't got a dime in the bank. He's really poor. And he – it's just his ability and he just goes on at this level of ability.

A fellow by the name of Lucky Baldwin has left huge piles of masonry and racetracks all over California And it's doubtful if old Lucky Baldwin could ever write an acceptable check at the end of a week. The man was just – his effort was rewarded continually. No worries – he just spent every dime he ever got his hands on. And, I think, toward the end, that somebody – he fell down on something or other and he was finished completely before he ever didn't have any money.

Don't worry. Capitalism today will take care of you if you've got an awful lot of money and you're suddenly unable to work; they'll take care of you. You suddenly get unable to work, how are you going to defend this money? The government won't; they take it away from you. They say, „That fellow's got money. Ha! Where's the officers of the law? Let's...“

How about having – I didn't mean to get off on an economic dissertation. I wanted – I've been trying to beat home covertly and surreptitiously during this congress – one datum is: The unwillingness to put out effort is the root of evil – if anything can be said to be. It's the unwillingness to exert effort – unwillingness to put out and receive in anchor points – effort And this is mirrored in every strata of life. And the decline of a society is measured by the amount they have to save and the littleness they hope to do.

„How about having real communication in our organization? Specifically, a directing of members complete with full...“

A directory! Well, you're sure going to get that „... complete with addresses and distributed amongst the members and also a regular monthly newspaper to contain news from, about and by the field.“

Okay. Okay.

You know, every once in a while somebody gets this beautiful dream. And it's a wonderful dream. And you send out letters to people in the field who should send you letters to tell you what they were doing. The columns sit there empty. You're writing to people who

obviously can't put out anchor points, I guess. Because you never get any news from the field to include in it because nobody sends you any.

Now, somebody can excuse this and say it's because you wouldn't print it if it were sent. Well, believe me, I have printed a lot more than I have ever received from the field.

I had had one of the editors indoctrinated into making enough complaints in the mails. The early issues of the *Journal*, by the way, contain alternate letters which are complaints. We just never receive complaints to amount to anything, and people love to read complaints. So he kept saying, „But nobody's complaining about anything.“

And so I said, „Well, get in a foul mood some night and write us half a hundred letters and we'll just draw on these.“ We did. Nobody complains. Most of the news coming in is very pleasant. But there's a lot of it that I would like to have and people send it in – gorgeous.

Now – also asks about the various steps necessary qualifying for the degrees.

Well, we've been starving along on this against the time when we would have everything set up to accommodate for that rather than announce it first as I used to.

I'm finding a wonderful facility these days for sitting exactly on the time track, you know? *Ptock*. And people rush up to me and they say, „Why don't you do something...“

See, and it's on the time track ten days away. That's up there.

„Well, yes, but they got to get ready for it.“

„No, ten days away is when we start planning it.“

It's very funny, if you're not terribly concerned about it, you start operating on a hair-line with time. You're not very concerned about it; you find out that a feeling of hecticness that you might otherwise have departs. You know, you're trying to crowd that time track, you know – so little time to get in and so on. And you go back and find out that all the crowding of the time track ever did was to get you to do less because you wasted all of your effort in pushing against time and it's awfully unresistive.

If you want to get a preclear feeling very funny, you say, „All right Now, get a large area of nothing.“ „Okay.“ „Now, get the idea you're fighting it.“ That's the MEST universe par excellence.

When people's voices start coming at you, and people are quarreling with you verbally, so forth, people get that same feeling. It's the identical feeling, you see, because they're fighting nothing. And they just feel like they're falling on their faces and everybody goes downscale and everything else.

The way to fight is just hit somebody! I mean, don't fight nothing – fall into that trap. Or don't fight! Or if you fight, why, just fight. But fighting is not bandying words around and so on. A lot of people have got this so bad that that's all they'll do is bandy words. And you say, „Well, let's get the brass knuckles!“ Or, „All right, what's the matter with a couple of can openers at ten feet?“

This is terrifically visible in bullfighting. They get the bull to fight the picador. And the bull fights the picador by plowing in with those horns, see? And he's got a good, solid

horse in front of him and a good solid man in front of him. And boy, he really shoves and very often the horse goes down and the bull's horns... Of course, that horse is terrifically padded and shielded, and it's quite often, though, the bull's horns will penetrate those quilts and shields and disembowel the horse and smash the rider back down against the fence and so on. That bull's got a lot of drive.

But all the time he's driving, Mr. Picador has a double-pronged spear that he's mounted in the bull's spine at a very tender spot at the base of the neck, and he just leans on that spear hard, see? The audience will boo if two picadors in a row put their spears in the same places on the bull's back so as to cause fountains of blood. The audience doesn't like this because it takes too much fight out of the bull.

But the point is they give him a nice big engram and there he's fighting something, you see, in getting this engram. After that, people come up and throw these *banderillas*, they just mount these *banderillas* into his back – two-spiked sticks. They come all up in front of him and drive them into his back and sail away. And then they give him capes and more capes and more capes, and it's just nothing. He's just fighting nothing, you see, from there on.

What's he fighting? He's fighting the engram the picador gave him. It's the most beautiful – gruesomely beautiful example of what an engram is and what it can do.

After that, he won't buck and the harder – the more you give him fighting nothing, the sicker he gets. The bull, just before he's killed, is about the sickest, scarest animal you ever saw.

America would not go for bullfights at all. Not because they're too bloody, but because they're too monotonous. It's the same bullfight.

Once in a while, you get a really good matador, and they're quite rare and they do fabulous things. They are fantastic. And to watch one of those boys at work, knowing very well the work is quite dangerous, is something that you just stand and hold your breath over. Because they will fix the bull the second the bull comes into the arena – no engram yet. And they will do such things as kneel in the middle of the arena with a red cape wrapped around their knees and just wait for the bull. And the bull will see that red cape and come up like an express train and go right straight through them. They're not there at the moment the bull hits.

And then they go through a process of hypnotizing the bull after the engram and so forth. A toreador will – or a matador will fix him – just fix him and then make him come ahead two steps. And then fix him again. And it's fascinating. They'll just make the bull do anything. But that is a magnificent matador. That's the top – the cream of the cream.

