

PHOENIX LECTURES

Colour, Print (suitable for print) (CP, Colour, Print)

Compiled 6. February 2010

a) Table of Contents, in Checkcheet order:

1. GENERAL BACKGROUND PART I.....	1
2. DUPLICATION: RELIGIOUS ASPECTS OF SCIENTOLOGY.....	9
3. GENERAL BACKGROUND PART II.....	9
4. GENERAL BACKGROUND PART III.....	17
5. CONSIDERATION, MECHANICS AND THE THEORY BEHIND INSTRUCTION.....	25
6. CONSIDERATION AND ISNESS.....	33
7. ISNESS.....	41
8. THE FOUR CONDITIONS OF EXISTENCE PART I.....	49
9. THE FOUR CONDITIONS OF EXISTENCE PART II.....	57
10. THE FOUR CONDITIONS OF EXISTENCE PART III.....	65
11. THE FOUR CONDITIONS OF EXISTENCE PART IV.....	73
12. THE FOUR CONDITIONS OF EXISTENCE PART V.....	81
13. TIME.....	89
14. AXIOMS PART I.....	97
15. AXIOMS PART II.....	107
16. AXIOMS PART III.....	117
17. AXIOMS-PART IV.....	127
18. TWO-WAY COMM AND THE PRESENT TIME PROBLEM.....	137
19. TYPES OF PROCESSES.....	147
20. OPENING PROCEDURE OF 8-C.....	157
21. OPENING PROCEDURE BY DUPLICATION PART I.....	167
22. OPENING PROCEDURE BY DUPLICATION PART II.....	175
23. THE IMPORTANCE OF TWO-WAY COMM DURING OPENING PROCEDURE BY DUPLICATION.....	183
24. GRANTING BEINGNESS.....	195
25. VIEWPOINT STRAIGHTWIRE.....	203
26. REMEDY OF HAVINGNESS AND SPOTTING SPOTS IN SPACE.....	219
27. DESCRIPTION PROCESSING.....	229
28. GROUP PROCESSING.....	237
29. SCIENTOLOGY AND LIVING.....	247

b) Table of Contents, in chronological order:

1.	54-05-03	VIEWPOINT STRAIGHTWIRE	203
2.	54-05-31	OPENING PROCEDURE BY DUPLICATION PART I	167
3.	54-05-31	OPENING PROCEDURE BY DUPLICATION PART II	175
4.	54-06-01	GRANTING BEINGNESS	195
5.	54-07-00	TIME	89
6.	54-07-00	TYPES OF PROCESSES	147
7.	54-07-04	SCIENTOLOGY AND LIVING	247
8.	54-07-06	REMEDY OF HAVINGNESS AND SPOTTING SPOTS IN SPACE	219
9.	54-07-19	DUPLICATION: RELIGIOUS ASPECTS OF SCIENTOLOGY	9
10.	54-07-19	GENERAL BACKGROUND PART II	9
11.	54-07-19	GENERAL BACKGROUND PART I	1
12.	54-07-19	GENERAL BACKGROUND PART III	17
13.	54-07-20	CONSIDERATION AND ISNESS	33
14.	54-07-20	CONSIDERATION, MECHANICS AND THE THEORY BEHIND INSTRUCTION	25
15.	54-07-23	ISNESS	41
16.	54-07-23	THE FOUR CONDITIONS OF EXISTENCE PART II	57
17.	54-07-23	THE FOUR CONDITIONS OF EXISTENCE PART V	81
18.	54-07-23	THE FOUR CONDITIONS OF EXISTENCE PART I	49
19.	54-07-23	THE FOUR CONDITIONS OF EXISTENCE PART III	65
20.	54-07-23	THE FOUR CONDITIONS OF EXISTENCE PART IV	73
21.	54-07-26	OPENING PROCEDURE OF 8-C	157
22.	54-07-26	TWO-WAY COMM AND THE PRESENT TIME PROBLEM	137
23.	54-07-28	DESCRIPTION PROCESSING	229
24.	54-07-28	GROUP PROCESSING	237
25.	54-08-20	AXIOMS PART I	97
26.	54-08-20	AXIOMS PART II	107
27.	54-08-20	AXIOMS PART III	117
28.	54-08-20	AXIOMS-PART IV	127
29.	54-12-03	THE IMPORTANCE OF TWO-WAY COMM DURING OPENING PROCEDURE BY DUPLICATION	183

c) Table of Contents, in alphabetical order:

1. AXIOMS PART I.....	97
2. AXIOMS PART II.....	107
3. AXIOMS PART III.....	117
4. AXIOMS-PART IV.....	127
5. CONSIDERATION AND ISNESS.....	33
6. CONSIDERATION, MECHANICS AND THE THEORY BEHIND INSTRUCTION	25
7. DESCRIPTION PROCESSING.....	229
8. DUPLICATION: RELIGIOUS ASPECTS OF SCIENTOLOGY	9
9. GENERAL BACKGROUND PART II.....	9
10. GENERAL BACKGROUND PART I.....	1
11. GENERAL BACKGROUND PART III.....	17
12. GRANTING BEINGNESS	195
13. GROUP PROCESSING	237
14. ISNESS.....	41
15. OPENING PROCEDURE BY DUPLICATION PART I	167
16. OPENING PROCEDURE BY DUPLICATION PART II	175
17. OPENING PROCEDURE OF 8-C.....	157
18. REMEDY OF HAVINGNESS AND SPOTTING SPOTS IN SPACE.....	219
19. SCIENTOLOGY AND LIVING.....	247
20. THE FOUR CONDITIONS OF EXISTENCE PART II.....	57
21. THE FOUR CONDITIONS OF EXISTENCE PART V	81
22. THE FOUR CONDITIONS OF EXISTENCE PART I.....	49
23. THE FOUR CONDITIONS OF EXISTENCE PART III.....	65
24. THE FOUR CONDITIONS OF EXISTENCE PART IV	73
25. THE IMPORTANCE OF TWO-WAY COMM DURING OPENING PROCEDURE BY DUPLICATION.....	183
26. TIME	89
27. TWO-WAY COMM AND THE PRESENT TIME PROBLEM	137
28. TYPES OF PROCESSES	147
29. VIEWPOINT STRAIGHTWIRE	203

General Background

Part I

7-ACC-25A, PRO-3

A lecture given on 19 July 1954

I'm giving you a lecture now on Scientology, its general background, as it might be known to man. Scientology is of course a word which you might say is Anglocized. We know what science means. We know that science means truth or wisdom, and we know what ology means. Anybody knows that, that means study. But this does not mean the study of science. This means the study of wisdom, which is about as close as you can get, as a straight definition, unless you said "wisdomology". Or unless you said Scientology is wisdom. And you said that what you were practicing was wisdom. If you said this clearly that would make a more definite point than saying you were practicing Scientology. But in the essence of the word, it is not talking about science, it's just that the western world recognizes in the word science something close to a truth.

Now we have the derivation of Scientology being scio, which means knowingness in the fullest sense of the word. And that is the reason why this Scientology was put together. It's the most emphatic word that existed in western languages, romance languages, which includes of course Latin, one of the roots of English. And it's a very emphatic statement of know. It's knowingness in the fullest sense of the word. It's not otherwise qualified.

Now you notice it isn't science-tology. It might have been better stated as scio-tology, but again that is not close enough to English. So we use a word which is fairly easy to say, which is simply Scientology.

You notice here that for a long while we have not used the word Dianetics, not because Dianetics does not belong to the HAS, it does. One hundred percent. It is a mental therapy, and says so in its own title. It says, "Dianetics." The derivation of that word was dianous, with an English engineering twist on it, etics. Which mean no more and no less than through mind. Well in view of the fact that the western world thinks of mind as something that mental cases have and other things, we weren't particularly interested in continuing to concentrate upon this thing called mind, although mind is a perfectly useful word. But look at this. Through mind.

In Scientology we're not going through mind. We're talking about knowledge. So Dianetics was a mental therapy. There is no doubt about that. And there is no doubt about it that it is a very legitimate ancestor of Scientology. But Scientology is a thing of considerable

amplitude. Where Dianetics was a very narrow thing indeed. And Dianetics belonged in the world of psychology. And Scientology does not belong in the world of psychology, and is not an advanced psychology, and cannot be defined in the framework of psychology. Psychology is an Anglocized word, not necessarily its root words, because today we find that psychology is composited from psyche and ology. And psyche is mind or soul, but leading psychological texts begin very, very carefully by saying that today the word does not refer to the mind, or to the soul. To quote one, "It has to be studied by its own history, since it no longer refers to the soul, nor even to the mind." So we don't know that psychology refers to. It simply got lost. And so we have to step out and take a word which actually means what it means, which is a study of knowingness, a study of wisdom. We have to take that word because that is what we are doing.

Now philosophically there is a word called epistemology. But epistemology is quite separate from ontology, another word in the same category as epistemology. Matter is considered to be separate in philosophy. Matter is considered one direction, thought in another direction, and so on. In other words, we are already looking at a cloudy vocabulary when we look at the field of western philosophy. In fact, nowhere in the west can we find any qualifications for a study which assumes to reach the highest possible level of knowledge which can be attained by man or life.

We find nowhere in the western world a word, or a tradition, which will embrace Scientology, which makes a difficulty for an auditor when he is trying to communicate to people in the society around him, since they want to know what Scientology is, and then he speaks to them without this tradition. They assume that the word psychology embraces all sorts of eccentricities found in mental behavior. They assume this, so they could not possibly understand how anything could be said to exceed or not be the same as psychology. And they are left in the dilemma of non-recognition. You have not communicated when you have said, "We study wisdom." You see, if you just said that they would say, "Oh yes, that's very well. I did that in the third grade."

Now in view of the fact that you go out of communication in a society which has no standard of communication on the subject about which you are talking, it is therefore necessary to resort to various shifts in trying to describe what you are doing. You have to find the background which actually leads to an understanding of your subject. Now there have been many ways that this could be accomplished. But before we worry about that too much, let's take up something that is quite important to us, and is not limited by any ignorance that we discover in western civilization.

Let us take up probably ten thousand years of study on the part of man, of the identity of god or gods, the possibility of truth, the inner track mystery of all mysteries. In other words, the mystery of life itself, and we find that for ten thousand years, which figure by the way does not agree today with certain historians, but then they don't know much of the data I am talking to you about. But for about ten thousand years that we know of, man has been on this track. We find that the material which is extant, even in western civilization, and in Asia, has gathered to itself an enormous verbiage, you might say. There's somewhere between, and I think it would be adventurous to state an exact number, but there's somewhere between a

hundred and twenty-five thousand and a hundred and fifty thousand books which have been written, and which comprise the Veda and Buddhist libraries. Now that's a lot of books. Of course some of them are very, very short, but here is a tremendous amount of data.

Now if all this data is in existence, then why doesn't the western world know more about this data? We have to go back and take a little look at what happened about ten thousand years ago. Of course that's rather cloudy, too. You could probably straight wire it, but let's put it into the field of anthropology, rather into the field of study or history. And we discover that perhaps much earlier than ten thousand years ago there was a division of peoples here on Earth. The division point was evidently the Ural Mountains. I am talking to you now from material given to me by the professor of ethnology at Princeton University, where I studied. And I have no more data than he gave me, and have no further qualification than this, except the man was an expert in his own field. And what he said seemed quite reasonable to me, and so I am saying it to you.

There was evidently a split of races somewhere in the vicinity of the Ural Mountains. Evidently part of the population which is now in the northern hemisphere went east, and part of it went west. The borning spot of the human race has been variously disputed, but if we don't worry about the borning spot, we just say that is more or less what occurred at that time, that there was a sharp division. And that part of the northern hemisphere's peoples went east, and part of them went west. We discover that a singular difference of personality occurred, which is, in the northern hemisphere, the most observable difference.

The people who went into the Steppes, into the Gobi, into China, India and into the various islands were evidently faced by an enormous chain of deserts. They were faced by privations of great magnitude. And they developed a philosophy of enduring. That was the keynote, because that was what their environment demanded of them. They had to endure. And so we find these races colored in a certain way so as to thwart the onslaught of sun and snow. We find them without protection naturally in their environment, and therefore we find them able to survive long after those who went in the opposite direction. This is a peculiarity. A Chinese, for instance, float on a raft off the Cape Horn during the war, had been on the raft for eighty days without food and water, and was picked up off the raft and wondered why they bundled him in blankets. And as soon as he could manage it; he had been on a British vessel which had been torpedoed; as soon as he could manage it he threw off the blankets, and went up and reported to the cook shack, and went to work. He had been a cook on a vessel which had been torpedoed. Eighty days without food and water, awash on a raft in the South Pacific. In other words, he had learned how to endure.

And so it is. Their colorations, their customs and so on, are different from ours just to the degree that they can survive in tremendously arduous surroundings. And the surroundings of those lands is arduous. It is a very arduous land indeed. They are; those races that are there are able to endure. And if you said anything about them, this is certainly a clear statement. They also are tremendously practical. Their practicality is such as to stagger a white man. The explanations that they will suddenly and innocently voice to a query are always of such sweeping simplicity that they leave a white man standing there staring, with a slack jaw.

Now the races which went in the opposite direction from the Urals evidently went into a country which had a heavy forestation. It had a great deal of game. And the philosophy of the western world became that of striking a hard blow. If you could strike a blow of great magnitude, hard enough and fast enough, you could kill game and so you could live. Because of the vegetation, and because of many other factors, they did not particularly need coloration. Their own customs did not need to be as thoroughly practical, and they were able to dispose of their lives much more easily, you might say, since food was plentiful, as it was not in Asia. And we discover the western philosophy building up on the behavior pattern of striking a hard blow. Get in there quick, hit hard, your game drops, and you eat. And beyond that, not very much thought or practicality.

Now however the truth of this may be, here certainly is something which is said to have preceded a period of ten thousand years ago. It might or might not have truth, we care nothing about that, but it is a very fast explanation of this. And we discover immediately, as we look at these two worlds, that one of these worlds having to endure, being faced with enormous privation, would of course develop a certain patience and an ability to philosophize. An ability to think. It would take a long time for anyone to think all the way through something. And a man who is merely accustomed to striking a hard blow is not likely to think all the way through something.

When we are up against philosophy we are, fortunately or unfortunately, up against an Asian tradition. This is a tradition which is not necessarily that of colored peoples or strangers. This by the way would come as a great shock to people in the western world to discover that in India the ruling caste is quite as white as any Norseman. This would be of great interest to them, and is something which comes as rather a shock to an individual throughout that area. Well they have, because they have a tradition of enduring, they have preserved records. Therefore we do not know what went on in North America. We can only guess. We do not know what went on in South America. There are a few ruins kicking around, but beyond this we don't know very much. We get down into the Mediterranean basin and we discover that there was a certain traffic with Asia, and therefore there is quite a bit known about the Mediterranean basin. This philosophy of endurance and so forth came through into the Middle East. Very poorly, but it was to be found there. The records of Europe we can hold in tremendous question. They do not know where or when they had ice ages. They actually cannot trace from one millennia to the next who was where and owned what. Every now and then they have to write a history, so everybody sits down, gets in a good state of agreement, and writes a history, to such an extent that Voltaire dubbed history a Mississippi of lies.

Now where the western world is concerned, we have records which go back probably, written records we say, on Earth thirty-five hundred years. Well this may or may not be true. But certainly the schools in the western world teach us that we can go back that far with written records. And they go back to Isis. I think; I've forgotten what particular reign, Egyptian dynasty. And they have found records in that particular area, and they hold these up as being very old. But be very careful, be very, very careful that you do not leave the western world, if you are looking for early records. Be very careful about that.

In order to have a blackout of history and a blackout of knowledge, you would have to stay on this side of the Ural Mountains. You go across them, and you discover no such blackout. You discover a tradition of wisdom which reaches back about ten thousand years. And that is the oldest trace that we have. Now true enough, we don't necessarily have to recognize that there are written works any older than any anthropologist in the western world knows about. It does happen, however, that there is a set of hymns, which I would love to give you the favorite western figure which puts them after Egyptian. But it doesn't happen to be the case. They, as far as I can remember, it was about eighty-two hundred and twelve BC when these things were introduced into the societies of Earth.

They are hymns. And it would seem that if we spoke of hymns then these would contain then mostly modes or rites of worship, since they were religious. But that would only be our western interpretation of what is religious. These were religious hymns. But they are our earliest debt in Scientology. Our earliest debt, because the very early hymns contain much that we know today checks against what we have re-discovered, or what we have followed back to. And this material includes such a common thing as the cycle of action of the MEST universe, known to you in Scientology as the cycle of action. And this is contained in, I think, the Hymn to the Dawn Child. Various captioned and translated by western translators, but always this information is there. Furthermore we find in that same set of hymns the theory of evolution brought forward a hundred years ago, or slightly less, by Charles Darwin. In fact, as we look at these hymns we discover almost any information you want to discover later, whether you call it science, or Christian Science, or what you want to do. Here is a tremendous body of knowledge. They are supposed to have come forward in spoken tradition, memorized, from generation to generation, and finally to have been set down. Now this is a western interpretation of what happened to them. I would not here to say whether this is true or false, but I can tell you that today these hymns are still in existence, but they are very hard to acquire in the western world. You have to find the specialized translations of them. And they are studied as *curiosa* more than anything else. But we do not know what sciences would suddenly open their doors should someone sit down and begin to study the Veda. We don't know what would happen. But it's a very strange thing that information seems to have leaked from that direction, into the Middle East, and into Europe rather constantly over the thousands of years.

Man is fond of believing that yesterday's man was unable to walk, to travel, to move. We find however in our western libraries a book called *The Travels of Marco Polo*. And everyone is quite surprised that a white man was serving Kublai Kahn in that age. Well that was an unthinkable early age. But we discover that Tamerlane had in his court an Arabian known as Eban Batuta, who had just completed a series of books about his journeyings and travels throughout Europe and Africa and Asia. We don't discover that man had any great difficulty in getting around. That's the truth of the matter. He did not have a great deal of difficulty in getting around. He had as late as twelve hundred certainly, he had horses. And horses can go almost anywhere. He was able to make his way here and there across the surface of Earth, and naturally where you get this you get a transplantation of information.