The rest of the boys and most of the fellows you see doing matador work and so on, they're poor. They're quick – poor. They turn around before they've adequately fixed the bull and walk five paces away to bow to the audience and the bull says, „Well, to hell with him!“ see, and comes in under him and throws him in the air!

But it's interesting too, commenting on that, because quite a few people have mentioned it to me – that here's a society which every day is perfectly willing to waste killing. And there's a society that is perfectly willing to sit around and watch the killing.

Every time you eat a steak, there was a fellow down there at the slaughterhouse – he stood up alongside of a chute with a baseball bat and hit the cow on the head, *pong*. And they come through, they hit them in the head. In other words, you're wasting killing of meat.

And if you were to check over the society at all, you would find out that very few people had any comprehension of this interesting item: that every time you eat meat, an animal had to die. And you're eating the meat at some very late, late, later date than it was killed and you're eating carrion. The meat is really no good unless it's still alive to eat. It's the only time it's got any admiration in it and that's all you're really – you're looking for.

And meat which is killed in fear – meat of an animal which was afraid when it died has a terrifically foul flavor. A lot of your Western beef and so forth has that flavor in it That animal was in terror when killed. And yet here sits around people saying, „I love animals!“ Chomp, chomp, chomp, chomp!

Your vegetarian – your vegetarian thinks to get around this and argues against eating meat, which is carrion, by eating live cells – eating raw vegetables. In other words, the food is still alive. Raw vegetables are very delicious.

If you left little kids alone, very few of them would ever get into eating meat. They would eat raw vegetables preferably because they're, of course, quite admiring. You take a stalk of celery and carrot, something like that, before it's been cooked. But when they get older, they want to make sure it's dead, so they boil it and so on.

You see, what's amusing is there's apparently no food value in any of this. There's a sensation value and so on. I'm not quite sure, but I know I like to eat But it's just something you like to do.

And then people get obsessive about it They think they have to eat Of course, a person who thinks he has to eat and then can't eat and starts starving, oh, he gets in terrible shape. And you can almost tell a family that has not fed their children well by looking over some fellow. He's funny about food. He's upset about food.

And you get any of your preclears coming by, one after the other, you'll find out that the preclears that you get would normally come to you, each one has had familial upset about food – not Mama (very young) – but just about food, about hamburgers and vegetables and so on. This kid has been bullied about food. It's a center aberration because it's the first decline of man into debasement.

I'm not saying stop eating, but stop being so serious about eating. It's not very serious. That GE that built the bull, he just goes back and builds another bull Probably this bull, probably, has enough of a shock left in him – you see, he probably has enough shock left in him that he'll never be selected for the bullring again. So the race survives.

„How can an occluded case get any certainty on a mock-up when he's not sure that merely getting the concept of a mock-up is out there? Will such be of any value? How can an occluded case get any certainty on a mock-up when he's not sure that merely getting the concept that a mock-up is out there will be of any value?“

Oh, I see. This business of put a mock-up, put a mock-up, put a mock-up out there – but you're talking about an occluded case. In high-level processing today, we don't talk about an occluded case getting mock-ups.

I can tell you how to get occluded cases to get mock-ups and so forth. Well, there are dozens of ways of running occlusion. The hottest one of running occlusion is: Get all of that blackness out there as a something, and then the answer as a nothing. We haven't come away from Something-Nothingness Processing with Q and A.

Get all that blackness as a something, and then get himself looking at it as a nothing. Get the blackness – re-turned around, in other words – turn it around as a nothing. If he can't turn it around, just leave it there and say it's now nothing. It's something-nothing.

Because that's the big question: It's black so you can't see it, but is there something in it? And that's the type of maybe, so people get into that maybe and there goes the case. So you don't worry about this fellow.

You solve the blackness with this and then you get it as silent And then silent is the answer. And you solve it in this fashion and then he gets mock-ups. It's very easy. You don't have to get mock-ups to exteriorize anybody anymore, actually.

Actually, there are a few auditors around – I don't do this because I consider that it's impolite. Sometimes it makes it feel like a piece of skull is coming off or something of the sort But there are some auditors around, actually, that simply reach over and grab ahold of the thetan and yank. They got a Theta Clear. Kind of uncomfortable but the person gets pretty good certainty on having been exteriorized. Of course he gets back into this mess again and he'll bog down some more but he knows something happened to him.

You can maintain an occluded case's interest in processing very easily. You don't use mock-ups of it. Whoever wrote this question believes that mock-ups are the center of processing, that's because probably he's concerned about mock-ups. He can't get them. If you'll just run that „Blackness is a something“ as a question: „Something?“ and then himself, Nothing, he's got that maybe apart.

Q and A, you see, can go from – not an identity but two different things like a Something-Nothing. But it isn't advisable to do that on anything less than just Something-Nothing. The blackness is „Something?“ And then turn it around as Nothing as the answer because that's relief.

By the way, before I forget it – before I forget it, you're going to find some cases around that ought to be run this way – they ought to be run this way. They've been in Dianetics a long time, been in Scientology a long time, and you want to wrap up the case and you aren't getting anywhere much with what you're doing. This case is still fighting around. Well, you will remember that the case – yeah, this is – you run into a lot of those people. Yes. All right

Cycle of Action Processing. Get the idea of a cycle of action. You know, a person wants to finish those cycles of action. I told you about that in the lectures. So they didn't run out the engram. So they've got to finish the cycle of action. And how do you do this? You get the engram – nothing. That's the end of the cycle of action. All right

„Get that picture you were trying to work with?“ „Now get nothing of it“ „Now get present time.“ „Now get the erasure of an engram, just as a concept“ See?

And then get this in a bracket. And you've finished off the cycle of action of every session they've had, see? An engram and nothing of it – that is to say, erased, nothing – is a very silly thing because all you're doing is running nothings. But it's running nothings with the idea in them, and they're still disturbed and still chewing up against this engram they never erased and so on. This is a highly specialized technique. You'd never bother to use this on the public.