For instance today, anyone who knows China discovers nothing very strange in Italian cookery. And you would not discover it very strange that Italian cookery suddenly came into

being and took place shortly after the return of Marco Polo, and many other travellers who had been in the same area. Just because one wrote about it is no reason a lot of people weren't there. It is always a matter of astonishment to some member of the Explorer's Club to pick up all the information he needs about an area, which is new, wild, and completely unexplored, from the white man or the Chinese, particularly the Chinese, who has been living there for the last forty years. And yet, the explorer brings back the information and publishes it in journals, and makes it available to people. The information collected by that white man on the ground was probably merely told to his family when he got home, and it was not broadly broadcast. So we have to recognize that certain information is broadcast broadly, and some is merely carried around. And so there'd be two categories of spreading information around. Marco Polo and Eban Batuta happened to be writers. And like writers, they wrote. But that is no reason why they were the only people in motion during the last thirty-five hundred years.

So it is no wonder that we discover the various wisdoms of Egypt appearing as the earliest wisdoms of Greece. It is no wonder why we look into the christian bibles and find ourselves reading the Egyptian Book of the Dead. It's no wonder that we look into the middle of the romantic period of Europe and find that the Arabian Nights had just been translated, and discover that European literature did a complete revolution at that point.

Now I'm not stressing the fact that nothing has ever been thought up in Europe. Yes, yes, lot of things have been thought up in Europe. But Europe has made tremendous strides forward, immediately that its doors were opened to eastern information, because the eastern tradition is you can sit and think. And sometimes somebody in the western world is reminded of this. And when he's reminded of it, he is struck by the fact that he can sit down and think, too. And if we have been taught anything, it is the patience of the east which permitted itself to stop acting long enough to find out how and why. And it's that tradition alone to which we are most indebted to Asia.

But are we indebted to Asia? Is it to Asia at all, or is it merely to man on this planet who, breaking into two halves you might say, went east and went west. The common ancestors of man. All of us have the same potentials, but it happens that the information which has been collected over the years is available in Asia. It has not been preserved in the western world. Therefore we look to such things as the Veda. We look to such things as the Buddhist texts, to the Tao Te Ching, and other materials of this character from Asia to carry forward to us information of the past. Who knows but what these materials did not come out of Europe in the first place and go over to Asia? We could follow a very dubious track in all directions, but we do know as we sit here in the western world, that man has a tradition of wisdom which goes back about ten thousand years, which is very positively traceable. And we find Scientology's earliest, certainly known ancestor in the Veda.

The Veda is a very, very interesting work, as I just told you. It is a study of the whereins and whereases, and who made it and why. It is a religion. It should not be confused as anything else but a religion. And the very word Veda simply means lookingness or knowingness. That is all it means. And that is all it has ever meant, lookingness, knowingness.

And so we can look back across a certain span of time, across a great many minds, and into a great many places where man has been able to sit still long enough to think, through

this oldest record and find where it joins up with the present, and to what we in Scientology are rightly indebted. For to say that out of whole cloth, and with no background, that a westerner such as myself should suddenly develop all you need to know to do the thing they were trying to do, is an incredible and an unbelievable and an untrue statement. Had the information of the Veda not been available to me, if I had not had a very sharp cognizance of earlier information on this whole track, and if at the same time I had never been trained in an American university which gave me a background of science, there could not have been enough understanding of the western world to apply anything eastern to. And we would have simply had the eastern world again. But the western world has to hit with a punch. It has to produce an effect. It has to get there. Nobody urged Asia to get there. You could sit on a mountaintop for a thousand years and it was perfectly alright with everybody in the whole neighborhood. They'd pick you up for vagrancy in the west.

So we combined the collective wisdom of all those ages with a sufficient impatience and urgency, a sufficiency of scientific methodology, and I think by the way that Gautama Sakyamuni probably had a better command of scientific methodology than any of your chairs of science in western universities. We have to depend though upon this scientific methodology and mathematics, and so forth, to catalyze and bring to a head the ambition of ten thousand years of thinking men. And if I have added anything to this at all, it has simply been the urgency necessary to arrive, which was fairly well lacking in the eastern world.

Duplication: Religious Aspects Of Scientology

also called

General Background

Part II

7-ACC-24, PRO-2

A lecture given on 19 July 1954

Continuing with this lecture, we have then the earliest known material being the Veda. Very, very little actually has arrived in the western world of any of this work, either the Vedantic, Bodhistic, any of these works. Very, very little of them have been translated. There's as I said, between a hundred and twenty-five thousand, a hundred and fifty thousand sacred books. That would take somebody a long time to get through, so lord knows exactly what is in these books.

But the Veda itself means simply knowingness or sacred lore. And don't think that that is otherwise than a synonym. Knowingness has always been considered sacred lore. It has never been otherwise than sacred lore. And it's only been in the western world, which is just growing up just now, where you had sacred lore hanging on so long as a superstition. But we will get into that in just a moment.

Now the Veda, should you care to look it over, is best read of course in a literal translation from Sanskrit. And there are four major divisions of the Veda. They're all of them quite worth while, as much as you could pick up of them. And as I say, a great deal of our material in Scientology is discovered right back there. So this makes the earliest part of Scientology sacred lore.

Alright, now the next written work, which is supposed to be the oldest written work, according to various friends of mine, is a book called The Book of Job. It is an Indian book, and it is quite ancient. It probably pre-dates quite a bit that is called early Egyptian. And we

discover that this book of Job contained in it simply the laborings, sufferings and necessity for patience of one man faced with a somewhat capricious god. Now other such works like the Book of Job are scattered on along the time track, and are known to us here in the western world as sacred works. They are thought to have come to us from the Middle East, but that would be a very short look. That is something like your preclear who can only see with certainty a spot in the room, but not a spot out in the street. It would just be the distance tolerable. Actually we're looking at the Middle East as a relay point, and as we think of wisdom we have to think for the western world of the Middle East as a relay point. A relay point by the way, from India and from Africa into Europe. And as you see, it follows a trade route in both directions. And so you have the roadways of the world, you might say, crossing through the Middle East. So we would expect such things as the Book of Job to turn up in the Middle East as holy. You would expect such things as the Book of the Dead of the Egyptians to turn up in the Middle East as part of the New Testament. And so on. There could be a great deal of argument about this. Someone who is passionately devoted to practice, rather than wisdom; there are two different things here that embrace religion; would argue with you. But you're not interested in arguing on that line, because we can make this very, very clear differentiation right here and now. The word religion itself can embrace sacred lore, wisdom, knowingness of gods and souls and spirits, which could be called with a very loose use of the word, a philosophy. So we could say there is religious philosophy and there is religious practice.

Now religious practice could take the identical source, and by interpretation put it into effect, and so create various churches, all dependent upon the identical source, such as Saint Luke. If we think of the number of christian churches there are, and we look at this one book, Saint Luke, and realize that just this one book, Saint Luke was productive of Baptists, Methodists, Episcopalians, Catholics, and here we go. We have this tremendous number of practices basic upon one wisdom. So let's get a very clear differentiation here when we talk about religious philosophy, and religious practice. And someone who comes to you and says, "So and so and so and so and so is actually the way you're supposed to worship god," you can very cleanly and very clearly and very suddenly bring him to a halt by merely mentioning to him that he is talking about religious practice, and you are talking about religious philosophy.

Now just coming down the track in a little more orderly fashion we get now to the Tao Teh King, which is known to us in the western world as Taoism in China. And we may have heard of this religious practice in China. Well Taoism as currently practiced today may or may not ever have heard of the Tao Teh King. See, it may or may not ever have connected, but we are certainly talking about religious philosophy when we mention the Tao Teh King.

Now it was written by Lao Tse in approximately, oh I'd say probably about 530 or 529 BC. Something around that period. He wrote it just before he disappeared forever. And his birth and death dates are traditionalized as 604 born to 531 died, BC both cases. Now this is the next important milestone in the roadway of knowledge itself. And we have there the Tao.

Now what was the Tao? It meant the way to solving the mystery which underlies all mysteries. This was the way to resolve the mystery of mysteries. It wasn't simply the way. The western world thinks of it as the way, and they don't know quite whether we're talking about the way of life of something like that, but I would suppose this would only be the case

if they were unfamiliar with the book itself. It is a book, and it was written by this man, when ordered to do so by the gatekeeper before the gatekeeper would let him leave the city. Lao Tse was a very obscure fellow, very little was known about him. His main passion was obscurity, and he started to leave town one day, and the gatekeeper turned him around and told him he could not leave town until he went home and he wrote this book. This book is a very short book. It's about, I don't know how many characters I've seen. I've seen it in Chinese, it must not be more than maybe five thousand, six thousand characters. A very short book, and he merely wrote down his philosophy on this, and gave it to the gatekeeper and disappeared. And he went out the gate. That was the last we ever hear of Lao Tse.

But the pronunciations I'm giving you by the way are the pronunciations which I heard around me as a boy. They are not necessarily the proper western pronunciation, since we have agreed to mispronounce, and so has everyone agreed to mispronounce on ten thousand years of track.

Well, when we have this book, we begin to see that somebody is trying to go somewhere without going on something. We have the western world defining this as teaching conformity with the cosmic order, and teaching simplicity in social and political organization. Well this in essence was what it laid down. And this would be a very finite goal for it, but this was actually not the Tao. The Tao simply said you can solve the mystery that lies behind all mysteries, and this more or less would be the way you might go about it. But of course what you're trying to solve itself does not possess the mechanics which you believe to be inherent to the other kinds of problems which you solve. It says that a man could seek his Taohood in various ways, but he would have to practice and live in a certain way in order to achieve Taohood.

Now there's no reason to belabor this any further, but it would amaze you that this book is a very civilized piece of work. It would be the kind of civilized work which you would expect maybe to appear from very, very educated, extremely compassionate, pleasant people of a higher intellectual order than we're accustomed to reading. It is a very fine book. I mean, it's not; it's worded simple, it's sort of naive, and it tells you that you should be simple and economical, and should do this and that. And that is, by the way, about the only flaw there is in it from a Scientological point of view. That you must be economical. That one is a little off the groove. But the rest of the way, who knows but what if we took the Tao, just as written, and knowing what we know already about Scientology we simply set out to practice the Tao, I don't know but what we wouldn't get a theta clear. I'm not sure about this, but it actually is merely a set of directions on how you would go down this way, which itself has no path and no distance. In other words it teaches you that you had better get out of space and get away from objects in order to get any consciousness of the beingness as things are. And it tells you that if you can do this then you'd know the whole answer and you'd be all set. And what do we do in Scientology?

Now Tao means knowingness. That is the literal translation of the word, if you want to translate it that way. In other words it's an ancestor to the word Scientology, just as such. Scientology is also a study of how to know. It's the science of knowing how to know. The Tao is

the way to knowing how to know, but it isn't said that way, it's inverted. It said it is the way to achieve the mystery which lies back of all mysteries.

Now however crude this might seem to somebody who was specialized in the Tao, that's really all we need to know about it, except this one thing. There is a principle known as Wu-Wei. Now it could be called Wu-wai, but I've heard it mostly Wu-way, which is odd because it goes right in with the Tao, which also means the way. Alright, it's Wu-Wei. Now as you are probably vaguely familiar with a practice known as judo or jiu jitsu, this is a principle which crudely applies to action more or less in that fashion. But let's take a look at this and let's find out that it's non-assertion or non-compulsion, and that is right there in the Tao. Self determinism. You let them use their self determinism. A little later on with judo they found out that if you let a man be self determined enough you could lick him every time. Well, that was outside the scope, actually, of the Tao. But that's an interesting fact to find sitting there as one of the practices which emanated from the Tao. That's the Tao Teh King. You would call it probably normally Tao Teh King. I don't know why they spell it with a T, I've never heard it called anything but Tao.

Well it must have been that there were a lot of very, very clever people on Earth at that time because we find in the lifetime of Lao Tse one called Confucius, of whom you have heard so much. But unfortunately Confucius evidently never wrote a single word. Confucius is reported by those who were around him, his disciples. And he, he took most of his material, or gave credit to some ancient Chinese works, and one of them if I remember rightly; oh they have very poetic names. What are they? One of them I think is the Book of the Winds. And these are very, very ancient. And I have seen some fragmentary translations of them. Well of course Confucius himself was the great apostle of conservatism. And as such has ever since been the very, very model philosopher to have in a government. He is worshipped today by many, many levels in China. You can buy his statue with great ease. And with great ease. In fact you have to beat people off with a club who are trying to sell you statues of Confucius throughout north China.

Now the amount of superstition which has grown up around Confucius is considerable, but we have in both Lao Tse and Confucius two people who never otherwise than pretended to be human beings, who were simply pointing out a way of life. Now Confucius is of no great interest to us. He is not of any great interest to us because Confucius was codifying conduct most of the time. And the great philosopher of that day, if less known, was Lao Tse.

Alright we come into the main period of the Dhyana, or Dhyana. Now the Dhyana has as a background almost as legendary a distance as the Veda. It is something which comes up in India, in its mythological period. It's legendary in its basics. Dharma was the name of a legendary Hindu sage whose many progenies were the personification of virtue and religious rites. Dharma. He's a mythological figure, and we have the word Dharma almost interchangeable with the word Dhyana, as Dharma is Dharma. But whatever you use there, you're using a word which means knowingness. That's what that word means. Dhyana, that's knowingness. It means knowingness, it means lookingness and so forth. In other words we are again on pounding down the line, and there's just no, no liberal interpretation of mind, you see, that has called the Veda, the Tao, the Dharma knowingness. I mean, this is what they go in for. And

these are all religious works. This is the religion we're talking about now we're moving in to the religion of about two-thirds of the population of Earth. It is a tremendous body of people that we're talking about when we start to talk about this. This is the biggest religion on Earth today, and we erroneously know about it and call it Buddhism in the western world. And it has very little to do with Buddhism, I mean Buddha, as I will tell you in a moment, that's something else. What we're talking about there is the Dhyana. The Dhyana is what the Buddhists talk about. That's their background. Alright?

We first find this word called; this Buddha actually is Bodhi. And a Bodhi is one who has attained intellectual and ethical perfection by human means. That's a Bodhi. Well that probably would be a Dianetic release or something of this level. Now there is another level that was mentioned to me, Arhat, with which I am not particular familiar, but it's said to be more comparable to our idea of theta clear. But Bodhi, that's a very interesting word. There were many Bodhis, Buddhas, you might say. And the greatest of these was a fellow by the name of Gautama Sakuamuni. And he lived between 563 and 483 BC. Now I won't go so far as to say he'd ever read the Tao Teh King. I won't go so far as to say that, 'cause there's absolutely no evidence to that effect at all, except that they certainly were writing on the same pathway. So much so that when the Taoists turned into Buddhism later on, they never abandoned the Tao. And Taoist principles became Chinese Buddhist principles to a very large measure. And what we have just talked about in terms of knowing the way to knowingness is very, very closely associated here with Buddha. We call him Buddha. It would be Lord Buddha or Gautama Buddha, or the blessed one or the enlightened one, or almost anything. But he is looked upon, and this according to my belief in the line, erroneously actually, as the founder of the Dhyana.

I think that this was in existence for quite a long time before he came along, but he pumped life into it. He gave it codification, he straightened it up, and made it run on the right track. And it's kept running in that direction ever since. He did such a thoroughly good job, he was such an excellent scientific philosopher, and he himself was so persuasive and so penetrating in his work that nobody has ever managed to pry apart Dhyana and Gautama Buddha. This is an identification, which is a very close one. And in areas that have no understanding whatsoever of the principles laid down by Gautama Buddha, we find him sitting there as an idol. Which would have been a very, very amusing thing to Buddha, because he never said that he was otherwise than a human being. He never pretended to be anything other than a human being, like Lao Tse.

Now he didn't ever have any revelations from supernatural sources, there were no guardian angels sitting on his shoulders preaching to him, and so on, as in the case of Muhammet and some other prophets. Nobody was ever giving him the word. But he went around giving people the word, believe me. He walked from fifteen to twenty miles a day, and you could always find him in a new place talking to some new people. And he was a very, very compassionate, as a matter of fact the stories which are told about him with his compassion for life itself and his ability, you might say, to grant beingness, these were very great. Also other stories.

They tried by the way, once upon a time, to discredit him by raping and murdering a woman in a grove, near which he was speaking. And tried to discredit him, but later on the ruffians who did it got drunk in a tavern and were apprehended, and appropriately disposed of. Some other various things occurred which are not very far out of line. He taught a chap, who then set up a school of his own, and who became violently incensed because Buddha continued to be successful, and he himself was not successful. So he had a large stone rolled down from a mountain while Buddha was walking on the road, and the stone accidentally split in half, and the two halves of it passed on either side of Buddha, and didn't hit him. And there was another incident about a roaring elephant who was mad, who was turned loose on Buddha, and he took one look at Buddha and calmed down. In other words, these however, don't, to us at least, border on the supernatural. I mean, a man could conceivably do something of this character if he had any ability to grant beingness whatsoever. Stopping an elephant in his tracks isn't very difficult. He never intended to be anything but a human being, and he was a teacher. Now, a tremendously interesting man.

Now we find however, some of the things that were written by Gautama, find them very significantly interesting to us. Very, very interesting to us, completely aside from Dhyana, could be literally translated as Indian for Scientology, if you wanted to say it backwards. And that is simply this. This was in Dharma Pada. "All that we are is the result of what we have thought. It is founded upon our thoughts, it is made up of our thoughts." Interesting, isn't it? The next line of, the next verse you might say is, "By one's self evil is done. By one's self one suffers, by one's self evil is left undone, by one's self one is purified. Purity and impurity belong to one's self, no one can purify another." Well it's just as you say, you can't grant beingness to the preclear and overawe him, you've got to have him working on self determinism or not at all, if you wanted to give that any kind of an interpretation. In other words, you've got to restore his ability to grant beingness or he does not become well. And we know that by test.

And we go here into the next verse, "You yourself must make an effort. The Buddhas are only preachers. The thoughtful who enter the way are freed from the bondage of sin." The thoughtful. Now the next one, "He who does not rouse himself when it is time to rise, he, though young and strong is full of sloth, whose will and thoughts are weak, that lazy and idle man will never find the way to enlightenment." The common denominator of psychosis and neurosis is the inability to work. And the next verse, "By strenuousness, his strenuousness is the path of immortality, sloth the path of death. Those who are strenuous do not die, those that are slothful are as if dead already." Now this is some of the material from that. By the way, a little bit later on in his work, in a discourse with Wanananda, we discover him announcing the fact that you have to abstain from the six pairs of things, in other words twelve separate things, and we in Scientology would recognize them as the various parts of things such as space, making and breaking communication, and so forth. They're all just named, one right after the other there, but he said you had to abstain from them. And the main difficulty is of course, the interpretation of exactly what he said. What did he say, what was written? Because the truth of the matter is that abstaining from these things would mean that you had to get into a position where you could tolerate them before you could abstain them, and that is the main breaking point of all such teachings. Is, one did not recognize that one simply didn't

negate against everything, and then become pure. And the way it's been interpreted is, if you run away from all living, then you can live forever. That's the way it's been interpreted, but understand, that was never the way it was said.

Alright, the religion of Buddhism carried by its teachers brought civilization into the existing barbarisms as of that time, of India, China, Japan and the Near East, or about two-thirds of the Earth's population. This was the first civilization they had had. For instance Japan, written language, her ability to make lacquer, silk, almost any technology which she has today was taught to her by Buddhist monks who emigrated over to Japan from China.

The first broadcast of wisdom which resulted in very, very high cultures, the cultures which ensued from Buddhism were very easily recognizable from those superstitions which had existed heretofore. No light thing occurred there. It was just some people who had the idea that there was wisdom. And having that wisdom you went out and told it to people. And you told them that there was a way that you could find a salvation. And that way was by becoming your own mind essence. And if you lived a fairly pure life, lacking in sensuousness and evil practices, in other words overt acts, why probably you could exteriorize and break, which they knew very well in those days, the endless chain of birth and death. You could break that endless chain.

Now all this material, all this material up to this point was given to a world which was evidently clearly cognizant of the manifestation of exteriorization, and was cognizant that one was living consecutive lives. Twenty-five hundred years later you would expect a race to be plowed in far enough below that so they would no longer be conscious of consecutive lives, but only single ones. And the hope of Buddhism was to reach salvation in one life time. That was the hope of Buddhism. That hope, by various practices, was now and then, here and there attained. But no set of precise practices ever came forward which immediately, predictably, produced a result. You understand that many of the practices would occasionally produce a result. But it was a religion which to that degree had to go forward on hope. A hope which has extended forward over a great, great many years.

Now the material which was released at that time is cluttered with a great many irrelevancies. A great deal of it is buried, you have to be very selective, and you have to know Scientology actually to plow it out and get it into the clear, but much less than you would believe. It was wisdom. It was really wisdom. And is today the background of the religious practices, 'cause you don't, you don't think for a moment that a Buddhist in the western hills of China knows the various words of Gautama Sakuamuni. He doesn't. He has certain practices which he practices. The basic wisdom is thin. And with that as a background however, they have certain religious rites, and they follow these religious rites. So even in China, very close to India where this came forward, and it was sent directly into China from India, we have the immediate division from wisdom into the practice. And we have almost all of China in one fashion or another bowing down to some form of Buddhism, and a very little of the intellectual world knowing actually the real background of Buddhism. But we have there a civilization, where before Buddhism we didn't have one, which is quite important to us.

Now there, so far, is your track of wisdom, which merely brings us up to the beginning of two thousand years ago, which we will have to take up subsequently.

General Background

Part III

7-ACC-25B, PRO-3

A lecture given on 19 July 1954

Continuing on religious and knowledge background of Scientology. When we look at Buddhism we don't wonder that a great change took place in the operating climate of man, because it certainly did. Rome went under just eight hundred years later. Now that's fast, for the time that it was going, because their whole philosophy shattered. The philosophy of every state operating on force alone, and every barbaric society that Buddhism touched shattered.

The first one to go by the boards was however India itself. India at that time was a very, very savage, barbaric area. So was China. Japan is still characterized very, very impolitely by the Chinese, and the civilization of Japan by Buddhism is almost in modern times. The civilization of Japan was completed by America, so there they meet very closely.

But now, moving forward on the time track over all of these ages, we discover that it took an awfully long time for the Veda to walk forward and emerge as a new knowledge called the Dhyana. And it took quite a little while for the work of Buddha to move out of Asia. But we see the work of Asia itself, not the work of Buddha necessarily, moving out into the Near East. Now there were trade routes that had existed since time immemorial. Man has no real trace of his own roadways. But the trade routes were quite wide open from very, very early times. We find the Phoenician, for instance, trading very neatly and very nicely up around Great Britain. And sailing out through the Pillars of Hercules we find him; and I was by the way last year standing on the edge of a Phoenician ruin, which was advertised as a Roman ruin, but it wasn't a Roman ruin because it had its inscription in cuneiform, which was a Phoenician script. And this was one thousand BC. One thousand BC.

Now in one thousand BC a Phoenician ship demonstrated at least ten thousand years of seafaring technology. It was a very complex ship. And Phoenicia spread its empire out through Europe, and just from where and what and why, we have no real trace. But Phoenicia was, is very well within our own teachings, our own history, and so on.

Well it was a thousand years after the Phoenicians that we first began in the western world to actually alert to a higher level of civilization. For some time the Hebrew in the Middle East had been worshipping in a certain direction, along certain lines. And they had as one of their sacred books the Book of Job, and many other of their sacred works were immediately derivable from similar sources. And into this society apparently other teachings sud-

denly occurred. Their holy work known to us as the Old Testament is leaning very, very heavily on what I just talked to you about. With the exception that it has a rather barbaric flavor. All due respect to the holy book, it was a long way from home. A long way from home. And we discover the civilized aspect of that religion which we know of in the western world as Christianity, taking place of course at the year, what is it? The year 30 AD, which I think we date, no, no, earlier than that. The year 1. Now we find that, that's of no importance to us, except that everybody who writes a date out here is talking about the man we're talking about. When he puts down AD, and when he puts down BC, we are dating our very calendar from this incident I am discussing here.

The principles known as Buddhism included those of course of love thy neighbor, abstain from the use of force. These principles appeared in Asia Minor at the beginning of our own dates. And I'm not, by the way now, discounting even vaguely the work of Christ or Christ himself, or anything like that. Traditionally Christ is supposed to have studied in India. This is traditional. One doesn't hear of him until he's thirty years of age. And he was a carpenter, and so on. One hears a lot of things. But he also hears this persistent legend that he had studied in India. Well this would of course be a very, very acceptable fact in view of the fact that the basic philosophy about which he was talking was a philosophy which had been extant in India, at this time, for about five hundred years. A little less than five hundred years. So it was about time that it moved out of that area, having taken over by that time two-thirds of the Earth's populace. But we don't quite recognize our Europe, if we think of it as a thriving culture. It was not a culture.

One thousand years after Christ, better than that. Twelve, thirteen hundred years after Christ a mighty conqueror stopped on the borders of Europe, because he was leaving all areas of civilization, and he saw no slightest gain in attacking an area where everyone was cloaked in fur loincloths. That was Tamerlane, Timouri Lang.

Now when we look at the Middle Eastern picture, we find ourselves looking at the rise of a philosophy which, however interpreted, however since utilized, is nevertheless a very, very interesting philosophy. You have told your preclears I am sure, to stop running those flows, and to get some space, and so he could tolerate that. And then change his considerations. Do you suppose for a moment that a preclear can actually get anywhere if he continues to use force? Well whether we try to put this into a public practice such as turn the other cheek, or whether we use it for theta clearing, the emancipation of a soul, we certainly are looking at the same fact. We are looking at the words of Gautama Buddha, however we wish to interpret this.

Now the parables which are discovered today in the New Testament are earlier discovered, the same parables. Elsewhere in many places, one of them, the Egyptian Book of the Dead, which predates the New Testament considerably.

Now we are talking about love thy neighbor. We're talking about be civilized. We're talking about use no force. But at the same time, at the same time, we are talking straight out of the mouth of Moses, so we evidently are at a crossroads of two philosophies. But these two philosophies are both the philosophies of wisdom.

Now the Hebrew definition of messiah is one who brings wisdom, a teacher, in other words. Messiah is from messenger. But he is somebody with information. And Moses was such a one. And then Christ became such a one. He was a bringer of information. He never announced his sources. He spoke of them as coming from god, but they might just as well have come from the god talked about in the Hymn To the Dawn Child, who by the way is rather hard to distinguish from gods talked about later on. He's certainly not the Hebrew god, the god the christians worship. He looks more like that one talked about in the Veda. He looks much more like it.

And we come on down to, from there, and we find that we are talking about a meeting place, a sort of a melting pot of religious practices, stemming from various wisdoms. But the highest amongst those wisdoms is apparently the Veda and the teachings of Guatama Buddha. The parables coming from the Egyptian Book of the Dead and from various other places were probably not original with the Egyptian Book of the Dead, so it's just not true that the parables of Christ necessarily came from Egypt, since we know full well that Moses escaped from Egypt, and that the Jewish peoples stem their history from their freedom from bondage in Egypt. Not all of their history, but the history which they speak of mostly in the New Testament.

Now here we have a great teacher in Moses. We have other messiahs, and we then arrive with Christ. And the words of Christ were a lesson in compassion, and they set a very fine example to the western world, compared to what the western world was doing at that moment. What were they doing at that time? They were killing men for amusement. They were feeding men to wild beasts for amusement. In the middle reign of Claudius we find thirty-five hundred men being turned loose four abreast, divided half and half across a bridge of boats, slaughtering each other for the amusement of the Patricians. How long can a society stand up when it is worshipping force to this degree?

Now however these teachings were interpreted, the vein of truth was still here. That an exclusive reliance upon force will bring about a decay and a decadence which is unimaginably terrible. And that was the truth which came through. And we find the Buddhist principles of brotherly love and compassion then appearing two thousand years ago.

Now Christianity spread like wildfire throughout Europe. But it was necessary to achieve a certain agreement. And in order to achieve that agreement, many of the practices which you know of today were incorporated into this worship. Basic and early Christianity is not recognizable today in many church practices. It's just not recognizable, I mean, it is very clouded. But these churches themselves recognize as their original source, the New Testament. And the New Testament contains, aside from a few court records and a few legends, all that we know of this particular transition. But here we have this information poorly interpreted, badly carried, through areas which did not know how to read and write, which is quite different from Asia. And we found this church and that church having to pick up and adopt customs in order to gain any entrance into these new areas. And we discover, we discover today the worship of the winter solstice in our Christmas. That is German, and that is also other barbaric societies. Almost every barbarism that's ever existed has worshipped the departure and return of the sun, in the northern hemisphere. And we find this incorporated into

Christianity. And over there we find that incorporated into Christianity, and over somewhere else we find this one. Each time a certain amount of superstition coming into the information line, until we don't know what was on the information line, unless we go back to sources and trace it through clearly and purely. We are again, however, working with wisdom.

What wisdom? The wisdom of knowing how to know oneself to resolve the mystery of life. And when this Christianity was interpreted and imported into Europe there was considerable speculation and resurgence, and an enormous amount of hope. The very same thing that the Buddhists hoped for became the hope, and this is what is very interesting, became the hope of the Christian world. Emancipation from the body. The survival and immortality of the human soul. And although there was a cult in Rome which had this idea, it itself had no great antiquity. And it had evidently stemmed over from Persia, which was closer yet. Now the christian impact wiped out this other cult. But that's because they were just alike. And one couldn't distinguish one from the other, and the Christians won.

Now we have this immortality, this hope of salvation being expressed throughout Europe, and they expounded expedient¹ to keep extending it, because they keep promising people that it was just about to occur. The day of judgment was just about to occur. Now get this as a sort of a barbaric interpretation of what Gautama Buddha was talking about. The emancipation of the soul from the cycle of births and deaths. Now, he was talking about that, you see, and now we get the fact that there's going to be a day when somebody blows a horn. And it's all going to occur. We don't know what barbarism that superstition came from, but we have that superstition today in our society. The day of judgment. At first hell was only the fact that Rome was going to disappear in a sea of lava, and everyone wanted to see Rome die. And that recruited people left and right. They promised them that Rome was going to disappear in a sea of molten lava. And they tried to prove it in Nero's reign, by burning the place down. Well, they didn't have a great deal of success doing it. Rome went on surviving, and was finally taken over entirely, and has since been the orientation point of Christianity. A thousand years or so after Christ they started to try to take back the actual birthplace of Christ in Jerusalem, and there's been considerable argument going on about it back and forth ever since. But the orientation point was made the only stable point, because that was the, that was the part of the world to which all roads led. And that became the dissemination point of all this information. But Rome split off and went back to Constantinople, and we had then the Constantinople branch of this church. And it however received its biggest blow when Russia suddenly turned completely atheist. We don't hear too much of that church anymore. But we still hear a great deal in the western world of this church at Rome. It is still there.

Now the use of Christianity was to produce a certain civilized state. And many people would blacken Christianity by saying it reduced people down to a very low level indeed. This is not true. It took an entire world of slaves and it made free men out of them. This in itself was quite a gain. Took a world which worshipped exclusively force and matter, and made it recognize that sooner or later one would have to turn to the fact that he had a soul.

¹ Editor's Note: According to the rendition of this text in THE PHOENIX LECTURES, this should read „they expound it and they find it expedient to been extending it, ...

Now remember that Christianity and its basic wisdoms and so forth is still available to us in the New Testament. And that this is really, no matter how it has come through the line, is quickly and swiftly traceable back to the Veda. We have a consistent track, in other words, here. This track is very consistent. The same message is coming through. The Christian god is much better characterized in the Vedic Hymns than in any subsequent publication, including the Old Testament. The Old Testament doesn't make near as good a statement of what the Christians think of as god, as the Veda.

Alright, not to go over this forever, we have, we have the loss of the trade routes, somewhere in the vicinity of about a thousand AD. And land travel ceased. Land travel up to that time had been very, very good between Europe and Asia. You had Europe wearing silks and using Asian products, back and forth. It was a good route through there, but remember that this was very far from a barbarism they were crossing there in the Middle East. This included Caldea, what was left of Caldea, what was left of Babylon, which of course was Persia at that time. It included tremendous numbers of civilization. And these trade routes went right straight through, one to the other. It wasn't run as a straight route, it was run as a relay route. You see, the caravans would go just so far, and then they'd relay their packs, and they'd go just so far, and they'd relay. And they did all this not on any plan, but on a barter system. So you could get goods all the way through.

Well those routes were closed and they weren't opened up again. No trade with Asia was opened up until Vasco Da Gama. Now there was an enormous period of non-communication. A long period of non-communication there. The; what had happened is Genghis Kahn, the various hordes which had been trying to pour out of Russia had cut them time and time again, and the amount of unrest and so forth, the taking of Baghdad and Jerusalem by such people of course just kept these things cut. You couldn't travel safely between these two worlds. And we find that communication doesn't open up again there until sometime really in the seventeenth century. Oh, it opened up a little bit earlier, but not really open. And we find seventeenth century, 'til we find in the middle of the eighteenth century, pardon me, middle of the seventeenth century we find certain eastern practices beginning to show up in France. And about the middle of the seventeenth century there are many books being published, all about you could do this and you could do that, and you'd achieve something else. As a matter of fact, the doctrine of a chakra is an interesting one, because that talks about theta clearing. It talks all backwards and upside down, and so on. You had to clear yourself of seven entities, of which the thetan was the last one, and so forth. But we find this being published in France in the middle of the seventeenth century, having come through on these reopened sea routes to Asia.

Now quite incidentally during this period, a navigator who should have taken more lessons, but fortunately didn't, by the name of Christopher Columbus, discovered America. He was simply trying to get to Asia, 'cause everybody knew everybody in Asia knew everything and had everything, and so you had to get to Asia. And he ran into America. Fortunately, because he'd miscomputed the size of the Earth so grossly that he would have perished out in the endless oceans if there hadn't been a continent there to receive him.

Now, oh I speak, that is the opinion of the Explorer's Club, almost en masse, concerning Columbus. But a bunch of experts on exploration looked at that man's exploration and shook their heads. But he was a very wise man, he discovered a variation of the compass and various other things. But he failed. It was up to the Portuguese to continue around the bottom of the Cape of Good Hope, and open the lanes to Europe. And as soon as we get them open we first find all of this information flooding in. Information suddenly starting to appear, parts of the Veda starting to appear, various practices of Buddhism, Zen Buddhism, other things start to crop up in Europe. And right along with this we begin to get such things as the Arabian Nights. And in the middle of the eighteenth century we get, you might call, a renaissance of literature, the birth of the novel, and so forth, coincident with the introduction of the Arabian Nights into France. A fascinating flood of information that came in about that time. And the culture had already, during the renaissance picked up considerably, but the renaissance was right in there with Marco Polo. And we find some other interesting routes were open during that time. People had managed to get through.

Well I'm not trying to tell that everything was invented by Asia. But Asia had a tradition of information. They had kept their records, which was not true of the western world. They'd kept their records. And so the information was there. And you might say it was a depository of knowledge which might as well have originated in the western world, gone to Asia, been put on file, and come back again. I don't care how you would trace this one way or the other, but we still find that it was the repository of all the wisdom there was in the world at that time. And it has more or less continued so.

Now the philosophers, the early Greeks and so forth on forward, made the first division, the first division in wisdom. And they said, "There is wisdom about the soul and there is wisdom about the physical universe." And there's some speculation about life. And this is the tradition of the Greek philosopher. And that has come forward to us as represented by people like Kant, represented to us by people like Schopenhauer, Nietzsche, so forth. Interesting, interesting material. And oddly enough, those writings are coincident with new releases of Asian information in Europe.

If you had ever accused Schopenhauer, had you ever accused Schopenhauer of writing nothing but sacred lore he probably would have committed suicide. But, he never wrote anything else.

Now where did we get this artificial breakdown? We got it right there in the Middle East. The Greek came forward, went through Rome, and the philosophic, scholarly, consecutive line has come to us through barbarisms. What we call science today came to us from a barbarism, priests, which civilized itself. It's an independent chute of information.

Now the western world is specialized in this, and it has never made enough advance in the humanities with it to bother about, so that today it would gladly, just to fill another test tube full of guck, it would very, very happily blow all of man off the face of the Earth. It is completely divorced from the humanities. Where we come to the humanities, and where we have to do anything for the humanities or with the humanities, we go straight back, all the way back as far as we can go, to the Veda, and come on forward. And as long as we're on that track we're on a track which means better men. And when we go on the other track, we're

talking about dead men. We're talking about dead men in an arena, and we're talking about dead men on battlefields, we're talking about dead men in cities under atomic bombs. That's what we're talking about. We're talking about barbarisms. And that is the tradition of barbarism. And the only thing that has let the western world survive all along this track was an entirely different track, that which went back to sacred lore ten thousand years.