You just say, „Now get running an engram and nothing.“ And „Get the feeling of present time.“ You know, „Now get the feeling of being back on the track and then present time,“ and so on. That cares for all the times they didn't come back to present time when some auditor stuck them down the bank. And if you run this in brackets, you'll actually run out all the bad auditing.

It sounds very silly, a very light technique; you'll overestimate it You'll talk too much to the pre-clear, I know you will because it's just a matter of, „All right...“ (you don't even tell him you're running out auditing) „... get the fact that there was an engram and now there's nothing.“ „Now get somebody else, the fact there was an engram and now there's nothing.“ And „All right. Get the fact that a fellow was back in time and is now in present time.“ „Get the fact that you were back in time and are now in present time.“ „Now, get other people who had an engram, had nothing.“

You get the idea? „Other people auditing other people.“ Finish the session. And then to end all this: „All right Get the idea of being aberrated and then being Clear – aberrated and Clear.“ You just work out these goals, you see? You don't have to run it very long.

The fellow says, „Gee, you know, I feel fine! It makes me a dog, doesn't it?“ Okay.

We've got here quite a few questions of... Oh! Oh, by the way, I'm just reading this question. I'm not going to answer the question because it just mentions Group Processing and I don't think everybody would be interested in it.

I think I'm going to shoot some auditor. I always wind up that way and something of the sort In running Six Steps to Better Beingness, an auditor whom I loved very dearly (I'll kick his teeth out just the same) ran this during the congress, ran Q and A in place of Opposite Poles, the sixth step – ran Q and A in place of Opposite Poles and then followed it with Self Analysis. What's wrong with that?

Male voice: It's double – the same way.

Yeah, that's introvert, introvert. And the people he was auditing hung up and got blurry, naturally. And he then said, „Where are you people? Where are you?“ while they were anaten.

Now, I fished out a couple of them out of that group. But please, if you're going to vary techniques, let me tell you the secret of varying techniques. Introversion technique which would be Opposite Poles and anything like that, Q and A – that's an introverted tech-

nique. It has to do with the subjective – the subjective being. Always follow it with the objective being.

Now, if you'll notice in Six Steps to Better Beingness, Opposite Poles is followed by step one again – Ten Minutes of Nothing. Now, Ten Minutes of Nothing is actually not a subjective technique. If the fellow starts running it, he'll get nothing here and then he'll start to get interested in the walls or something like that and he'll become aware after a while that he – realize he's still surrounded by walls. So he'll eventually bite off and get nothing of the walls, and then he'll get nothing of the town and nothing of the planet. He's going out. He's very definitely going out, and it's an extroversion technique if there ever was one. But, if you followed it with Self Analysis, which is more mock-ups on top of the mock-ups which appear in Q and A, people would have a tendency to get very foggy. See why that is?

So it's introvert technique, subjective reality, and then objective. Subjective-objective, subjective-objective – and if you're going to put together or vary techniques, you should do that.

And you should never ask anaten people questions or anything like that.

More important than that, Q and A is run for a group just as I ran it in a demonstration. We pull people in on the preclear and then had the preclear put himself backwards on people out in front of him. Now, why did we do that?

Here we have a situation of extending the anchor point. Putting on the body backwards collapses his anchor points. Now, we put it out there and extend his anchor points – now, just recall this. You see, that was in the process. We don't just put it in.

Now, you'll notice Opposite Poles is a much gentler version, but it has its outpost too. Opposite Poles has to do with points out here. There's things out here saying, „I'm going to betray you.“ In other words, he has to look out here a ways and then he plays these heads dose up. So it's an out-in technique although all of it is a subjective technique.

Now, let's look at Q and A. He put on Mama, Papa and so forth backwards and turned them around each time as the answer. And then he got Mama and Papa out here and he put his body on them backwards. You remember that in the demonstration? In other words, if you did that to him, all you'd work out was motivators, and a fellow hasn't got enough motivators anyhow. So for heaven's sakes, put his body out here, have him mock up Papa and then have him put his own body on Papa's backwards and then turn it around as the answer. Have him mock up Mama, put his body on Mama's body as the question and then turn it around as the answer. And you've got his points out again.

There are very few things that could go wrong in this, but if you find anything going wrong, it's trying to run into a present time problem with the preclear which you then don't complete. And so you would leave alone those people with whom the preclear was more or less tied up in present time.

You would use standardly – if you were doing it with Group Processing, you would leave alone, really, the husband or the wife, working with a group. Why? Because it's going to be too hot to handle. You can just be sure that two people living together have a lot of

problems which are unsolved and so on, and you've got to spend a long time on this if you start using husbands and wives and so on.

So you start shooting this at the group, „Now put your marital partner's body on backwards and turn it around.“ By the time you've done that a few times, there's two or three members of your group aren't going to be with you. They'll be into a boil-off or something. So you want to avoid the present time problems.

Truth of the matter is, just Wearing Heads, you see, doesn't have this question and answer connotation and they get big line charges out of it-groups do a lot of times.

„Put on your first-grade teacher's head,“ „Put on a cop's head.“ „Put on Papa's head.“ And so on, and they get a big bang out of this. It's very amusing.

One case I had reported to me, the girl had been afflicted most horribly with a mustache for years and was very sensitive about it and the auditor knew it was an aberration of some sort, when he ran into Opposite Poles, just Wearing Heads. „Now, put on the head of somebody you detest,“ he said. And she puts on this head, and it's a very, very, early, early teacher she had, who had a mustache that she detested and had been wearing it ever since. And in twenty-four hours it was gone. Just the (*snap*) realization that fast.

So Wearing Heads is a little bit different, you see, than Q and A and it's a lighter technique and can be used more easily on a group. And I would actually advise you to use Opposite Poles rather than Q and A on a group. But you can use Q and A on a group but use the whole bracket That is, use at least for self and for others on the bracket And at least throw into the process, past people and leave alone people who are obviously present time problems.

Yeah, last night at one o'clock, I was auditing. That's really ornery. I thought I'd ended this a long time ago. But I didn't know this process could be done wrong – Q and A. Actually can't be done wrong. There wouldn't have been any damage there if the auditor had not said, „Where are you?“ Because both of these people began to wonder where they were. And they – well, were dazed enough to think maybe they were in birth or maybe, „I don't know, where am I on the track? Maybe I'm a baby on the track. Maybe I'm just...“ See, real dizzy.

Nothing wrong with it That would have worn off in a day or two anyhow and it wouldn't have killed them. If you think you're going to mess anybody up with these techniques, it's pretty hard to do. All right.

Oh! „Would you discuss the mechanical aids you touched upon?“

Yeah, but I tell you, I don't myself have enough case histories on these mechanical aids to make any kind of a report and all I'm doing is going on preliminary findings and data. And that's one of the things I've got to do across the river over there. That's one of the things this group working with me has got to do. We've got to get our hands dirty on the subject of mechanical aids.

I can see it now. One of these has to do with mirrors and another has to do with cans and so on. There are four mechanical aids, and one of them is vitamins. How far can you go with vitamins as a mechanical aid?

He's – also puts a question here: „How about vitamins?“

There are four of these mechanical aids: One of them has to do with mirrors, the other has to do with cans, one of them has to do with vitamins, and another one is called distraction. And any one of these – any one of these is strictly mechanical. They're just for psychotics, that's all. It's just an effort to mass-handle psychosis.

And your mirrors automatically double-terminal the person. You just put him in the box and strap him down and he looks up and he's double-terminaled. That's real grim.

If you want to know how that works, go yourself sometime and look fixedly at a mirror for about three or four minutes and you all of a sudden will flip into the mirror on that side and back of the mirror this side and back there and back there and it's very, very baffling.

I discovered this, one day, was a little bit too much for a preclear. I'd sent him over to the mirror and then noticed a fixed look got in his eye, and I said, „Well, let's just carry this out just a little bit further.“ And I carried it out for about ten minutes. And at the end of that time discovered that he did not and could not tell me which side of the mirror he was really on or whether he was in front of his face or behind his face.

And the fixation of people upon mirrors gives them the idea that they're in front of their faces and they'll often establish this viewpoint They're putting up a good picture and they would like to look at themselves so they have...

Matter of fact, you want to get a little kick this morning here? Just get the idea about a spot out in front of you that is facing you, „How I'd love to have that viewpoint!“ Just get that now. Just get that as a concept A spot out in front of you here, looking back this way at you and get the idea, „How I'd love to have that viewpoint!“ Hit it again.

That desire to behold oneself, you see, when you give it all over to a mirror and so on, it'll swing people out in front of their faces. You very often say, „Be three feet back of your head.“ Well, he's already two feet in front of his head.

Vitamins, by the way, have the same validity they've always had for us which is the fact that you start running a person with too many hours and an insufficiency of food, and the GE just can't take it I said, a little while ago, food wasn't necessary, but I said, until a person is well downscale, his whole sanity isn't monitored by food.

But when a person hasn't much storage capacity, has an idea of tremendous scarcity on the subject of food, you start auditing them, and they're unable to work. And very often, as a matter of fact, every time I have found what was called an auditing failure – when I found an auditing failure being very serious to people, extremely serious – the preclear was hungry, starved when audited, insufficiency of food. I don't mean he's just had the sensation of hunger; I mean he hadn't been eating for days or weeks.

We used to give intensives up at Elizabeth (a little town up the line up here) and they used to give intensives up there and the people would come in there and they'd eat a sandwich and drink a cup of coffee for lunch, eat no breakfast and eat a sandwich and drink a cup of coffee for supper. And then at two o'clock in the morning somebody would be on the phone saying, „We have somebody here that just can't seem to reach present time,“ and you hear

this – faint screams going on in the background. You have to patch this character up but you've already passed this margin of safety.

Two o'clock in the morning! You should never audit anybody at two o'clock in the morning. Traditionally, that's the time of day when people die. If you're ever going to spin anybody, you'll spin him at two o'clock in the morning.

And these conditions will be followed – if you ever spin anybody, these conditions will have been answered: You audited him too many hours, and at the moment of the spin it was between one and four in the morning. He will not have eaten sufficiently for the preceding week. He is very deficient on calcium lactate and vitamin B1. It just will follow just like that *pam, pam, pam*.

Regardless of what you did to him in auditing, we – not interested in that – let's just look at these other factors, and you'll find out that they're present if the preclear spins. The auditing is just something else. You see? It's something for you to remember.

They've got to be well fed. They've got to have good rest, and they will start having nightmares, dreams and hallucinations if they don't get enough vitamin B1 and calcium lactate.

You give somebody a bunch of – oh, once in a while you'll get this patient – a patient, this time, not a preclear. Some doctor or somebody will have really flubbed the dub. And this patient will come to you and they're seeing spiders. And they're seeing horrible things and they don't know what these things are and they're very upset emotionally, and you check back on them. You can always ask a man a question, „Have you been to the doctor and are you on any drugs?“

And the fellow will answer to this question, „Well, yes, I've been taking some medicine, but it doesn't amount to anything.“ The doctor's had him on something like sulfathiazole and it's productive of hallucination and there's nothing wrong with this fellow except the doctor didn't give him the B1 to go along with the sulfathiazole. This manifestation does not occur in the presence of adequate B1 – neither does alcoholism.

You get an alcoholic. Well, he's so deficient on B1, he's got to waste it. He can't have it. He's in bad shape. And you have to really pump him full if you're going to audit him. And people will try to audit alcoholics under alcohol or something like that Oh, no – B1, B1.

B1 is wonderful stuff. I don't know who sold the cells a bill of goods on it, but they sure bought it.

And this hallucinatory condition which you will often hear about from a preclear will just clear up. And if you audited him madly and intensely and on and on and on and on and on in the presence of insufficient food or something like that, all of a sudden he *mil – he'll* start to get hallucinations. The way you remedy it...

Female voice: How much are you calling „filling full of B1“ at this present time?

What?

Female voice: How much are you calling „filling full of B1" in terms of...