Scientology then today could not possibly be characterized, could not possibly be characterized as a science, the way the western world understands science. Scientology carries forward a tradition of wisdom which concerns itself about the soul and the solution of mysteries of life. And that is what it concerns itself with. It has really not deviated. The only reason why I would suddenly come up and do something like this in a western culture, a very simple reason. I studied, my earliest years, the first thing I was exposed to in this life was a rough, tough frontier society. Montana. And there was nothing tougher than Montana, either in terms of weather or in terms of people. And from there I went over to the completely soft Far East. And heaved a long sigh of relief and found out what it meant to be in part of a civilization. And the shock was so great to me that I was very deeply impressed. And so, although I was a young American, I did pay attention. I had many, many friends in the western hills of China, friends elsewhere, friends in India, and I was willing to listen. I was also willing to be very suspicious. And I was willing to be very distrustful. But I was never willing to completely turn aside from the fact that there was some possible solution to the riddle of where man came from.

Now any work that I am doing or have done, and that you are doing, has a tremendously long and interesting background. You are delving with and working with the oldest civilized factors known to man. Anything else is Johnnie-come-lately. As far as Scientology being a religion is concerned, it has more right to be a religion than the Catholic church has. And could stand up and be proven in court to that effect. Anybody who would dare try to make religion into solely a religious practice would be neglecting the very background of Christianity.

Wisdom has no great tradition in the western world. But if we are very industrious, it will be up to us to make one. Thank you.

Consideration, Mechanics And The Theory Behind Instruction

A lecture given on 20 July 1954

Want to talk to you now about the basic theory which underlies instruction and indoctrination. Just want to give you a few items quite rapidly here which might be of some importance to you. This is, you might say, demonstrable material or doctrine, or anything else you want to call it.

The first one is: *Considerations take rank over the mechanics of space, energy and time.* Considerations take rank over these things. These mechanics are the products of agreed-upon considerations which life mutually holds.

The reasons we have space, energy, time, objects, is because life has agreed on certain things, and this agreement upon these certain things has resulted in a solidification, you might say, of agreement. And so our agreed-upon material is then quite observable. It's very, very observable to us. They're still basically considerations, but because they are agreed upon they are very observable.

You can, by the way, start somebody into the matter of agreement. You can make him agree with somebody else about something. You can build a fact this way. I've done it experimentally with a group. We have just gone round and round, at first facetiously, and then more and more and more – just the mechanics operating there just beautifully. They were agreeing with one another that there was a chair sitting in the middle of a completely empty room. And when they got through, they finally saw the chair. Curious.

That's the formation of this universe as far as we can tell.

The mechanics have taken such precedent in man that they have become more important than the considerations. Mechanics have taken a tremendous precedent in man and have become so important that they are *more* important than his considerations.

"Doesn't matter what *you* think!" You see? In other words, the mechanics of space, energy, objects, time, rooms, houses, Earth, space – anything like this – electricity, Ivory soap, these things have a greater value than man's considerations. In other words, he's inverted. Having agreed upon these things so long that they are so solid, he is now *below* the level of having agreed upon them, so his considerations do not apparently pack as much power as his immediate environment.

Now, this is what overpowers a man's ability to act freely in the framework of mechanics. He can't act freely in the framework of mechanics, although he invented them, be-

cause his considerations are now of less impressiveness than the mechanics with which he is operating. In other words, the agreement is more solid than his *new* consideration.

And so he makes a new consideration, and he runs into the mechanics of existence: space, energy, objects, time, his agreements with people and so forth.

The goal of processing is to bring an individual into such thorough communication with the physical universe that he can regain the power and ability of his own postulates.

All right. We discover this individual in an inverted state. That is to say, his considerations have less value than the wall in front of him.

Now, the goal in processing is simply to put him into sufficient communication with this wall that's there in front of him so that he can then see that there is a wall in front of him – this is necessary, you see? – and he's graduated upstairs, you might say, to a recognition of what his postulates have created. Now, he can go on from there and graduate up to where his considerations again have precedent over mechanics.

You see, the mechanics are so much in his road, they are such observable barriers, that he has become unacquainted with them.

Now, it would seem that it wasn't necessary to do this at all. All one would really have to do is get an individual simply to change his mind enough to all of a sudden have an individual who can change his mind – and it doesn't work this way. It's just not workable that way.

The way it does work is to get an individual into thorough communication with the environment – with his solid agreement of his called reality – get him into thorough communication with *that*, and then, when he has lost his fear of *that*, to demonstrate to him that he can change his mind.

But unless you get over his blindness, his unreality about something he has already agreed to, he is going against his own agreements. He is fighting his own agreements. He has agreed that there is a wall there, so there's a wall there. And now he's fighting that agreement and he is saying, "There is no wall there," and so on.

In other words, he is fighting his own postulates. So his own postulates are therefore very weak because the wall is there because that's his own postulate. And now without undoing that postulate, he's trying to change his mind about it and say "There is no wall there. There is no wall there." And there's a wall there, all right.

So this is the state in which we find 99 and 89/50ths of our preclears. They've agreed that there is a physical universe, and then having agreed upon it they are sorry for it. And now they want to change their mind about it but to change their mind would make them wrong. An individual who has already said there is something there, if he now says, without changing the first postulate, that there is now *nothing* there, of course, has got to make himself wrong before he can be right; and if you're wrong your postulates don't stick. That's what man's up against.

We're trying to just clarify this, give it a very fast rundown in case there's any question about this material. Scientology is the science of knowing how to know answers. It's extended

a little bit further. It's actually the science of knowing how to know, but we had better say what we are trying to know. "Answers" is there, observably, but we'll just add it: it's the science of knowing how to know answers.

A Scientologist is expected to be able to resolve problems in a great many specialized fields, of which auditing is the first field he addresses. If you know the principles, for instance, of ARC as the modus operandi and the mechanism of agreement, which has been agreed upon itself, you could then take an organization, an industry, a store, a troop of Boy Scouts and so on, and you'd sure know how to straighten out this mess. I mean, if we know the anatomy of confusion... Confusion starts in with an unpredictability and that goes into a confusion and that becomes a mystery. That is a mystery.

And we know why this is such a mystery to these people. That's because basically it was evidently such a confusion to them, and if it was such a confusion to them, it was because they didn't predict something. And this made them wrong, so that's why they think these things are so mysterious.

The only reason they think they are mysterious is because in the past they didn't predict them and then something happened; they said, "I didn't predict that," and this made them confused. And this confusion became intolerable to them – the amount of unpredictability became very, very high, so they closed it all off and said, "It's a mystery and we now don't know anything about that."

And the anatomy of mystery, there, if an individual knew that and ARC and a few other things, he would see this troop of Boy Scouts or this business or this disaster area or anything else that we were connected with, and he would see it would be necessary for the individuals in it to follow a certain pattern in order to regain a communication.

And having regained communication, why, he knows that other matters would remedy themselves. He, in other words, would not have to be an expert in turbines to straighten out a factory which made turbines. All he would probably have to do is get management in touch with the foremen, and the foremen in touch with the workmen, and the workmen in touch with the management and the plant would make turbines, you see? He would be a specialist in knowing how to know answers. But this does not mean that he would have to accumulate an enormous amount of technical information. What he would do would be to get the people who had the technical information and put them into communication, and the job would get done.

All right. The world is every day more violently impressed with mechanics. Oh, it is impressed today with mechanics. The little wheel that goes spin, spin, spin is far, far more important than the little boy who is going spin, spin, spin. The care of the body and the transport of the body, the conduiting of electricity is far more important than any activity life itself could do, so much so that an engineer today working with electronic brains is very swift to tell you "Why, this brain is accurate. This brain is wonderful. This brain..." He doesn't say this but he implies it: "Why, you should actually get down on your knees there and worship this here machine (because if I had the power to do so, you sure would)." But anyhow, "This brain is accurate and it's not like the human mind. Oh, that's capable of enormous error, and it's always wrong and it doesn't come up with good answers." He completely fails to recognize that that electronic brain was conceived by a human mind and that it runs only as long as

the self-determinism of at least one mind is feeding it problems to get answers to. And when that no longer occurs, the machine neither has activity, nor use, nor anything else. And if everybody forgot about the machine and wouldn't look at the machine anymore, and didn't use the machine and cut off its power, the machine would probably disappear. Probably right there in the middle of the plant floor it would just *pffff* – *be* gone.

The world, then, is very, very impressed with these mechanics. It's so impressed with space and energy and machines, objects, that any of these seem to be more important than a mind – the mind which makes them. And this is curious. But it brings a person down – as he gets more and more impressed with mechanics – brings him down to lower and lower levels of being mechanical. So if you could conceive it, a life-energy production unit has actually dropped out of sight to such a degree that people don't even know they are one anymore.

Now, that is attributable to a dependency upon mechanics and a validation of mechanics. It isn't that you just withdraw from mechanics, you understand, and leave them all alone and "Let's all go off and quit." No, an individual has to be put back into communication with them, mostly because he's afraid of them. And after he's done this he says, "Why, look-a-here," he says, "I don't have to depend on these things. That's nonsense." And the next thing you know he has regained some of his own power and ability.

Now, when it comes to atomic fission, you are producing of course in this society an enormous mystery. You couldn't help but do so; it's unpredictable. In other words, the first bomb was dropped without any warning. This is an unpredictability. Nobody even knew one was being made. That's nice and unpredictable, isn't it?

Well, the world is living in an expectancy of an unpredicted atomic attack. Well, that looks interesting too, doesn't it? I mean, more unpredictability.

Now let's take up the confusion aspect. What do you suppose is the picture of all of these electrons and protons and morons exploding in all directions on a random pattern with great violence? Do you look upon that as a confusion of particles? What would be your chance, by the way, of tracing each one of those particles individually all through the entire mass?

Well, your chance, if you're in good shape, is very good of doing that. But Johnny Q. Public out here knows that he can't trace one card while it's being dealt across the table. That's what cardsharps thrive on. And much less, billions and billions to the billion power electrons and morons exploding all over space – and that's a confusion to him! You see? So here you have an unpredictability and a confusion.

Now, what follows after that? Mystery. And so we have everybody being very secret about all the formulas of fission. They're only in all of the library textbooks that are in all of the libraries in all the world. They're *very* secret. They are so secret that the notebook of anybody who has studied nuclear physics and so forth, abounds with the basic-formula material of atomic fission. It isn't something somebody suddenly discovered. They just decided to do it. It took billions of dollars to do it and it took a long time for somebody to put up that much money. But they're being very secret about formulas which have been public property – some of them, for heaven's sake, for fifty years. And *all* of the material that the U.S. had on the

manufacture of an atomic bomb has already been transported, by a couple of spies who got executed for it, over to Russia. So who are we keeping it secret from?

Now, that's a problem!

Well, maybe we're not keeping it secret from anybody. Maybe it's just a mystery because it is unpredictable and confusing. So it's a mystery, so therefore we'd better lower all of our communication lines. And before you know it, the U.S. government is going to be almost totally out of communication with its own people. Just on this basis: you get just more and more communication-cut lines, cut lines, cut lines, cut lines.

There's a big mystery coming up. Well, how would you solve this? The way I would solve it, unfortunately, would be to simply point out the fact to the government and to people that atomic disaster was not going to ruin the entire world and that if you accepted a disaster and predicted what was going to happen, then you could resolve the disaster.

Next thing I would do is ask that we make the study of the manufacture of atomic fission a third – or fourth-grade subject, so that we could get in there, you know, and get the children indoctrinated into this great mystery real quick – so it wouldn't scare the kids. Actually, really, all they're doing is scaring the kids these days, which is not an honorable activity for big, grown men.

Now, the role of Scientology is to impede any disintegration which is going on in the realm of knowingness, so on – just to impede it. But if disintegration occurs, why, people who know Scientology ought to just be ready to pick up the pieces.

What do we mean by disintegration? We could mean on any dynamic, in any direction. Now, you could have a society so rigged and so operating that it didn't disintegrate people so quick; you could have one where freedom itself could be achieved. But if you all of a sudden looked at a complete smear-in on the part of a state or a county or a nation or something like that, you still, knowing principles of communication and so forth, could play a *very* large role in picking up the pieces resulting from that disintegration.

Now, as far as the political significances of Scientology is concerned, I would say off-hand probably that it would hew to a democratic line – not Democratic party, but democratic principles – because of our self-determinism. But that does not make it necessarily possessed of a political opinion. A body of knowledge cannot have an *opinion* on something; it simply extends what is found to be true wherever it is found to be true into greater truths. That's all.

And if something is true, that's all right. And if something is false, well, one simply recognizes that's false. So that as far as a political opinion is concerned, Scientology as such could not have and does not have a political opinion. It knows that certain types of government could be very disintegrative to a people. It knows, for instance, that fascism, military control of areas, and so forth would result in a knockdown of communication lines, which would be very, very unhealthy for that particular area. But this is in the field of Scientology that it is talking, not in the field of politics. And you should remember that rather carefully.

Scientology has no political opinions or allegiances. If one political practice works better than another one according to Scientology, that's fine. But what's working is Scientol-

ogy, not the political practice. You see that? Don't ever get detoured on this one. Because if you do, you get lost.

Now, the next one is: Does Scientology have any religious conviction? Well, again we have the matter of a body of data having an opinion, and it doesn't have an opinion. I know a lot of witch doctors who make more sense than a lot of priests, and I know a lot of priests that make a lot more sense than a lot of preachers, and I've seen the history records and found out that the Roman Empire didn't kill many Christians. As a matter of fact, in one year, Christians killed more Christians in the city of Alexandria than the Roman Empire executed during all of the existence of the Roman Empire. Yes, one hundred thousand Christians were killed in one year by Christians in Alexandria. Well, that's because of a conviction without wisdom. Because there must have been some kind of a conviction running counter to some kind of a conviction. This demonstrates – this demonstrates there must have been real bad ARC around there someplace. The fact that it might be slightly amusing to you as a datum actually means nothing to the body of data.

So a Scientologist's political and religious convictions would be those that he held to be true and that he had been trained in. I mean, so he's trained to be democratic in his viewpoint, and he's trained to be a Protestant. Why, he's certainly democratic in his viewpoint and a Protestant, unless he sees fit to alter his convictions to some degree or another because a greater wisdom seems to have penetrated those very convictions. But what would he do in that case? He'd probably simply modify or better his convictions.

Now, one of the oldest things that was ever given into the training of wise men, that I know of, was simply this: The basic faith in which the individual was trained and the basic political allegiance of the individual must not be tampered with by the order training him. And it was the order itself which laid that down.

That's an old, old one. They were training very wise men, and that was the first thing that they made sure that they did. They did not tamper with their early religious convictions or their political allegiances – did not tamper with these things.

If the individual cared to alter these things himself, nobody was going to tell him to or tell him not to. Nobody was even going to vaguely persuade him to. It might be in the course of his study that he found certain things that men did laughable or confusing, or he found certain things that men did remediable, but nobody was standing around trying to lead him in to a higher religious or political conviction.

And that is the case very much with Scientology – very, very much the case. If you were to teach a bunch of tribesmen on the banks of the Yap-Yap River, Scientology, and they believed in the great God Boogoo-Boogoo, you would just be wasting your time to start in by training them on the basis that the great God Booga-Booga was nine feet tall, not twelve feet tall. That's about all you'd probably accomplish, too. You would probably convince them he was not quite so tall or something of the sort. You have no business fooling around with a savage tribesman's political or religious convictions or a very, very cultured or supercultivated Oriental potentate's religious or political conviction. His customs, and so forth, are definitely his. What do you want to do, tear up his whole bank? That's not a way to clear a man.

There are very, very many ways to live. All of them can be derived from the same source and from the same sources. And just because they can be doesn't mean they're not different; they *are* different. So Scientology does not tamper with an individual's religious or political convictions.

The total empire of a Scientologist, and of Scientology and its organizations – from my viewpoint, the total empire is an empire of wisdom. No political empire of any kind. There is no effort on the part of Scientology to own or have the allegiance of billions and billions and billions of people or to have thousands and thousands of tons of masonry piled up, with *Scientology* written across the top of it or to have certain governments of Earth giving their allegiance to Scientology or something of the sort. This is very, very dull indeed. The empire of Scientology is 100 percent the empire of wisdom and there is no other empire envisioned.

Now, on the basis of mechanics, an auditor is expected to follow the Auditor's Code of 1954. That is part of the *Auditor's Handbook* and is a very, very solid compilation of things an auditor can do wrong. These are the common denominators of why processing goes wrong. Each one of those things has considerable importance, but the one which tells you to run a command until the comm lag is flat and the one that tells you to run a process until the process is flat, are the two most important parts of that code – very, very much the two most important parts of the code.

So you should know that code. That code was put together to keep you from making mistakes. It depends for its authority only upon this: that when it is disobeyed in processing, an auditor has a lot more work to do. And that's its total authority; it enforces itself.

Not so the Code of Scientologists. The Code of Scientologists is put together on this basis: The entire field of Scientology has suffered by preclears walking around from one Scientologist to another, doing the thing which preclears do best: cut affinity lines. And the society tries to keep the organization, and organizations of Scientology, cut to pieces by cutting their affinity lines. And the first part of the Code of Scientologists is simply an arbitrary slid in front of this one. If we don't permit our affinity lines to be cut, auditor to auditor, auditors to organization and organizations to auditors, we will certainly thrive much better and we will survive much better and we will certainly be a lot happier.

And as we go down the line on those various things, that again is simply material which if we had followed – some years ago had started following this material – today we would have far less difficulty than we do have, just with the public at large.

And the last one says: Don't enter into unseemly conversations on the subject of Scientology with the uninformed. Well, that's no effort to keep the material of Scientology – I will just explain that one real quick. That's no effort to keep the material of Scientology closed up. No, keep those lines open, keep it flowing. But somebody comes along and he's a major in phrenology at the university of something or other, and he says, "Well, I don't believe..." and "Is your conviction..." and so forth. And you just start talking about the weather.

That is, please, an invitation not to go into a fight on the subject of demonstrating, to somebody who doesn't have any brain to talk to anyhow, all about Scientology. In other words, it keeps it out of the argument class. You'll find out that we would have been a lot fur-

ther ahead if we had never sat down and entered into verbal fisticuffs with everybody who disagreed with us on the subject of Dianetics or Scientology.

You know, I mean the guy started talking about it, and you know, and "It couldn't be true," and "That couldn't be..."He hasn't any information on it. Now, you're going to sit there and give him a complete HCA course?

Well, do you have any idea of how much trouble it is to bring somebody up along through the level of HCA – bring them up to that point? There's a lot of work expended in that department; takes a lot of weeks. Nowadays, with codified training it can be done easier, but you're not going to do that in a drawing room. And it says please recognize this, and don't make the party awful for eight other people while you and a psychologist argue.

Reporter comes in, he wants to know all about it, why don't you tell him all about the weather. Why enter into a big discussion of Scientology with people who cannot hear you? That is not an apathy, that is about the snidest method of handling it you ever heard of. It will make people frantic. It will make them frantic and it will also make citizens out of them.

Now, you will find that a scarcity of preclears sometimes dogs one's footsteps if he's practicing professionally. A scarcity of preclears depends upon the indigence of the auditor, that's all. If an auditor is pretty good, he doesn't have any scarcity of preclears. He can go out and dig them up. Good auditors dig up lots of preclears; there isn't any doubt about this. I mean, it's something that happens.

You should never depend on anybody's industry with regard to the society at large or carrying the word in the society – never depend on anybody's industry but your own. Other people, other organizations and so forth are going to help you all they can, but don't depend on that help. Depend on yourself.

Consideration And Isness

A lecture given on 20 July 1954

Now I want to talk to you about the most fundamental fundamental that there can be fundamental below the level of consideration.

I haven't talked to you very much about considerations. There really isn't very much to say about considerations. And I made a considerable number of lectures on the subject of consideration; everybody appears to be very confused after I lecture on the subject. Because consideration is a consideration and all things are a consideration of the consideration, so that if you consider something which is considerable, why, you have considered it. And various phenomena such as space and energy and time, matter and so forth, is produced on the basis of consideration. So consideration of A is senior to A. Consideration of R is senior to R. And consideration of any and all parts of C are, of course, senior to any and all parts of C.

When you're dealing with A, R and C you have entered into a very early level of anatomy as far as the business of life is concerned. But you are not into the first and immediate level of anatomy as far as mechanics are concerned. There is a level lying between considerations and A, R and C, and this is isness. It's the consideration of isness.

Things *are* because you consider that they are. And, therefore, something that *is*, is considered is. If you don't consider that it is, it of course can be considered to be something else. But if you recognize that it is a consideration, you only have to recognize that it is. If you recognize that something is, then you recognize merely that it is a consideration. As soon as you have recognized that something *is*, you have reduced it to a consideration. And that's that.

Now that you know all there is to know about Scientology... What's the matter, don't you follow me there? All right, we'll go into that again. Considerations are senior to A, considerations are senior to R and are considered senior to C or any part of C.

One has affinity because he considers he has affinity; one has reality because he considers he has reality; one has agreement because he considers he has agreement; one has disagreement because he considers he has disagreement; one has the third dynamic because he considers he has a third dynamic; one has a second dynamic, but some people don't, and so on.

Any part of the dynamic principles of existence – create-survive-destroy, ARC, the Chart of Attitudes, top and bottom, the entire Scale of Emotions, Know to Mystery – are all preceded by a consideration. In other words, they are postulated into existence.

But right with consideration we have the most native and intimate mechanic which precedes all other mechanics, and that mechanic is isness. We have to consider that we can consider before we can consider an isness.

One considers that one considers and, therefore, what one considers is, *is*. So therefore, anything that is, is considered as being. What is, *is* as it is considered to be.

Now, the moment that you recognize, then, the isness of anything, it will disappear. To *have* something, to have anything over a long period of time, particularly, you have to beware of recognizing what it is. Because if you look at it with the recognition of what it is – simply its isness – this simple recognition will, of course, vanish it. So you have to be careful, if you want something, not to recognize what it is.

Now, one of the best ways to have something for a long time is to put something in your pocket, you see, and then forget that it is there. And you'll have something in your pocket. You'll have something in your pocket even though you've forgotten it's there. And that's the safest method of possession, is to forget that you have it. Because if you remember that you have it, you won't have it.

Now, this would all be hopeless if there weren't another factor way above consideration. And that is knowingness. You know anything you want to know and you know anything that has gone on.

Now, let's take the person who is using facsimiles in order to tell him what has happened. He looks at the facsimile, the facsimile has certain pictures and symbols in it, so then he knows what took place. Well, he had to know what took place in order for a facsimile of that incident to be created.

Now, he *knew* what took place, so he could create a facsimile of the incident, and he does this on an unknowingness level. But above this level, he can then look at the picture and know what took place. But he had to know what took place before he made the picture. Now if the picture is gone utterly and completely, he would still know what took place, unless he has the consideration that he has to have a picture in order to prove to himself what took place.

Now, anybody would know anything that was going on if he didn't have to prove it. Proof, conviction and so forth is a very early level of aberration itself. As soon as you have to start proving things and convincing people of things, why, then you have to get into agreement with them. And in order to do this, you have to alter isness. You have to have something to persist long enough for them to see it, so that they can then understand what it is. So, in order for them to really understand what it is, you can't possibly put up something that they understand what *is*. Because if they saw completely what it was and what is, why, then of course, naturally, it would disappear, so you would not have been able to have proven it.

I hope you follow this very closely. Because, actually, everything I'm saying makes sense if strung together and looked at in a rational way. But if you try to alter it, if you try to alter it around, then you'll be able to remember it perfectly. But if you merely accept exactly what I am saying in each and every second that I am talking and so forth, you know this already, so it won't exist.

Now this is a very bad thing, I realize. So the best thing for me to do would be to color – if I really wanted this material to be remembered – would be to color the material so that it appeared to be something else than what it was. That would be the easiest way to get it remembered, to get it complied with – to color the material.

And now, I could do that, for instance, by talking about your egg-libido and your re-conscious. I could quote authorities who didn't exist – that's always best, you know; that's *really* a curve, you see? Nobody can ever see those, so they can't ever disappear. And I could quote these authorities which didn't exist but which you couldn't disprove didn't exist, and we could go on about the counter-reflex of the ceretapal palsy and the og-libido, the bog-libido, the sog-libido and the mog-libido. And that we would categorize these things as explanatory to the behavior of fecie preservation on the part of young alligators. And this, of course, would then be utterly comprehensible because it could be so well remembered. See, it could be remembered perfectly, in every detail, particularly if it were altered from what I was really talking about. I was trying to talk to you about turbo-electric systems with that amount of data in it. We could go that far afield and you'd find that your brain would start hanging up on these non sequitur facts. Did you ever notice that?

Well, as a person becomes unable to recognize the isness of the things, he can't get jokes anymore. Every datum that comes in must have a significance. You see, it never occurs to him it *doesn't* have a significance. There must be a deeper significance for something to remain. So this accounts for the facsimile bank of an individual, particularly when that facsimile bank of the individual is badly jammed and so on. Now we get somebody who has a badly jammed bank and we tell him, "You have a right foot. All preclears have a right foot. In order to clear a preclear all you have to do is reach over and touch their right foot, then have them touch their right foot, then you touch their right foot, then they touch their right foot and they would be cleared."

And this might be true, you see? And you put it out in this wise and you explained it very carefully and you went over it many, many times. And he would get into an auditing session and he would say, "Now, let's see, what is the significance of touching the right foot? Well, obviously, the significance of touching the right foot means, of course, that the preclear must always be right. So, therefore, what we should run on the preclear is the number of times that he has been wrong. Now, the best way to run this would be to remain out of contact with it." So the auditing command that he said, obviously, was "Bury and occlude and never have anything to do with all the times you've been wrong." And that would be the auditing command which would evolve out of this.

Well, he would certainly get a preservation of data, wouldn't he? And boy, he'd really get a preservation of engram bank on the preclear, wouldn't he?

Well, let's talk about these various categories of isness, and we find out each one has a gradient scale. And first there is as-isness. This is the first level that we encounter and is actually the disappearance level. As we are content or can accept things as they are, they won't exist. That is absolute. If we are content with and can accept things as they are, they won't exist,

Why? The simple recognition of their existence will blow them into a consideration. A wall? What wall? We really know what a wall is; there isn't going to be a wall.

That's as-isness. And we see that mechanically. We have a lower mechanical strata on that which is a perfect duplicate. If we make a perfect duplicate of a wall, boom! – no wall. All right. That might be just for the thetan, but it's certainly no wall. I at least will lead you down the track to believing that you are not about to destroy the physical universe. Because I wouldn't want you to shy off from these processes just because they knocked out the physical universe.

Anyway, the next stage down the line from as-isness is alter-isness: the effort to preserve something. By altering its characteristics, we make it as a simple consideration and then we alter the method by which we made it. In other words, let's dodge on it. Having mocked it up, we will now dodge and say, "Joe mocked it up." Well, this is as far wrong as is necessary to get something to exist. But you have altered an as-isness slightly in order to keep it from being perfectly duplicated. Now, if it is perfectly duplicated, of course, it's in its own time, its own space, with its own energy and mass and it, of course, would cease to exist. So we enter into the field of alter-isness as a method of preservation. And one seeks, then, when he makes an object or a space, to get it to exist simply by saying, "Somebody else did it," or "It is a different kind of space," or "Its method of construction was different." We say, "God made it" or anything that would throw somebody off the track. Well, supposing God did make it; that would be all right. It'd still blow if you looked at it, recognizing that God made it. Your consideration is altered just enough so that you'll get your continuation of it.

Now, people get into alter-isness simply by the process of having had too many things disappear. So we get a person who has lost many things, then trying to change *everything*. He's trying to shift the as-isness of everything. He's trying to shift from as-isness to alter-isness. And so therefore he's got to change the significances and structure and background and everything around him, so that then these things will continue to exist. And that is his first impulse.

Now, alter-isness is simply the mechanism by which we persuade things to exist. We say they're something else than what they are, and after that they exist. See? Because one hasn't duplicated them. We build a brick house and then cover it up with shingles, you see, and then say and insist in argument that it is built out of lumber. Well, that would rather consist of an existence. You would get into enough of an argument with people trying to buy the house, and so forth, who could observedly see there was not totally a lumber house for them to get upset and worried enough. And that house is liable to persist in one's own ownership for some time if he just did that sort of thing.

All right. We get alter-isness, then, totally mechanically as a method of getting things to continue their existence. Now that's an important fact.

Although the nomenclature here is simply chosen at random, it's a pretty good nomenclature because it says *exactly* what it means.

The control case, by the way, is an "alter-ist." He's got to change, change. Well, he's lost too much. So now he's got to change everything, but he's not satisfied with anything. If he were walking down the street in a limber and loose fashion, he would think he had to walk in

a tight fashion, and so forth. He's become anxious about things disappearing, so he, of course, has to alter everything he sees in order to keep these things from disappearing.

All right. Now let's get into the next category. And we get not-isness. Now this fellow has altered things up to a point of where they're beginning to persist most damnably. In fact, he's upset about their continuous persistence. He doesn't think this is a good thing, to have a Fac One camera staring him in the face all the time, to have the walls of the room appear to be 180 feet tall – although they're only nine feet tall. It's not a good thing, this alter-isness, he's concluded: he's changed too many things; he's lost track; he isn't quite secure in what the things were in the first place, he's shifted them so often. (He's like the small boy who has told so many lies that he can no longer remember what lie he told, and so he's stuck with the lies and so becomes a human being.)

Now, the next step there, not-isness, is manifested as unreality and is in itself the mechanism we know as *unreality*.

Now, the next category: that's where things fade down, disappear, are made to be further away, dimmed, poor perception, fellow is trying to make nothing out of things, he has to wear glasses that make objects much smaller. That's a case of not-isness.

Okay. Now we go into the next category, which is the category of just plain isness. Well this, of course, is not a bad thing. This in its highest level is what we call reality. That's just plain isness. But we could spell this with bigger and bigger caps. See, we could keep spelling *is* there with bigger caps and bigger caps and bigger caps and finally spell it with an exclamation point which would represent a psycho.

There is a dragon in the middle of the room. And he *knows* this. There are many other things which he doesn't know, but he *knows* this. When he gets a mock-up of an anchor point, he makes a pyramid out of solid iron. When he is asked to pick up one of his mock-ups, he knows he doesn't have that much strength. The world is too real!

Now, once in a while, when somebody is just about to kill you, cut your throat or eat you up or arrest you or do something of the sort, you get an enormous flash of isness – a recognition of the situation. Boy, this is! It is *real!* Glug! A moment after that, you're liable to get – or postulate, as you would – an immediate reaction of not-isness. It's not real. A fellow will flare up and daze in about that order, from isness to not-isness in a sudden emergency.

Now, alter-isness, not-isness and isness would be, then, the categories which can be aberrated. But remember, these are not basically aberration. They only become aberration when they go entirely beyond the ability of the person to re-recognize as-isness. When a person has lost his ability entirely to recognize as-isness, he's gone. After that, he's stuck with, and only has one of the remaining three – alter-isness, not-isness and isness – or one of the three. All three or one or two of the three – some such combination – with no as-isness left. Therefore, he gets everything persisting around him, he gets everything less and less changeable and he goes into a dwindling spiral. Because he has lost his quality of as-isness. That's all he's lost. When he loses that, of course, he gets stuck with one of these other qualities or some combination of them. You see how that is?

The psycho who is walking around is made well simply by touching a few walls. I mean, you have him go around and touch walls for a little while and all of a sudden he says, "This is a wall!" And he feels much better and he knows he's in communication and so forth.

Well, that's because he either has a case of not-isness: "There are no walls," or isness: "There are walls all through the room and all through my mind, and I have barriers everywhere, everywhere, everywhere," or "There are no barriers anywhere, anywhere, anywhere," which is just variations of not-isness and isness. And you've shown him that there were walls and these were agreed-upon walls. And of course that's way upscale because you have demonstrated to him something closer to an as-isness.

Now, each one of these is a gradient scale. And you know that you can recognize poorly enough the actual as-isness of something – you know, I mean you just draw back just a tiny bit from the as-isness of something. In other words, indulge in just a little bit alter-isness or just a little bit not-isness or just a little bit isness – you know, making it a little bit more – and it'll persist with *great* satisfactoriness. Of course, if you walk up to it and simply hit it with as-isness, it's *not there* anymore. You follow this very carefully? Because it's quite important, although the technology which we're using is elementary.

Now beware, beware, beware – ding-dong. You get this real carefully, now. I'm only going to mention this once. And I don't want to hear anybody going off the deep end in some direction or another, mounting a horse and dashing off in some direction. Many philosophies could be adjudicated out of these four categories. And believe me, any philosophy there is, *has* been adjudicated from these four categories. This is the root of all philosophy as well as all existence. And you're standing right there at the tiniest co-point between mechanics and considerations that we have so far attained.

All right. Now, you could then develop, as I said, *many* philosophies out of this. Now, the first and most dangerous of them would simply be this one: "Well, I just have to accept everything as it is and, therefore, what we're really supposed to produce out of this is an apathy, because if I had to accept everything as there is there'd be nothing left but apathy because if I can't change this and mess it up somehow or another... No, but I'll go into apathy. Yeah, I know what the auditor wants, he wants me to be apathetic about the whole thing."

This is too easy a philosophy; this is the philosophy of Zeno. "You can't do anything about it, so you might as well accept it," and everybody go into apathy and cut his throat anyhow.

Well now, we have an enormous number of things which we could say, list or categorize in terms of the philosophy of this, and this is only one of them that will hit your preclear. You see, he has to be able to accept his own restlessness before he can be restless. He has to accept his own dislike of things before he can dislike things. Remember, he has to accept something before he can have it – the case *he's* in! Because he has to get back some as-isness before he can have *any* as-isness.

Well now, he has to get back some as-isness before he can become fluid in his practice of as-isness, alter-isness, not-isness and isness. And the business of life requires that he be quite able in all four categories. It's necessary to be able in all four categories, not just as-isness. So you're not particularly specializing in this.

But when it comes to this universe, you will discover that as you return your preclear to as-isness, things disappear. That may be regrettable, it may be interesting, it may be this and that, but those things too, just like opinions of art, are merely considerations.

Now, the first step that we would adventure upon in this, would be a step which would be immediately addressed to such a thing as exteriorization. You would merely find what part of the body was acceptable to the preclear – you know, what part of the body was he able to accept as is. And we would go on asking this question and asking this question and asking this question. We could vary it by saying what part of the body would he be at liberty to alter as to its position or shape? What part of the body would be acceptable to him on an absent basis? What part of the body would be acceptable to him on a much more present basis. For instance, just a hand walking all around all by itself.

Indicated processes. Actually, this processing is so good that you can almost take any part of it and just work with it. Indicated process on as-isness is simply done with that command: "What part of your body is acceptable to you?" "What part of the environment would be acceptable to you?" And you merely have him improve his considerations. And if he hangs up too long, you could say, "Well now, can you accept your dislike of – – – – ?" And, of course, it just involutes. He could just watch it. It just sort of goes away. It's terrible. The first thing he could recognize is the fact that he disliked the environment. All right. Well, can he accept his dislike of the environment? The second he does this, he has recognized the as-isness of his dislike, which moment will blow it.

Now, you can get him to recognize the existence of anything as such and it'll disappear, just by getting him to accept parts of the body, just on this simple auditing command: "What part of the body could you accept?" "Give me another part of the body you could accept." (There's tremendous comm lags on this.) You could say, "Well, how would it have to be altered for you to accept it?" "What would it be fine to have absent about this body?" Then we can turn around and say, "What's the acceptance level of your body about a thetan?"

Well, he doesn't do this by mock-ups, you understand. That's the trick. Get him to concentrate on the actual body. Does it accept the thetan this way or that way or how? What condition? "What distance could your face tolerate to a thetan?" We already have this on exteriorization processing, but without this one fact *stressed* which makes the difference between a workable technique and a nonworkable technique: "What distance is acceptable?" "What distance would be comfortable from your face to the thetan?" "Well, where would your face accept a thetan?"

And the first thing you know, you have spotted the preclear. I mean, the face *seems* to have spotted him. Then he spots himself.

But the whole thing would run out without any such complexity of command at all. You would merely ask him "What is acceptable to you in the environment?" "Look around." And simply go over it, one item after another item after another item, and his considerations will improve, which is the modus operandi behind 8-C Opening Procedure, except you're not doing it with any further consideration.

If you ran 8-C Opening Procedure long enough on a preclear, he would find the entire environment he'd been working in, certainly, very, very acceptable to him.

We could just continue to run this as "What part of the environment is acceptable to you?" And he begins to check them off, check them off, check them off, check them off, and he would eventually get down to his body. And having gotten down to his body – and taken care of the space around the body and that sort of thing – having gotten down to the body, we'd take it by parts of the body: "What parts of the body are acceptable to you?" And just on and on and on, and he'd be out there standing in back of his head.