Oh, not very much: fifty, a hundred milligrams – one tablet, two tablets. That is, they're fifty milligrams, a hundred milligrams. That's lots of B1. Matter of fact, it will make him easy as a good car to drive for about an hour after you take it. It has a euphoric edge. Take two or three, oh, maybe ten grains of calcium lactate. That's awful cheap. That's something like sixty-five cents for hundreds of pills, and B1 is rather expensive.

But don't go dabbling around with five milligrams of B1 and ten milligrams of B1. And don't get upset or excited about the fact that you're not giving him balanced rations – you actually can – of drugs or balanced rations of minerals or something like that Boy, you can get so precise about this.

I've worked with this quite a bit and I've found – never got into trouble – never have gotten into trouble yet by simply giving B1 and, if possible, backing it up with some calcium lactate. And giving lots of B1 – it doesn't upset the system.

But a lot of other vitamins and minerals packed on top of this have to be in very precise balance. You could pick up probably a scoop shovel of B1 and load it into the preclear. And you could probably put five milligrams into the preclear and it'd do some tiny fragment of good. A tiny amount or a large amount, you could back it up with any quantity in the world of calcium and it wouldn't do anything. It's like eating chalk. It goes into solution in the body a little bit better in the presence of calcium, I understand.

And it's not anything dangerous or critical. There is neither a dangerous nor critical aspect on the administration of it. It's not really a drug or anything. But we go off into other tablets, minerals, proteins and so on, we can have a picnic.

Thank you very much.

QUESTION AND ANSWER PERIOD, PART II

A lecture given on 4 October 1953
by L. Ron Hubbard

34 MINUTES

“How to start a family up that had some bad auditing in the early days.”

Well, lot of things you could do, but it's mainly a communication problem. Very probably, if I were really interested in this problem – actually these things don't solve in the absence of a great deal of interest because if you want to solve any problem in this universe, you have to put out effort. Takes effort to solve any of these things – real effort And if you just want to sit around and get a thought solution and you go *bap* and that goes into the machinery again – no.

But you take real effort, find a friend of theirs and explain the problem to the friend of theirs and then audit the friend of theirs and bring him up Tone Scale and demonstrate that this happened, and that brings them back in again. That's establishing communication by picking up a communication relay point of theirs, making it yours and through that point shared, communicating.

Oh, yes, this is wonderful: „Athletic directors require their athletes to exercise. Can Scientology reduce the time requirements for their physical training?“

Well, yeah. Physical training is laughingly called, of athletes... You ever around a bunch of athletes? Well, honest Have you ever been around a bunch of athletes? You've seen them on the screen in the movies and so on, but have you ever really been around them? Boy, they're always all bunged up. They're in horrible shape. Every time I run into a bunch of athletes, why, this guy's got his foot all taped up and fingers are all taped up here, and he's got a strained muscle.

And they're like racehorses. They'll get out there and they'll really pitch, but they kind of like to hold up that sore fetlock, too. Very interesting, but they are quite delicate. You'd think they were; they are quite delicate. And they're valuable, and they're aware of this. And I think right there you have the answer to an athlete: The mock-up is too valuable. And they go around and start damaging it and this becomes terrific.

For instance, one day I saw an athlete – the only one who really got a tremendous ovation (talk about acceptance level) got a tremendous ovation from the crowd, was one who was

damn fool enough to get spiked. And then bravely went back to bat with beautiful sadness. That was athletics.

Now, how would you reduce their physical training by... If anything, you'd push it, an athlete's physical training, up above where it is. And as far as your own physical training is concerned, gee, don't be afraid of knocks and bumps now. It doesn't matter how many knocks and bumps and muscles you build now.

Many of you, in handling Effort Processing and so on, have gotten kind of leery of packing in that much effort. Actually, you're effort hungry. You have to waste a lot of effort before you can have any. It really doesn't matter how many knocks and bumps you get.

You ought to do something in life that is rough on you physically-rough to do. Oh, anything – go play handball once in a while or go swimming. That's the accepted method of doing it I've taken up all sorts of things. One of the things I've been doing lately is ride mud-dicycles – murdercycles, they ordinarily call them. And they're quite a fistful – and various things.

The best thing I know of in terms of sheer labor is a yacht, a sailing yacht. I was handling a sailing yacht for a little while. But some years ago, when I was really handling sails and so forth, I used to have a very, very delicate little hand; the beautiful sadness of hand. I was very careful of my hands. I was a writer, you see, and if I bunged up my hands, I couldn't write. They were a couple of athletes that had to be kept in blankets or something of the sort.

And one day I said, „The dickens with this!“ and I went out and started in again, picked up something – I'd done a lot of motorboating earlier, but never any yachting with hawsers, you know, and ratlines and halyards and – gee-whiz.

About three weeks of this and I looked at my hand, what was left of it – rope burns, calluses, and the palm had broadened out almost one finger width. You talk about an unexercised pair of hands, I really had a pair. A bellboy one time – I gave him a tip or something of the sort, and he looked at my hands and he said, „Well, haven't you ever worked at anything?“

I had worked at a lot of things, but I'd just never done any hard work with my hands. Just three weeks of yachting and I got another finger width on the palm.

Well, a motorcycle – it's never gotten any wider, but real tough. And after that, I never had any trouble with my hands typing – never. Just – I just forgot about it and my hands never got tired anymore. I had wasted them, you might say, enough in the body. You can waste in the body, like wasting energy in exercise and banging yourself around and so on. It works, because you're mocking up the waste every time. You're getting the same amount of energy back into it again; you're actually building it up.

Well, an overt line of action which results in bumps and bangs for you in life is apparently desirable – not just tolerable, but apparently desirable. That's the best way in the world to do mock-ups of action is to knock your body around because you're in immediate contact with the state of the body. You could probably pick up other things the same way, if you were really good. You'd admire everything out before it hits.

The way I'd train a bunch of athletes is I would first make them waste bodies like mad until they got so bored with the idea of having to help this body that I would disabuse them of it That's why they have to be retrained all the time. They become careful. Did you ever see a baseball team given new uniforms and immediately lose the game? Well, that's the same thing.