Now, that's the easiest method of exteriorization I know, and the method which I commonly use when I am balked by a preclear, because it's an easy and certain process. It's a rather short process, really. You just ask him to pick up the as-isness of his environment and body, and if he really recognizes it, believe me, he'll be outside. And that is simply done with that auditing command. This is the easiest process I know of anyplace, anywhere. So, we have it.

Once in a while he says, "Well, I really dislike this and that."

"Well, can you accept your dislike of it?"

This will involute it, which is the only additional command I think I've ever used.

Okay. So much for as-isness, alter-isness, not-isness and isness. All cases fall into these categories.

Isness

A lecture given on 23 July 1954

I want to talk to you now about four conditions of consideration.

We start out at the beginning, or anywhere along the road, with this as the highest truth: *We are dealing with a static which can consider.*

That it can consider and then perceive what it considers makes it a space-energy-mass-time production unit. That it can perceive what it considers makes this static into a space-energy-mass-and-time production unit.

You see, don't ever get hung up on whether or not the actuality that is made is an actuality. This is the wrong way to approach this problem. It's the way people have been approaching this problem for so long that the problem has remained, up to this time, pretty darned abstruse.

That you can perceive something, and that you can perceive that somebody else also perceives something, qualifies only one of these conditions of existence. It qualifies only one of the conditions. That's isness. And that is reality – isness.

Now, that you simply say something is there and then perceive that it is there means, simply, that you have put something there and perceived that it is there; that's what it means. But that is no less an isness. That nobody is there to agree with you at the time you do this does not reduce the fact that you have created an isness. It is an isness. It exists. It exists. Not just for *you*. I mean, it just exists, you see?

Now, if you were to now desire that that persisted, you would then have to go through a certain mechanical step: you would have to make sure that you did not perfectly duplicate it. That is, create it again in the same time, in the same space, with the same mass and the same energy, because it would no longer be there.

But what have you done, really, when you have done that? You've just taken a thorough look. And what you create will vanish if you simply look at it, unless you pull this trick: unless you pull the trick that it is alterable and that you have altered it.

Now, if you say you have altered it and now that you have forgotten the exact instant it was made and the character of it, it of course, then, can persist. Because you can look at it all you please with your first look, you might say, and it won't vanish. Don't look at it, however, with your second look, because it'll be gone. Again, you will have duplicated *it* – a *perfect duplicate*.

The definition of a perfect duplicate is creating a thing again in its same time, in its same space, with its same energy, mass, motion or continuance. Now, that's a perfect dupli-

cate. For instance, if we looked here at the front of the room, saw an object, we would simply have to look at it and conceive ourselves to have made its exact duplicate or counterpart, which is to say, conceive ourselves to have made *it*. Just conceive ourselves as creating it, in other words – just no more and no less than that. And, of course, it would get rather thin. But to some who are having a rough time with conditions of existence, it will get brighter and brighter and brighter and then get thinner and thinner and thinner. And it'll disappear for one. This is a curious thing, but it is immediately subjected to and can be subjected to a very exacting proof.

All right. Now, let's look at this very carefully and let's look at what reality is. Reality is a postulated reality. Reality does not have to persist to be a reality. The condition of reality is simply isness. That is the total condition of reality.

Now we get a more complex reality when we enter into the formula of communication. Because this takes somebody else. We have to say we are somebody else, now, viewing this and that we don't know when it was made or where it was made to get a persistence of the object for that somebody else.

But let us say we just, more or less accidentally, go into communication with somebody else, and we have an argument – that is to say, chitter-chatter back and forth – about what this thing is. If that other person perfectly duplicates exactly what we have created, it will again disappear. It doesn't matter, really, who created it; he only has to assume that he created it for it to disappear for him. In other words, he has to duplicate it in its same space, same energy, same mass, at the same instant it was created and it'll disappear for him.

So you and he had better alter this thing which you made so that you both can perceive it. And then we get what is known as an agreed-upon reality, and that is an isness with agreement.

Now actually, the word *reality* itself is commonly accepted to mean "that which *we* perceive." Now, this, then, is the real definition for a reality – the one that is commonly used – and that would be an agreed-upon isness. An agreed-upon isness – that would be reality.

All right. So much for that.

We have another condition. A not-*isness* is a protest. The common practice of existence, of course, is to try to banish an isness by using it to destroy itself. They take a mock-up of some kind or another, such as a building or something of the sort, and they try to destroy it by blowing it down with dynamite or doing something like that. (I mean, it's a very practical application, this material I'm giving you. It isn't esoteric; it doesn't particularly apply to the engram bank. This is just existence.)

All right. *Is* can be translated quite generally as "existence."

All right. We get a not-*isness* being enforced upon an isness by the quality of the isness itself or by a new postulate by which the individual is saying "It's not there."

Now, this new postulate does not pattern the mechanics of the creation of the isness. See, the new postulate by which you simply say, "It's not there," doesn't pattern itself with the

exact time of creation, the exact space, the exact continuance – same mass, same space, same time – and as a consequence, we say, "All right. It's not there." It will probably dim down for you, but you have to do something else: you have to put a black screen up or push it away or chew it up or do something to it here rather than giving it a perfect duplicate (which we'll get to in a moment). But we do something else here. We say, "It's not there." And that's not-isness. We say something *doesn't* exist which we know darn well *does* exist. See?

Now, you have to know something darn well *does* exist before you can try to postulate it out of existence and thus create a not-isness.

Now, the definition of *not-isness* would be, simply, a definition of "trying to create out of existence, by postulate or force, something which one knows priorly exists." One is trying to talk against his own agreements and postulates with his new postulate or is trying to spray down something with the force of other isnesses in order to cause a cessation of the isness he objects to. And this is the handling of mass to handle mass, of force to handle force and is definitely and positively wrong if you ever want to destroy anything. That is not the way to go about destroying something; that is the way to destroy yourself, which is why nations engage in it. Force versus force.

We see a very badly misunderstood rendition of this in early Christian times with the introduction of the idea that if you were hit you should turn the other cheek. Well, that's a very, very bad thing to do. Now, the truth of the matter is, if it were rendered this wise, it would have made much more sense: When you encountered force, don't apply more and new force to conquer the force which has been exerted, because if you do, you will then be left with a chaos of force. And pretty soon you won't be able to trace anything through this chaos of force, you see? So "turn the other cheek" is actually a very workable situation if it's simply translated to mean force must not be used to combat force.

Now, the way to properly handle such a situation is just to duplicate it perfectly.

All right. Now let's go into this business of a perfect duplicate. A perfect duplicate, again, is, you might say, creating the thing once more in the same time, in the same space, with the same energy and the same mass. A perfect duplicate is not made by mocking the thing up alongside of itself. That is a copy or, more technically, a facsimile, a made facsimile.

Copy and *facsimile*, by the way, are the same words. But a *facsimile* we conceive to be a picture which was taken of the physical universe. And a *copy* would be something that a thetan, on his own volition, simply made of an object in the physical universe with full knowingness. In other words, he copied it – he knows he's copying it. A facsimile can be made without one's knowledge by a machine or the body or something of that character.

All right. This is a perfect duplicate, mechanically. But it is more important to recognize it in the terms of our four categories of existence. It's as-isness. If we can recognize the total as-isness of anything, it will vanish. Sometimes if it had many component parts, we would have to recognize the total as-isness as including the as-isness of each component part of it.

Now, in that lies the secret of destroying actual matter. And actual matter can be destroyed by a thetan if he is willing to include in the as-isness – which he is now postulating toward any object which exists (toward any isness) – the as-isness of each component part.

Now, let's look at that very rapidly and recognize here that a thetan created a mock-up and this mock-up was agreed upon very widely, and another process, alter-ism, which we'll go into in a moment, was addressed to it and it became more and more solid and more and more solid.

And then one day somebody cut it in half and dragged part of it up the hill to make somebody's doorstep. And that's already, you see, out of location. Same place is part of this mock-up – same space, same place. So it's already been removed from the place it was mocked up, you see, and it's been moved up to the top of the hill. Now it's making somebody's doorstep. Now, those people themselves don't quite remember where the doorstep came from, if asked suddenly, but after a while these houses up there – and, by the way, just mock-ups like everything else – are torn down or something, and somebody picks up this doorstep and chews it up for road ballast; throws it out in the road to be used for road. And they make a road with it and it just runs just fine. Well, this is alongside of some wharves, and one day, why, the road is no longer being used – they now have a big, long steel pier or something that comes out there. And somebody uses a steam shovel to pick up a whole bunch of rocks and gravel and dump them into the hold of a ship which is going to South Africa or something of the sort, and it takes it down there. And they unload this ballast, and the natives use it to gravel the garden or something, and at length, why, there's a volcanic explosion; it's buried under twelve feet of lava.

And time marches on, in other words. And this thing is getting more and more remote from its agreed-upon original position, much less its postulated moment – the moment it was postulated as related to the time span of the people who were agreeing upon it. You see, they've agreed upon a time span, so this thing is aging. And they agreed upon this space too, and it's getting moved around in this space. And here, atom by atom, as the aeons roll along, this object, which was part of an original mock-up, is now distributed all over the place.

It'd be fairly hard to trace unless you suddenly took a good look at it and sort of ask it, or located it easily.

Now, conservation of energy blows up if anything is created in the same time and space. In view of the fact that the time itself is a postulate, it's very easy to reassume the first time of anything. Just like you ask a person in Dianetics to go back to the moment when. Well, he could reassume the time. And if you would also ask him to go to the moment when and the place where – if we had just added that – and then said, "Okay. Now, duplicate it with its own energy," why, it would have blown up. And this, by the way, runs out engrams and it blows up engrams like mad. It is not a process that we would use today, particularly, but it's a process that you should know about.

So a person, to create an as-isness, would have to create the as-isness of the object itself and all of its parts. And only at that moment would he escape the law of conservation of energy.

Conservation of energy depends upon the chaos of all parts of all things being mixed up with all the parts of all the things. In other words, we couldn't have any conservation of energy unless we were all completely uncertain as to where this atom or that atom originated. And if we were totally uncertain as to the original creation spot in the space of the atom, molecule, proton, whatever, if we were to remain totally ignorant we, of course, could not destroy it, because force will not destroy it. Force will not destroy anything made of force.

And in view of the fact that you'd have to make as many as-isnesses as there are the atoms in the object, why, it looks awfully complex, unless you could span your attention that wide and that fast. And of course, at that moment, why, it would blow up.

Therefore, conservation of energy is exceeded. It itself is a consideration.

Now, we've taken care of as-isness by this mechanics of a perfect duplicate. As-isness would be the condition created again in the same time, in the same space (same place), with the same energy and the same mass, the same motion, in the same time continuum.

The same time continuum is only incidentally important. It comes up as importance when you're crossing between universes. And particles do not cross between universes. A particle is only as good as it is riding on its own time continuum. You destroy the time continuum and, of course, no activity can take place from that moment forward. That's completely aside from this. I mean, here's group A and they made a set of postulates which gives them certain energy and mass, and over here is group B and they make a certain set of postulates. Unless group A and group B get together and mutually agree to accept each other's masses, why, you just would never get to a point where the *mass* created by group A and the mass created by group B would interchange. Somebody has to be around, always, who was part and parcel of the creation of the mass looked at, at least by agreement. See, he has to be around, at least by agreement. And we get a time continuum. We get a continuous consciousness.

Now, it's this thing that they talk about when they talk about *cosmic consciousness*, which is a very, very fancy word for saying "Well, we've all been here for a long time." We could translate it much more intelligibly that way.

All right. Now, let's take this as-isness and let's discover that if a thing will disappear, if a mock-up will disappear – and that too can be subjected to proof very easily – if a mock-up can disappear simply by creating it in the same time, in the same space, with the same energy and same mass (in other words, just repeat the postulate, you might say), if it'd disappear the second you applied as-isness, then people start avoiding as-isness in order to have an isness. And that is done by alter-isness.

We have to change the character of something; we have to lie about it for it to exist. And so we get any universe being a universe of lies. Then when this universe of lies compels you to tell its truth, we can get *very* confused. We go back in history, we find people on every hand telling us "Well, maybe there was such a person as Christ and maybe there wasn't, and maybe he wrote this and maybe he didn't, and maybe the material came from there and it came from there" and boy, are they giving him survival.

Why? Survival itself is dependent upon alter-isness – a-l-t-e-r. Alter-isness. In order to get an as-isness to persist, it is *absolutely necessary*, then, that its moment of creation be masked. Its moment, space, mass and energy, if duplicated, would cause that to cease to exist. The recognition of as-isness will bring about a noneness – bring about a disappearance. In other words, a return to basic postulate. See? You'd have to make the postulate all over again, and then to get it to exist any further, why, you would then have to go forward and change it in such a way that people would not actually be able to recognize its source at all. You'd just have to obscure the devil out of the source in order to get a persistence. You see that? You'd have to say it came from somewhere else, by somebody else.

Now, you see, people have done this with such things as Dianetics. The last rave I read on this subject claimed that it was really invented in the late part of the eighteenth century by a guy by the name of Hickelhauser or Persilhozer or something. This is a fact. I mean, here we had something which could be un-mocked very easily because it was set up to be unmocked – see, just set up to unmock. Very, very easy to simply say that its as-isness was such-and-so and so-and-so, and it would have practically disappeared if you'd continued to assert that its as-isness was what its as-isness was.

In order to get a persistence of it, of any kind, we would have had to have done something very strange and peculiar: we would have had to have altered it, we would have had to have entered the practice of alter-isness. Now, we begin alter-isness and we have the thing persisting. Something will persist, then, only so long as it is not perfectly duplicated – which is to say, its as-isness isn't recognized. You see that? So that if we try to alter something bad, we'll make it persist, one way or the other.

But don't think that if you're going to alter something just as-is we will get an isness. Anytime we practice alter-isness on anything, what do you know? We will get an isness, whether it's bad or good, beautiful or ugly. Whenever we practice alter-isness, we are going to, then, get a persistence of the condition.

Now, this is about the highest common denominator that you could talk about this on. So that if you knew this data you could, however, practice alter-isness. Oh ho! If we just took an ax and took a long, sharp heave and blew the whole thing up in smoke – bang! Ax blade went all the way through.

If you know that life is basically a consideration of a static which is not located in time, space, which has no mass, energy or wavelength, then, if you know also that as-isness is a condition which will unmock or disappear; that you have to practice alter-isness in order to get an isness; that after an isness has occurred, the mechanism of handling it is to postulate a not-isness, or use force to bring about a not-isness, and that any further alter-isness practiced on it will only continue to create an isness of this new condition, and that every new isness is going to be met by the postulated or force-handled not-isness, and that every not-isness is going to be followed by an alter-isness which is going to result in a persistence of what we now have – we begin to see, after a while, that there was no way out of this giddy little maze of mirrors except this recognition that we have a static that can consider, and the pattern by which we arrived at what we call reality, solidity and so forth is contained in these four conditions.

The cycle of existence is, then, for a static to consider an isness as an as-isness. See? It just says "There is." That's as-isness. And then to alter the as-isness, even to his own recognition, and obscure his knowingness as to that as-isness to procure an isness. That having procured an isness, he usually can be counted upon, sooner or later, to practice a not-isness. And not liking the results, since what he – the isness he was contesting, you see, doesn't disappear. It simply hangs up and he gets unhappy about it, you see? He now would practice a new alter-isness – which would get a confirmation of the not-isness he now has – which would *then* persist. And we find out that life can enter itself upon a very, very dizzy cycle. The new isness is treated with an alter-isness, is followed by a not-isness and is followed again by a new condition, which is persisting – a new isness. And so we get this back and forth and seesawing around.

Now, this depends upon a basic postulate that we agree that things proceed in a fairly orderly fashion or a uniform rate of spacing or at speed or at tolerance or something of the sort. Time has to be entered in there. And we must have had a postulate right in there ahead of all of these isnesses that would determine *whens*. And in the absence of that one, you'd got no time continuum, so there'd never been any such thing as a persistence. So time fits right in there.

Now, do you see this progress of these various conditions?

I think that the problem of existence now narrows down just to this: an examination of the actual agreements of time to blow all the conditions of isnesses. But the agreements as to time itself are conditional upon what was created in the time stream, and we get basic postulates in there, resistant to all effects, as being time itself. Resistance to all effects.

Well, anyway, these are the four conditions of isnesses and the various definitions which accompany them and will explain any manifestation of life, human behavior, matter, space or time.

The Four Conditions Of Existence

Part I

A lecture given on 23 July 1954

I want to cover with you this morning a little more about the various states of existence.

Now, all we need to know about existence is that it *is*, you see? Whatever complexity it has, it still *is*. Now, it isn't ever *was*, which is the most interesting part of this particular nomenclature. There isn't any *will-be-ness* and there's no *was-ness*; there's simply isness.

Now, if we talk about existence, people spontaneously add to it *will-be-ness* and *was-ness*. See? So *existence* is not the word we want. We want the word *isness*. We want just the word we're using. We want that state which is.

Now, the Dhyana makes the error of "beginningless and endless time." But that is not really an error. It's an error as far as the symbols involved are concerned. Now, we don't know that the symbols that were used by Gautama to describe this manifestation added up into English as "beginningless and endless time" – you see, we've already crossed one language jump – and so we don't quite know what he was talking about. It was an interesting thing that you could represent this by a continuous line which joined itself. Any kind of a complexity of circle, in other words, would represent the fact that we had a beginning-less and endless somethingness.

Now, that is too complicated an explanation. In view of the fact that time depends upon a postulate, you could say, "Yes, it is beginningless and endless." You could say as well that it's linear; you could say as well that it is continuous; you could say as well that it's Eastern Standard or sidereal. It doesn't matter now how you qualify it. Having once made the postulate, you can then go on making further postulates. Nobody is going to limit anybody in making postulates.

But there happens to be, strangely enough, a truth lying back of time—there is a truth lying back of time. Time is a postulate.

Now, it doesn't even have to be agreed on. You could have a time span all by yourself. You could shut your eyes and say, "Now I've sat here for a million years." In the next two seconds, you could say, "I'm going to sit here for a million years." Nothing about this – that's real time. Don't be so baffled if you dream for five seconds about a five-hour time span. You've just repostulated some time, that's all.

Unless you continue to postulate time, you haven't got any. And that's the first and foremost thing you can know about time – unless you continue to postulate it, you haven't got any.

Now, that fellow who depends on a clock up there to move time for him is going to get in trouble sooner or later. He's going to get (quote)"stuck on the track"(unquote) and (quote)"out of pace with his fellow man"(unquote) because he's depending upon *their* agreement on time to give him time. And the only way he can have time is to continue to postulate time.

One of the roughest things you will discover with anybody who is having trouble with his case is to have him put something on the future time track. And he'll say, "Oh, no!"

Now, one of the ways to do this: You say, "Can I have an appointment with you? Let's make it at 2:05 this afternoon."

"Hell, no!"

See? I mean, that's upsetting.

That's why, when you pick somebody up off the street, you don't tell them to come around to see you later at your office. You've undoubtedly picked up somebody who has attention on the subject of postulating time. The thing for you to do is to take him right over to your office, if you possibly can. You see that? Don't put something on the future time track for him any more than you can help, because the person who is really in difficulty, who has psychosomatic ills and so forth, has stopped postulating time. And the moment he stops postulating time, he doesn't have any.

Now, how much time has a fellow got and how much time is he rushing and how much time is he sitting still with? And all of this is all very interesting, except it depends on just this one fact: Your individual is or is not postulating time for himself.

Looking over a very busy career, I can see definitely the speed factor of composition as derived from strictly one postulate. I used to write about a hundred thousand words a month by writing three hours a day, three days a week. Now, that's a lot of words, but it never occurred to me that it was a lot of words. In other words, you simply postulate that that much action can fit in that much time. You postulated the time. There's nobody sitting there agreeing with you or disagreeing with. Actually, you're just walking free. Well, I might as well have postulated eight million words in one hour per month. I was just saying how much physical-universe time can be allocated to the time span which I am using in which to compose. You see that? You get that as a difference.

Now, let's take anybody out there doing a job of work, and we'll find something very, very peculiar. We'll find somebody who is just working like mad-he's just working, working, working, and he's just got to get it all done, he's got to get it all done. And the end of the day comes and he has nothing done. You know? It's all in a confusion. And he was awfully busy all day but nothing happened. Did you ever run into anybody like this, huh?

And the next day he goes on and – oh, he's just so busy – he's just got to do this and he's got to do that. And he finally is sitting still, presenting a very funny and silly picture. He's

sitting still, not even moving, not even talking, not even writing – accomplishing absolutely nothing – telling you how awfully busy he is and how he hasn't got any time. And he'll eventually collapse down to the point where he has no time of any kind whatsoever to employ on anything and that's why he's sitting there. But that's perfectly reasonable to him; that's perfectly reasonable.

He'll get so he can't *start* anything. Why? He has no time in which to start it, much less to finish it. So he starts in originally by saying, "Well, I haven't got time to finish it," then "I haven't got time to do it well," then "I haven't got time to do it. I haven't got even time to start it." And then, finally, "I can't think about doing it."

And that's what happens to a person's doingness. It's his ability to postulate the amount of time. And the only confusion that you would get into about this is the fact that we have an agreed-upon time span. But you might recognize that the time for an entire nation or an entire earth could thereby go awry.

How much can you do in an hour? In an hour? What's an hour? An hour is the length of time it takes the sun to move fifteen degrees in the sky. The sun isn't doing anything. What's this coordination?

Well, you'll find out that when a country can still postulate time or a world can still postulate time, then, an hour would be a tremendous amount of doing-ness. They would have a festival at sunrise and a couple of games, you know? And then along about noon, why, have a feast. And that leaves them all afternoon – that leaves them all afternoon completely empty – and so that would be a good time to go boating so that they would have time in order to practice up for the dance they were giving that night. And then they'd finish up about midnight and say, "My, what an idle day!" This is the amount of time they could postulate in terms of doingness. Do we have time to do it or don't we? is the question.

This is very simple to understand if you understand that time itself is merely a postulate. It's a postulate.

Now, what is the – if it's a postulate, does it have an anatomy as such? Well, yes, it's a complexity of postulates, the way you look at it in this particular universe at this time, but not very complex.

Time depends on change. In order to have time, you have to alter things, because is-ness has a condition there – alter-isness. In order to get an isness to persist, you of course have to have something there about persist, which would consist of the time postulate. The way the postulates have gone together which make up this universe – not the theoretical way in which they *could* go together to make up a universe... Get this as a different thing. You see, you could go about this just all out in an entirely different fashion and postulate time and still have time, but it would not necessarily be the postulates which were made and are made and are in this universe right here and now. See? It wouldn't necessarily be the same set of postulates if we suddenly dreamed it up.

So we have to subject the postulates of time to a little subjective truth-proof, you know – and get ourselves a test on it. And we find out that we can make things persist by changing them. If we keep on changing something and change it and change it and change it

and change it, we're getting persistence. But actually, what we're doing is postulating the time for it to persist in.

And when an individual has stopped postulating time, he's stopped perceiving. So perception and the postulate of time are identical phenomena. You see? Perception and postulation are the same thing.

You should recognize, very clearly, that time is a postulate. Because when you're working with a preclear who is having difficulty perceiving, you know that there is something wrong with the time postulate, therefore there is something wrong with change. See?

Alter-issness is that part of the time postulate which we can most evenly and closely observe. And we find out that changing things brings time into being. It causes a persistence; we get a continuance of time by alter-issness. The mechanism of alter-issness gives us a perception of time.

We find out somebody who is in a state where he believes he is about to perish will then try to change everything in his vicinity, right up to the point where he knows completely that he *is* perishing, at which moment he will simply succumb – bang! – and he will cease to exist or persist, you know, as that particular individuality. And he as himself *without* that individuality will proceed on and pick up another body.

All right. We'll get the tremendous amount of change or accomplishment which has to take place immediately before death. Here we have people all around the place who aren't doing anything, their affairs are in horrible condition, they're out on the street or in businesses and so on.

Now, if we were to go up to these people, one after the other – you know, I mean, let's put on a – oh, carry a little black bag (I'd forgotten what galaxy I was in for the moment). That's the badge of office – a little black bag and a stethoscope. One doesn't quite know what one does with a stethoscope but it's interesting. A stethoscope won't detect whether or not a person is dead or not, you know, really – they often miss. It's not a reliable instrument, but it's a badge of office.

A stethoscope is the dramatization of the serpent, of the caduceus. That's right. I'll have to write a paper on that. (Most acceptable thing I could possibly write for the AMA.)

Anyway, we have the little black bag and we go up to this fellow and we say to this fellow, "My dear fellow, I must inform you," having tapped the stethoscope against his chest, so he knows he's being hit by a snake (I think that's about it – yes, I'll have to write that paper). Anyway, we tap him and we say, "Oh! We have just learned through this diagnosis that you only have three months to live."

The funny part of it is you'll see a busy man, promptly. He'll really get busy. Well, he'll sit down in a slump, you know, for a moment or two – that's just the impact. And then he'll say, "Let's see. Time. Time. Oh! Alter-issness, alter-issness, alter-issness, alter-issness, alter-issness, alter-issness, alter-issness," you know, change – "I've got to get my will straight, I've got to get this straight, I got to get that straight and I got to get Mary moved out of that house into the other house which I've been building. Gotta have this and that." And the months go by and the months go by and the years go by, and he's still alive.

"Well," you say, "the doctor was wrong." No, the doctor wasn't wrong. As of that moment, the experience of the doctor demonstrated to him that people who had this illness (who had not been told that they had only three months to live) died in three months. What he's left out of it is the factor on people who have been told they only have three months to live. You tell somebody that he only has three months to live, and he will, of course, throw into gear – or not to necessarily say that he would throw into gear, but he *could* throw into gear – the only mechanism available to him to cause persistence in this universe, and that is alter-iness. And he would change, change, change, change, change, change, change, change, change, change, change, change.

He right away has got to change his condition; that is the first thing he thinks of. You think that this is just natural that he would do that. No. We're talking on a higher echelon of philosophy. You tell him he's only got three months to live. "This is an unacceptable fact to him," you say, "and so therefore he's got to change his condition." No, worse than that – worse than that. He's got to change his condition. If he has no time persistence, he has got to change his condition. The one thing with which he can gain persistence is alter-iness. If he would simply change the furniture around in his office he'd live better. I mean, he'd live a little longer – the amount of change – because he can do that successfully.

It's unsuccessful changes which fix a person and cause a not-iness to occur.

Now, unsuccessful and successful are themselves postulates. You know, "I am this individual, and this individual is supposed to persist." You could just as well say, "I am this individual and therefore this individual is not supposed to persist." I mean, you could make up your postulate that way just as well as the other way.

But the accepted chain of considerations which go in to make up art criticism, appreciation, win-lose and so on – we just have a set of considerations. And we say, "Well, they are successful changes as long as the individual is doing it, and the changes are unsuccessful as long as somebody else is doing it." And that's very much a part of the win-lose factor and of the time factor, too. That's self-determinism. One merely has made the postulate that as long as one does it one is successful. You know, as long as one is able to accomplish the postulate, this makes up win. "I am now going to pick up my right finger. I won!" You see? "Picked up my right finger; I made the postulate good."

Well now, what's happened to the preclear is, he has made the postulate and then something has contraried the postulate to such a degree that he is fixed; he is fixed, he cannot change. You see?

When he makes the postulate, it just works out – *in this universe*; not necessarily the most theoretical or most optimum setup you could make, but in this universe it just happens to work out that this is the way it was. When you made a postulate and then didn't accomplish the goal postulated in that postulate (remember you were postulating time to postulate a goal), when you were unable to reach that particular attainment, then, of course, you hadn't changed anything.

Well, the way you could make time was by changing the position of something, and that's the way time is made in this universe: change the position of something in space. Time is made by changing the position of something in space. And so we get all of the neutrons and

the morons vibrating at a vast rate of speed, but a uniform rate of speed, changing their position in space. And then we can look around at several of these particles, such as the sun, Earth and other things, see that they're changing their relationships to each other in space at a uniform rate, and having perceived this, why, then, of course, we are looking at a change in time. Change of position brings about time.

There is no such commodity as time. It isn't anything that can be poured from one bucket to the other. But then this happens to be true of matter too. You can't pour matter from one bucket to another, actually, unless you first made a postulate that you could. And in such a wise, time cannot take place until a postulate is made concerning it, and in this universe the postulate had to do with change of location in space. And when change of location in space occurred, then time occurred.

Well now, you could change something's location in space simply by lying about it, and you'd get a persistence. You'd come off as-isness. Now, the moment you change something's location in space, you come away from as-isness, and it doesn't unmock, so you get persistence.

Now, an individual is as well off as he can change things in location in space. Let's take up the Prelogics and we find out the Prelogics – those that precede the Logics and Axioms – have to do with "a thetan is an energy-space production unit and that a thetan can change objects in location in space." And right next door to that, we have the fact that a thetan can create objects to change in space of his own creation. In other words, he can do all of these things, and we get that, in this universe – and this is pretty common to most universes – we get those postulates as the conditional postulates upon the universe.

Now, he makes another postulate and that other postulate, of course, is that something can persist and that there is a time stream, that there is a persistence and so on. And this postulate is represented as time. So when we locate something in space, we are actually working with the time postulate: persistence.

If you see somebody who has failed often, what do you mean by failed? He has decided to move something in space and then hasn't. Total anatomy of failure: He has decided to move something in space and then hasn't. The way it's recognized in this universe, that's the total anatomy of failure.

Of course, he could simply postulate that he'd failed. So that's another anatomy of failure. He's always free to do that. You can, yourself, do that, not to run out anything or anything of the sort, just simply say to yourself that you failed, not for any cause, reason or anything else. "I failed and therefore I have to feel a certain way," and so forth, and then feel that way. You could. Or you could simply postulate, "I've won." Not won anything, you understand, you just postulate that you've won now, and the conditions of winning are feeling good, which is part of the woof and warp of postulates, and therefore "I feel good" – having given you a reason to feel good.

Or why don't you just postulate that you feel good? It doesn't matter where you enter into this. There is no *sensible* concatenation here. We are only talking about an agreed-upon concatenation.

This universe and the postulates which formed it is not necessarily the best universe that could be made. It just happens to be the universe we're sitting in and it happens to be the universe in which our postulates are being made and unmade, and it just happens that it went together on these four conditions of as-ness, alter-ness, not-ness and isness. So we've got these four conditions, and those four conditions, of course, woven together, make this universe act like it does and behave like it does and gives you the ideas of what a win is and what a lose is and so on. It's on a postulate basis.

But the most curious manifestation of all of this is the manifestation of time. And that is our main interest here this morning. And we have this matter of time occupying a considerable space in the field of aberration. And that is because of this: It is the one postulate where an individual begins to depend on other-determinisms more than any other way.

You see, we see the sun moving and we take the cue from the sun as to how much time we have. We see clocks moving and we take the cue from them as to how much time we have. That tells us how much persistence we have. Oh, so we're being told by these objects whether we can live or not, aren't we? That's just the most curious of things in this universe, that one would take his clue as to whether or not he was going to persist on whether or not the sun moved a certain direction or distance. That's idiotic. So the sun did figure eights. If I'm not dependent upon the sunlight, I'm certainly not going to die just because of that.

And a thetan is not dependent on sunlight. Quite the contrary, a thetan is dependent for his good health on manufacturing his own jolly old energy; he's not dependent on the sun manufacturing his energy for him. That's just an intricate hook-together. And that, again, depends on postulates.

Well, now, the postulate of time could be simply, cleanly made in some universe, and say, "Well, there will now be a continuance for one and all," and that would be that. But that wasn't the way it was made in this universe. It was made on the basis that when as-ness is postulated, in order to get a persistence we have to practice alter-ness. We'll have to change the thing in location, one way or another, in order to get a persistence.

Now, people get inverted on this in this universe, so they take an isness and they change it in location; it starts disappearing.

Did you ever have somebody move a postulate with a mass of energy around? He starts moving it around and the energy mass starts disappearing.

But what started disappearing? It was the energy mass, wasn't it? Hm? It was not the postulate, particularly. He just got used to that postulate and he finally took it over as his own postulate. So what!

Now, therefore, a person can invert in this universe, and we run into isness followed by not-ness. A person can finally say, "Well, if I move something around, it'll disappear." He's made it a counter-postulate.

Well, he's perfectly at liberty to make a counter-postulate, but it isn't the postulate on which this universe is made. This universe is *rigged* so that that postulate will avail not to an individual. You know, that's part of the considerations that make it up: that if you've got something and then you say it doesn't exist, you're stuck with it. That's this universe.

Now, alter-isness produces two types of persistence: we get persistence as isness and we get a persistence as not-isness. See? The fellow is persisting, but he doesn't want to be there. Well, he's persisting because he doesn't want to be there. This, too, is a change, although he's fixed in a locale. Now, there's the fellow who is persisting because he wants to be there and he's persisting because of change.

They're both alter-isnesses. An individual's desire to change continues his persistence in the spot he's in, if he cannot move. But he had to postulate that he couldn't move before this could happen. So we get the dwindling spiral.

Now, we also get the manifestation of accumulating energy on a preclear. Every time a preclear has said, "Now I am going to move," and hasn't moved, or he says, "Now I am moving and I'm going to continue moving," and he's stopped – you know, such as you're walking down the street and you walk into a lamppost – any time this has occurred, he has lost, which is to say, he's got a counter-postulate. So he adds up loss as stationary.

This universe, you see, brands everything which isn't moving as innocent, and the things that are moving are guilty – always. So he's lost.

Well, how do you lose then? By getting *fixed* in a place. That's how you lose.

Now, an individual who is unable to move objects out of a certain location, eventually gets to a position where, when he's trying to move these objects out of this location, he recognizes a failure, and so he goes into apathy. He says, "I don't have enough energy to do this."

What nonsense! He doesn't have energy enough to move energy? Why doesn't he just postulate it someplace else? (But that's another thing.) He could say it is as it is and it would disappear, and then he postulates existence someplace else and then change that around so it couldn't be disappeared again, and he'd be all set. What's he doing picking things up?

Now, a drill, however, in moving things and putting them back in the same place again will run out this consistent, continuous failure, and so you get Opening Procedure by Duplication and its tremendous effectiveness. If it's done with a little bit heavier object than is ordinary, an individual recognizes he can even pick up and put back into place the same object and win, not fail: you've changed the basic postulate by which he's working in this universe, which is to say, if he can't move he's failed.

All right. However that may be, we have these various conditions. And the point we want to drive home, immediately and right this minute, is that time depends, in this universe, on alter-isness – at least the desire to change. So anybody who is desiring to change is persisting in time. And people who do not want to change, and so forth, do not persist in time.

The whole universe is rigged around these postulates.

The Four Conditions Of Existence

Part II

A lecture given on 23 July 1954

I want to talk to you about extremely elementary processes.

In view of the various factors in Scientology, we can discover that some extremely elementary processes could be designed if we would look at these upper-echelon factors.

Now, let's look, first and foremost, at this thing called isness – reality. How much in the way of processing could you get just out of this concept: that there is such a thing as isness – an existence? How many processes could you possibly do? Well, actually, you could do a very great many.

But let me call your attention, very quickly and abruptly and immediately, to a very singular fact – if I have not mentioned it before – and that fact is simply this: that to give a thetan exercise in getting ideas is minimal. A thetan can always shift around his considerations one way or the other, but it depends upon the scope he is willing to shift them around on.

Now, an individual on one point – that is to say, a receipt point of the communications formula – an individual standing on this receipt point would feel himself limited to the degree that he had to be on receipt point. So he would then feel that the consideration that he was on receipt point, or was being the effect of existence, would monitor his ability to make considerations. That is to say, he would not feel, then, that he was free to make any other consideration above the level of the fact that he was on receipt point. Now, all of his other considerations, then, would fall below this level.

Now, let's take somebody who considers himself to be on cause point and solely and entirely and completely on source point – source point, cause point; receipt point, effect point. (Formula of communication: cause, distance, effect – the most elementary statement of it – involving attention and duplication.) And we would discover that if an individual was monitoring himself with one *basic* consideration, his consideration would then fall below, and his ability to change his mind would then fall below, that basic consideration.

Basic consideration could be "I am on an effect point"; that is, "I am being the effect of many flows and messages and that sort of thing, and this is very bad." Now his considerations are various.

Let's take this most basic consideration: "I must get off this point." You see, "I am on this effect point and I do not like this." Therefore, he makes the consideration that he must get off of this point.

Well, what is monitoring the consideration that he must get off the point? The fact that he's on it, of course. You see?