„What are the chronic illnesses that form the 30 percent you mention as not psychosomatic?“

Well, I'm sure you've been asked this question, and you can refer it to the same place I'm going to. This statement is on the authority of Morris Fishcake – I beg your pardon, Fishtwine – Morris Fishtwine. And he has classified that and made that statement and it's been made in many medical books, and it's a fairly standard everybody-knows-that statement, see? And I just took it from there. I took it from authority. And I've never explored it because frankly it's closer to 100 percent.

But it sounds good, and you've got to take a certain amount from the society if you want to agree with it And the doctors all agree with this. Everybody agrees with it I don't know where they got the figure and I don't know what the ills are that are chronic. I've never found one myself, except having one's head removed. I would say that was chronic.

I suppose there's other chronic illnesses. I don't know whether parts of the body will rebuild or not Auditors have hazarded that and they're working on it; they're trying to figure it out Trying to get the third tooth to grow where a tooth's been pulled, trying to get this to happen and that to happen and trying to get a finger to grow, something like that.

People's limbs have lengthened two, three, four inches; their spines have lengthened, their height's grown. And I've seen places on the body fill in where chunks had been pulled out But I haven't seen a whole limb grow, or I haven't seen half a limb grow, I mean, and complete itself and be a full limb again.

I don't know. Possibly something to do with structural pattern or the bud or something has to be implanted along the line or something. One of these days we'll find out what that is and then we'll all have two heads.

„Should a Step V who needs energy and can mock up a flow of energy or generate a flow of energy coming in from the outside or a point use this source of energy continuously as long as it's proving beneficial?“ (Which apparently is.)

Well, I don't know. Any way you solve energy starvation, you solve energy starvation. Except I must say this is a mighty quiet way to do it And I frankly don't think this Step V is mocking up this energy. I just think he's pulling it out of the bank. Pretty soon there won't be any left of the bank; then he'll be a Step VI.

Oh, you sit down during a session – you don't use the energy that comes in, you just sit down during a session and mock up energy.

„The dietitian recommending organic foods claim the function of the MEST body can improve measurably.“

Oh, sure, sure. You can fool the cells into thinking that MEST is important to them. You know, I was going to do this while I was here – I didn't do this – I was going to show you that the MEST body had the same mechanical aspect as a motor by simply bringing a motor and a pretty girl up here and showing you the two. But I didn't do this because I remembered that it wasn't Los Angeles and... (*laughter*)

So, the fact of the matter is that you're running a carbon-oxygen motor. And it runs at 98.6 degrees Fahrenheit, and it has a certain requirement of water and a certain requirement of air, of course – carbon and oxygen. And it's just a motor, and it happens to have a lot of living parts, which each one is a motor. And it just runs. And you pour the gasoline into the tank and you step on the starter – *-pam*. And when you've stepped on the starter, the motor turns over and the drives drive the rear wheel, and the rear wheel goes around and you put it in gear and away she goes.

Carbon-oxygen engine. Same thing as a motor vehicle. There's nothing strange about either one of these except one's a biological engine and the other is running on biology which occurred some millions of years ago. Remember that gasoline is a biological product – not a MEST product.

Alcohol is a biological product, not a MEST product. The only fuel they've run into which is apparently strictly inorganic is the atom bomb. And I'm afraid to look too close at that thing because I'm not real up Tone Scale enough to sit in the middle of one of those blasts yet. The government doesn't tell me, too, when they're going to set one of them off, so I can't make the test. I'll make the test with a preclear one of these days, but... (*laughter*)

„How do you help the preclear to determine what his goal is?“

Well, there is a process known as Future Processing where you merely have the pre-clear start mocking up horrible futures. And all of his goals will shake loose. Just have him mock it up in brackets.

This is the neatest little technique you ever ran into. There are lots of techniques, but you'll find that the first time he says, „Well, I couldn't think of anything in the future like that,“ you say, „Well, get yourself in the future sitting under a tree.“

„Ah, but there's ants.“

So on. You'll find he can't go into the future. Anyway, you just keep mocking it up on gradient scales into the future until he's better and better and better in the future.

And all of a sudden – *pam*. He'll say, „What do you know? I used to be – want to be a Pullman car conductor; that was my prime ambition,“ and so forth. „I guess that's why I've been trying to get you to run birth on me.“

Only reason I said that is because I just thought of it. But it'll show up his goals.

If you wanted to orient somebody on goals and you started looking over an E-Meter, don't look for logical goals. Look for the most ordinary and foolish articles such as automobile tires, wash pans, windows, houses, cats. Cats is even too logical. They're MEST objects – most of them.

I don't think there's a preclear alive who does not have and who cannot give you on the E-Meter a MEST object. It's his goal to be a ____ (and some kind of a MEST object like a diamond ring or a brass spittoon or anything you can think of). The darnedest things.

Every once in a while a preclear will get a sudden startled picture—very, very brilliant, of this beautiful object, and then he doesn't get it anymore. Oh-oh. You just ran into what—the thing that won—that he would be if he could. Oh, this is very interesting.

I ran into a preclear one time that couldn't emanate, because he was trying to be a sun. And you'd think it was semantics, you know, semantically messed up—he was trying to be his mother and father's son. This was not true.

He had just been boiled and baked so solidly and so hard by the sun that the sun had won and, when you ask him to put out flitter, all he could do was kind of try to go into the valence of the sun in order to put out sunbeams. And he didn't have any idea whatsoever of flitter. And, as I say, he was trying to make his flitter do what sunbeams did. And of course it didn't work at all. That's all right. We just processed him some more on SOP 8.

„How do you help him determine what his goal is?“

Well, that's what I say. You can start running just futures in brackets and his goals will show up—easiest way I know of.

„Please elaborate more on Child Scientology and special tricks you've picked up.“

Well, truth of the matter is that one of withdrawing from the child is very interesting. And special mock-ups for the child, as long as you're not giving the child stories, is very interesting. You just give him separate mock-ups. You can process whole classes of children without anybody ever suspecting you're processing them, just by giving them mock-ups. And it's happy—pleasant sort of an undertaking, and they all get well.

As far as special tricks is concerned, the child follows through SOP 8, better, if anything, than an adult. And he just runs beautifully on SOP 8—just gorgeously. You don't really need any special tricks, but just remember this: His attention span is so brief that you may have had his attention span while you are still trying to get his attention. You may have had it the first time.

And what do you do? You just skip it that day. You pick it up the next day. A child's attention span is so tiny. It might go into two minutes, if you're lucky. That's a long attention span for a child.

In the schools, Self Analysis is normally given for about ten minutes. And the total period of processing is about twenty minutes. That's—would be a few minutes to get the children quiet enough to give them the first mock-up, then ten minutes of mock-ups, and then a few minutes giving them the end-of-session processing—the last list in *Self Analysis*.

You could get twenty minutes' worth out of this. It's just terrific, I mean, taking all the steps necessary in returning them to class or sending them out for recess afterwards. Twenty minutes, and that's on children in the third grade.

So what do you expect the attention span of a little baby is? Actually, a little baby will give you quite a bit of attention, but in little brief spans. And the second you try to crowd the

baby to give you more attention, it's just-the baby can't tolerate it. They just don't have the ability to look at you any longer than they look at you.

And parents who will get impatient about this and they'll sit a kid down and they'll start talking to the kid. Well, their act of getting the kid to sit down has normally exhausted the kid's attention span and the kid isn't there all the time they're talking. The kid is just gone; he just can't fix on them. He just disperses all over the place or something.

You sort of have to get it in quick with a kid. You give him some kind of a snap of some sort or something that alerts them. You shake him by the hand – make a motion toward him and shake him by the hand and say, „Can you get a picture of a dog?“ *Thuhhnt!* And then he goes off playing with his toys. He's had his processing for the day.

I've told you about cases that this answers: „How about techniques for processing individual who cannot communicate due to physical...“ (Hey, what do you know?) „... due to physical reasons such as cerebral palsy and mongoloid cases?“

I've told you how to do that In a little section in a recent issue of the *Journal* under a heading, „The Old Man's Case Book,“ I think you've got the data on that.

It's just withdraw – you withdraw from them slightly and make them – make them reach for you. Just wait for them to reach for you and then withdraw slightly, so on. That's the technique. It just doesn't look like much of a technique to you. I know it should be rigged up there with them big wheels run by that big robot But that's the technique. And don't think it isn't effective.

„Do you plan to train auditors specifically for work with children?“

No.

„Is there any material now available for work with children?“

Yeah, SOP 8.

No. I don't plan to train auditors specifically for work with children, mostly because I would have a tendency to get auditors to process children so that auditors would understand auditing, because you can find amongst children, with great rapidity, all of the manifestations you'll find in all older ages. And more than that, you get a great deal of action and you get considerable response and you get a considerable quantity of phenomena.

You ask this kid something or other and it just runs easily. When I use children on this course that's just coming up, it will be for that reason – not to train them how to audit children.

You know there's people think children are a different breed. They're Homo sapiens. Except if their parents have really resisted their survival, they're psychos. And everybody knows children act like that, so nobody pays any attention.

You go down the street here and you see more six-, eight-, ten-, twelve-year-old kids that are strictly batty. They're just not there. They're just not functioning. They're out of coordination. And you say, „Good heavens! Out of a sanitarium, too.“ There's this little kid go-

ing down the street and he's just in a terrifically distracted, disassociated, agitated frame of mind. He's – can't make it.

And the parents say, „Well, if we just beat him up a little bit more, why, he'll get over that nervousness.“

Well, the truth of the matter is the child has a physical imbalance and difficulty with physical controls, so on, up to the age of puberty. People say that puberty keys in all their engrams or something of the sort, and well, this is true, it does that, too, but it also keys in their controls. And it also, many times, will bring them back sanity.

How would you like to live for that many years without any androgen, no glandular extracts to amount to anything, body completely out of – imbalance; it's just unable to function. It hasn't grown up. It's not formed. It's like trying to cross bridges that are still built out of scaffolding. You get the idea. So they don't hang together well.

And then people start punching them around because they don't handle themselves well. They spill things or they fall down or something happens to the child, and then people got to punish the child and – to make them listen. And the child is in this world of giants, and he just goes crazy, that's all. And they think, „Well, that's the way children act. You see these kids out there playing, hitting each other over the head with dubs and so forth.“

And you look at these kids – and the parents say, „Well, that's just the way they play. I mean, just like children. That's normal.“ Well, it may be normal, but it's not good.

You'll see a bunch of kids that are in good shape. If you can get a kid out of hysterical merry-go-round for a short time – just isolate him for a little while, give him some space and give him a little bit of comm – all of a sudden, he'll heave a sigh of relief and he'll start to get healthy and he'll start to grow and he'll get cheerful about life and he'll get pleasant and he can handle his body. He stops falling on his face. But you leave him in hysteria and punishment and upset and being responsible for all...

How would you like to go around – supposing you were unable to carry a glass of water and you knew you would get beaten if you spilled it? And people made you carry it and you kept spilling it. And yet you had to be responsible for this glass of water, but you couldn't manage it or handle it? You'd get pretty daffy after a while. Well, it's that situation in all of its guises which is faced by all children and which has been faced by all preclears.

Children aren't sane in the run. You have to be a pretty good auditor to audit children. You have to be a lot of person to handle kids. You can't be any sissy to handle kids. They just don't respond to it at all.

I don't know how you do it. You just say, Tour attention, please.“ And they kind of come out that way. And then you suddenly say, „Pow, pow, pow,“ whatever you want them to do and so forth. And they do it. And they're squared around. And you've audited them. And that's about that. It's terrifically fast results. But it's like processing in an insane asylum, except it's very, very pleasant and very cheerful, and they're really not crazy. They just can't get aligned. Boy, do they do weird things as thetans, too. Fabulous!

And then every once in a while this kid comes into the sudden realization that he's sorry; his difficulty is just handling the body and he'll look at you kind of embarrassed and he knows he's not a kid. And he's known that off and on all the time. You can spin almost any kid by asking him, „Who are you, really?“ And he'll look kind of haunted. Because very early in life, they have straight recall, except nobody validates it. And they don't think it's odd and they never mention it.

One little girl walked up to a parson one day in the church, and she was five years old and she was carrying just a little bag, her doll in her other hand. And she says, „Sir, would you please call Townsend,“ (a town near there) „and find out if my husband and children are all right.“ And he did. The description she gave him, the names she gave him, everything is fine. She'd never been up there.

And he came back and told her, „They're fine.“

„I'm so glad; I was so worried about them,“ and immediately became a five-year-old child.

They have a lot of these cases on record. This person just had a little bit of responsibility for leaving those eight kids behind and dying at the age of forty-five or something without raising all of them.

„How would you handle a displaced person who suffered severe trauma in concentration camps, but does not appear to be psychotic? Oh, they act with extreme hostility and aggression, have very low frustrat....“

Oh, you've got a case of terrific starvation and every other thing. Just enclosed space and nothing you can do about it. You might as well ask, „What do you do with a person who has been put in a penitentiary by the government?“ What do you do for them?

They're in a situation of fixed space. So you've got to unfix the spatial situation. And how do you do that? Just get them to put out and pull in anchor points. SOP 8, Six Steps to Better Beingness, SOP 8-L.

„Please differentiate between anchor points, dimension points and terminals.“

Terminals is the end of a communication line or it's a communication line potential. In other words, this is a terminal – this is a terminal because it's – even though it weren't connected, it would still be a terminal, because it has a communication potential, so on.

An anchor point – these pieces of paper which I have here, you might look on them at once as anchor points, your anchor points and terminals, because they're talking – these pieces of paper. And when you get an anchor point – an anchor point is something which encloses an extremity of a certain space.

A dimension point would of course do the same thing, but you get masses of dimension points. Therefore you get form. But you could call, as I did in the Doctorate Courses, anchor points dimension points, because any point encloses an extremity of an individual space. That's true, isn't it?

Male voice: Viewpoint.

Well, a viewpoint is just a geographical location within space which does or does not have any physical point connected with it. A viewpoint can be completely missing as far as anything with which to view is concerned. This is a viewpoint. There's no point there, but it could be a viewpoint. That isn't tough.

You just look at viewpoint of dimension and get those anchor points pinned out there and you'll see then if you pushed them all together, you would have mass. And this mass, of course, you could say at that moment, was being made out of dimension points.

But every one of those things is a terminal, too, because it's a point from which potentially you could communicate. But you know what I'm talking about. It's just a point. What are you doing? We're just trying to classify classes of points. A point is a point. A point doesn't have mass or it does have mass. Well, that's the critical description of a point. A point either has no mass – which is, the most it could be would be a potential of mass. It's not tough. Okay.

„How does an aberrated thetan arrive at the conclusion that he is nothing in the physical universe?“

I don't know. Sometime run some Nothing, and that question would be immediately answered. That's all. It's just space is nothing, and that's the first thing he's run into, and that's lots of it, and he's space, and he just identified himself as nothing.

Actually, he is something in connection with the physical universe but he's not what we have in the physical universe that we call a physical something. We call a physical something M-E-S-T and he's not any one of these things. So therefore, he's nothing. But he can be something; he can create something.

„What do you do exactly to establish what the pc will accept?“

Oh, you're having an awful time with that. All you have to do – all you have to do is just start feeding him the most loathsome things you can think of, and at the moment when a pleased smile comes over his face, you've got it.

You can't think of things loathsome enough to be acceptable to a lot of people that you'd run into down here in the street. And they'll just sort of boredly take them. Well, don't think you've got to pep it up or make it more exciting; make it more dull, if anything, and just more gruesome.

For instance, you'll find out that somebody couldn't accept beer, but they might accept warm beer. Now they're getting a little bit more interesting. And now they might accept warm beer with ground glass in it – vaguely acceptable. Beer with strychnine in it, and they start to smile.

Well, beer with strychnine and several unmentionable things in it, „Gee, that's real good, yeah!“ I mean, how did they say it's real good? You just get the fact that this mock-up moves in.

You see, they just accept the mock-up and they're very pleased about it and they're very – quite relieved about it. And they can keep mocking them up and they're mocking it up, mocking it up.

All of a sudden they say, „I’m not interested in that anymore.“ Well, they’ve actually gotten bored with it They had a hunger for it.

But when I say, „for *if*– take alcohol. All right We get an alcoholic down the street We say, „All right Mock up some alcohol.“

„Yeah.“

„Well, let’s mock up some bad alcohol.“

„How bad?“

„Oh, denatured alcohol“ Well, he can accept it see, so on.

This fellow by the way is drinking, all the time, wine; or he’s drinking good, good gin; or he’s drinking perfectly good alcohol. That’s what he’s drinking. But we’re looking at what his acceptance level is. He can’t get his acceptance level because the society would frown at him and people are preventing him from actually taking what he would – what he would accept in the form of alcohol.

You finally get down to the line, and you say, „Well, get canned heat“ Yeah, he’s getting real pleased now. See, that’s poison, strictly.

„Canned heat. All right.“

„Now, let’s get canned heat and let’s put some unmentionable quantities in it“ That’s him. *Tsk* Boy, there’s where you get the entering wedge of his acceptance of alcohol.

And you just start running this for a while and he’ll get up to the point – and the next time he goes out – here’s what’s interesting: The next time he goes out to have a drink, something like mat why, he’ll look around and he’ll look at all this stuff he’s been drinking – that was not acceptable to him.

Well, now his acceptance level’s gone way up, and he’ll say, „Well, gee, don’t you have something special, something really special, something this way or something that way?“ He’ll be quite particular.

And he gets so he doesn’t care quite so much about who’s looking at him. But you can raise his acceptance level up.

What’s the acceptance level of alcohol for an alcoholic? Well, it’s certainly canned heat or lower because that’s all you can – all he’s got left that he’s trying to resist – is completely poison alcohol.

Okay. Let’s take a break.