All right. Now let's take it reverse-end-to, and let's get an individual who finds himself on source point. This individual is on source point and there he sits on source point and he's being cause: he's being the source of the impulses or particles which are going across the distance and hitting effect points. Well, this individual is saying, "Now I mustn't cause anything bad. I must cause only good things. And I must do this and that for people," or "I must do this and that for this or for that," or something of this sort, you see?

And what is this host of considerations being monitored by? Of course, that he is on a cause point; he's on a source point of a communication – synonymous here: *cause* and *source*, *effect* and *receipt* – *naturally*.

All right. Now, if he discovers himself suddenly on the receipt point of something, this fellow is really dismayed. You get the dismay? His basic consideration is that he's being cause point, and yet all of a sudden he receives something – ooh! Now, that would be a breakdown – basically and primarily – would be a breakdown of his isness; his reality, a breakdown of his isness.

He can then have a break of reality only to the degree that other-determinism brings into question the postulate on which he is operating. See, he can have a break of reality only to the degree that other-determined hammer-pound brings about an invalidation of the postulate on which he's basically running. He says, "I'm cause and I'm being a good fellow and I'm doing this and doing that," and all of a sudden he gets jailed. My, this is upsetting! But what is his basic consideration? That he is occupying a cause point.

Now, let's take this in a very minor fashion and let's take somebody who has super-paralysis of the medulla oblongata or some very, very serious ill, such as entire closure of the pocketbook. And we find him trying to change this condition. Now we've entered into another field. See? We've entered into not-isness and then we've entered into alter-isness, you see? Now, he has this terrible ill. He has this mental difficulty. He has some other difficulty or other and he now says, "It mustn't exist." That's his statement there. "It mustn't exist." And his next statement after that: he said, "All right, don't exist!" *Grrrr*.

Well, what do you know? It keeps on existing. Well, "All right," he says, "I'll change it on a gradient scale. I'll chip away at the corners of it," and so forth. Well, he'll at length decide he can't do anything about it.

One of the actions that he would finally do would be to draw a black curtain over the thing – that's one of the basic actions on this. He says, "Now, look. I can't change it at all." He's trying to affect not-isness by using alter-isness. See? Not-isness would not take place by a postulate, he discovered – or thought he discovered – so the basic thing he must do immediately then is to start changing it on a gradient scale, which is to say, alter-isness. And it just stays right there. And he is already running on a failed postulate of not-isness.

So what's his activity of change?

His activity of change is then proceeding from the basic postulate that it must not be, which is proceeding from another basic postulate that it is, which is proceeding from the basic postulate that he's there in the first place (you see that?), which is proceeding from the basic postulate that there must be a "there" for him to be at.

So we trace back these basic postulates and we discover a little rule here. And this little rule is that *an individual has a condition and the condition continues to exist as long as the individual has a condition.*

Now, that sounds like an idiotic little rule, but it's a very, very true little rule. It'll continue as long as he has a condition.

Well, why does he have a condition? He must have a postulate about the condition before he has the condition. Right? So there's a more basic postulate every time you find such a condition.

In order to get over something, you have to have postulated that you have it. In order to recover, you must postulate that you have something from which to recover. In order to go through the actions of emptying a pocketbook, you must have had to have postulated that it was full and that it should be emptied.

Now, you're all too prone to look at existence and say, "Well, there's existence there, and now we'll make some postulates." No, this is not quite the direction that we're drifting. You'd have to make the postulates to have existence there so that you could make some postulates to recover from having the existence there.

Let's get back to this isness. A condition has to be postulated before it can be unpostulated. That's right, isn't it? Well, so that any condition to have any existence or persistence must be based on time of some sort. Well, therefore, there must be a time postulate. And we find out that an individual doesn't have any time unless he continues to postulate it. An individual ceases to have time to the degree that he ceases to postulate it.

Now, when I say "cease to postulate time," I don't want you for a moment to get the idea that there's any witchcraft involved, that you have to go out with spider webs and mix them up with four quarts of morning sunlight and stir them all up with a whisper. There's no witchcraft involved in making this postulate. It's simply this kind of a postulate: "Continue." Just get the notion of continuing something and you will have a time continuum.

Now, you could get that notion right now. Just sort of get an idea of a little piece of space out in front of you there and you have the notion "Continue" about this little piece of space. All right. That's making time. You've made time. That's all the postulate there is. There isn't even the words "Now I am going to make some time and I am going to cause the time to persist and continue." No, it's just *urn-mmm*. You see, you can do anything.

All right. Now this time continuum is a tremendously interesting thing, particularly in view of the fact that so many people have agreed upon it. But their apparent agreement with it leads them to depend upon other people finally to carry on the agreement while they just sit there. And what do you know? Eventually they just sit there!

Now, you'll find many a boy who's having a bad time simply sitting at home in his bedroom – just sitting there. What's he stopped doing? Well, he couldn't have any motion, he says.

Well, motion consists of this: consecutive positions in a space. Now, he'd have to conceive that he had some space and that he'd have to have some consecutive motions in it.

If you could just ask such a person to go out and trim the hedge – just no more, no less – just tell him to go out and trim the hedge; if you ask him to go out and put a piece of chalk on the sidewalk all the way around the block, every five feet, you would see considerable recovery in his case.

Why? Well, he knows that he'd have to go all the way around the block or he knows that he would have to finish trimming the hedge. See? Or he would have to come around to his door again, you see, on the block, or come around to the other side of the yard. In other words, he can continue to postulate a time continuum against the objects which are already there.

Now, you could just say to this fellow, "All right. Now get the idea of moving this dish. Now move it." Now get the idea of moving this dish again. Get the position you're going to move it to, now. Now move it." "Now get the idea of moving this dish. Now get the place you're going to move it to, and move it."

Hard as it might seem for some people to conceive, an individual can be made violently ill with this. Why? What's kicking back there? The thetan can't get that sick, certainly. Well, this individual's agreement with the body – he is the body, the body is himself, therefore, everything that happens to the body is what happens to himself and everything that happens to himself is what happens to the body. In other words, he's in a superidentification.

What postulate is this individual already riding with?

Now, let's take a look at isness. He has to conceive that he has a body before he can recover from one.

Let's get this salient and *horrible* fact, that this whole thing is monitored by isness, no matter how much not-isness. You see, not-isness is always pursuant to isness. No matter how much alter-isness that takes place... You see, you've got an as-isness, then alter-isness has to take place to get an isness. Well, if you have any isness persisting on a continuum – and that is our basic definition of *isness*. Isness is something that is persisting. *As-isness* is something that is just postulated or just being duplicated, you see?

As-isness, that's just no alteration taking place, and as-isness contains no life continuum, no time continuum, nothing! See? It'll just go anytime you postulate a perfect duplicate for anything – same space, same object, same time-boom! If you postulated it all the way through without any limiter postulate hanging around at all, it would just be gone, and that's all there is to it. It'd be gone for everybody else too.

This isness is your monitoring postulate.

An individual couldn't possibly get into trouble with as-isness, except if you consider losing everything trouble. But it would be things that he was losing which he either didn't

want or had just postulated into existence. In other words, as-iness is an exact duplication or an exact creation. All as-iness is doing is merely accepting the responsibility for having created it, and anybody can accept the responsibility for anything. That's all as-iness is when it operates as a perfect duplicate.

There's two kinds of as-iness: there's the as-iness, you postulate it in the space and time; you know, you postulate it right there where it exists. And the other one is, the as-iness where you re-postulate it; you see, you just postulate it again. The object already exists. There is an isness being approximated as an as-iness and it becomes an "as-is-that-isn't"; it becomes, then, a not-iness.

If you just created it as an as-iness, unless you altered it rapidly, you would get a not-iness. And if you exactly approximated an isness as an as-iness, you would again get the same result. You got the same result both times – not-iness.

As-iness, perfectly done, if not followed by alter-iness becomes a not-iness, quickly and immediately – but right now.

Now, you've had that experience in knocking out engrams, facsimiles and so forth. It hasn't occurred to anybody yet, fortunately, to simply exactly approximate the body. Treat the body as an as-iness and go your way. Well, you say, well, it's got a lot of facsimiles and so forth. All right. Treat them as the same as-iness, all in one operation – boom.

But of course you had to *assume* you had a body before you could possibly treat it with an as-iness.

Now, existence goes this way: there is an isness. And then the individual – and this is the only error you could make, and this is another method, slightly, of getting a continuation, because it is an alter-iness. You see? There is an alter-iness right there between isness and not-iness. The second you say, "There it is. Now I don't want it and it doesn't exist," you see, you've postulated that you're changing it. But it is a very abrupt and particular kind of isness, is not-iness.

And instead of following isnesses with not-inesses, we followed them with as-inesses, nobody could ever possibly get into any trouble. The way you get into trouble is to follow an isness with a blunt, thud, not-iness. You say, "There it is. I don't want it. It isn't." Oh-oh. Oh, oh, oh, oh, oh!

Now, what's the difference between these two operations? Very interesting difference. You've got an isness. Here's an ashtray. You don't want the ashtray anymore. One operation – a correct one, as far as you're concerned, if you just really didn't want it anymore – would be simply do an as-iness. You know, as-iness, perfect duplicate. Boom! – gone. See, *you* haven't got an ashtray anymore. Certainly *you* haven't got one.

This baffles people when you're running perfect duplication on Opening Procedure by Duplication, and you include in it the step "Make a perfect duplicate of it." The thing disappears if they're going real good. Then they're asked to come back to it and pick it up, and this seems to be an invalidation. It isn't invalidation, because they're in agreement with the auditor and the auditor has repostulated it into existence. So they actually, by just saying, "All right"

and walking back to it again, they have to postulate it into existence to pick it back up again, and they miss that step.

So in running Opening Procedure by Duplication, you would have to say, "All right. Now, consider a book is over there." "Now walk over to it." "Now pick it up," and so forth – weight, color and get a description. "All right. Now make a perfect duplicate of it" or "Put it down. Make a perfect duplicate of it." "Now walk away from it."

Well, you tell an individual to walk away from *it*, he's just as-isness'd it. See? It's gone.

You'd say instead, "Walk over to the other book." Now, when he finished that, when it comes to this first book, "Now consider there is a book over there." "Now walk over to it and pick it up and make a perfect duplicate." Of course, it's gone again.

This invalidative factor of agreement is that for you it's gone and for somebody else it's still there, finds agreement. Your willingness to be a good fellow, which postulate you are also running on, lets the other fellow put it back there again. So an individual can get upset about as-isness. Now, this just isn't auditing, this is in living. You say that car isn't there anymore and then your wife keeps bawling you out because that car is still sitting out there – mass of junk. Well, you've decided it wasn't there anymore. To heck with it. And she wants it moved! Well, you listen to this for awhile and you finally come off the postulate, and postulate that there is an isness out there and go do something about it, you see? Then you have to use action. Well, if you could just ask *her* to just look at it, make a perfect duplicate of it, then you'd both be happy. Then maybe the neighbors would complain. Well, instead of going into terrific agreement with these neighbors, and so forth, you just have them come over and make an as-isness of the thing. They wouldn't see the car anymore either.

In other words, we would keep this up until anybody who had a basic vested interest in agreeing with the car had finally seen – and actually this would be the long way around. These individuals that are doing this, by the way, all consider themselves to be occupying a finite point of individuality and existence, you see? And they won't take the responsibility for every other person's consideration. To make a thing really disappear, you just have to take the responsibility for every viewpoint in the whole universe and say "As-is" – different operation.

But to follow an isness with an as-isness brings you into an *actual* not-isness – thing doesn't exist; an actual not-isness. But if you just postulate against this thing that it doesn't exist – and you've said a not-isness right here, you know; you didn't do an as-isness – you've done what? You have refused the responsibility for having created it and you have said, "Somebody else creates it and I don't want it." You've said "somebody else." You've postulated the existence of somebody else with regard to this thing, and you've said, "Another determinism is placing this thing before me and therefore I don't want it, so therefore I'm going to say that it isn't but it really belongs to somebody else."

We have to postulate another determinism, which is to say, refute the responsibility for having created the object, before you can get such an appearance as a not-isness.

Now, an individual can fail utterly. There's the Empire State Building, and he says, "It isn't architecturally sound. It doesn't exist as far as I'm concerned." He's trying to postulate a

not-iness; he's trying to make it unreal. He has to postulate right along with this that somebody else created the Empire State Building to get what we consider *unreality* or the manifestation of unreality. See? And the case which gets these unrealities is handling life on this basis: "Everybody else put it there and created it, and I really don't dare interfere with any determinism on their part, so I'll just kind of dim it down a little bit. I'll say it's not there."

He goes rushing down a mountainside in a car that has the brakes burned out on [it], and there's a big boulder right down at the bottom of the hill, and he runs right straight into this big boulder – crash! – and just before he hits, you can always find him postulating this: "It's not there and I'm not here." Crush!

Only, you see, he doesn't do an as-iness. He doesn't say "I'm in a car rushing down the mountainside. I have the responsibility..." – you know, just this feeling; you wouldn't say all these words: "In a car rushing down a mountainside and all these people are in this car, and I'm in this car too; and there's a boulder there and the car is going to hit the boulder." As-is! – bing! No car, no boulder, no mountainside, no people. It would happen, even before he hit the boulder. See? Something would happen at this point.

This is a very curious lot of phenomena that we're fooling around with here, and of course, we have no serious intent with this phenomena, which is a fortunate thing. Otherwise, somebody realizing exactly how this is done would sooner or later, maybe, unmock the Republican Party or Russia – leave a hole. And of course to do that you would have to accept the viewpoint of two hundred million Russians or something like that. You see? And you could unmock Russia if you did that. But you'd have to take full responsibility.

Now, what's this full responsibility? Full responsibility merely says this: "I created it." When you ask somebody to make a perfect duplicate of it, he's going through the mechanics of creating it. Therefore, it disappears. He knows, unless he throws some other-determinism in on the thing – in other words, practices some alter-ism on its creator – that it's not going to exist at all.

Now, the physical universe, as we look at it right around us here, is an isness for one reason only: we all agree that somebody else created it. Whether that is God or Mubjub or Bill, we agree that somebody else brought these conditions into existence. And as long as we are totally agreed upon this, boy, have we got everything solid. And the moment when we agree otherwise and we say, "Well, we made it," then it starts to get thin. Now, this will worry a preclear. It's just as if he feels he could never make another one. It'll get thin for him.

In the processing of reality, if you just handled isness all by itself, you would just have an individual start to look at what he considers to exist. And we would take the most solid manifestation of that and that would be the space in the vicinity, the walls in the vicinity, so on. That would be the most elementary process that we could do. We just start spotting spaces and walls – just that, no more. And we just keep spotting them and spotting them and spotting them. And let what happens happen. That's all – just let what happens happen. Just ask the individual to keep on spotting things. Very permissive, you see?

Now, supposing he kept on looking at them with his physical vision. We find out that he would get up to a certain level and then he'd start to have body somatics. Because making the body do this continually and so forth is actually processing a reality vaguely in the direc-

tion of an as-isness. See, it's not bluntly or sharply in the direction of as-isness, it's just asking him to process it a little bit in that direction. "Let's just take these walls as you find them." You know? "Let's take the spaces around here just as you see them." In other words, "Let's look at another spot and let's look at another spot and let's look at another spot. Let's just take these things as you see them." And of course after a while the walls are going to get brighter and brighter and brighter and brighter and brighter and brighter and bri... and duller and duller and duller and duller and duller and then gone.

Well, when they get bright, bright, bright, bright, bright, that's all right: the body will still feel pretty good. But when it starts getting dull, dull, dull, du... thin, thin, thin, the body doesn't like this; it does not think this is the best thing to do. It would not recommend this as subject matter for an article in Bernarr MacFadden's magazines. Because it knows it'll fall if it stands in space.

So therefore this very, very simple process would not necessarily have to be completed simply by remedying havingness, but just by getting the fellow to close his eyes and spot anything he could see, no matter how vaguely, as a thetan. Just spot anything he sees. If he sees a nothingness, okay; if he sees a somethingness, okay. Just get him to spot it. We don't care what he sees. We might indicate various directions, but we would make a very bad mistake if we indicated them as body directions – on your right, on your left, above your head. Oh, no. No, no. We just ask him to look around, and what he sees, "Spot a couple of spots on it." "Now, did you do that?" "Now, something else: "Spot a couple of more spots on that."

Well, we know already, if we've run it permissively in the environment, he's had to point them out and walk around to them, he will obey orders. Now that we've got him to a point where he will obey orders on this subject, we can trust him to close his eyes and spot spots or spot spaces or spot anything he wants to spot with his eyes closed. And we just simply keep on spotting them.

And that would be the most elementary process there is in Scientology.

The Four Conditions Of Existence

Part III

A lecture given on 23 July 1954

Okay. Now we have these various conditions of existence – four various conditions of existence.

These four conditions of existence which we are studying are actually variations of existence itself. They are certain attitudes about existence and they are the basic attitudes about existence.

Now, we could make many more attitudes and we would find that we were all deriving them from these four. But we could make these four and find out that we were all deriving them from one: isness, or reality.

There has to be an isness before you can do an alter-issness; there has to be an isness before you can do a not-issness. Isn't that right?

Okay. There has to be an isness before you can do a not-issness. Unless, of course, you want to postulate it in reverse. But we are talking, now, about this particular universe and how it got here.

And we discover as we look along the track that these four conditions of existence presuppose the existence of a postulate known as time. In other words, all existence presupposes the postulate time.

Now, time is just a plain, ordinary postulate which says out of a nonconsecutive beingness, which doesn't exist forever – there's no forever, see? It would just *be* there, see? No forever involved, no instant involved, it just hasn't any consecutive existence at all. And out of this we would have to make a postulate "there would now be a consecutive existence" – consecutive *existences*. Or there'd have to be a consecutive series of states. And out of this consecutive series of states, we would get, *then*, a parade of time; a time continuum.

Now, an individual who is simply occupying space without any energy involved whatsoever has the same feeling, but a bad one – he doesn't have a good feeling about it. Without any space, he could have a good feeling about it – no space, no energy, no continuum; he could have a fairly good feeling about this. But when he gets into the matter of a space, now he has this feeling of forever-ness unmocked. He makes that uncomfortable for himself, so he will now go on creating consecutive states of existence and have a game. Space is necessary to start this game, but when you've just got space and you've got nothing else, it's rather unbearable. Do you see that? You're already occupying, so there is an existence there, but it isn't

an existence which has any consecutive difference of state. And that's real poor. You get this feeling every once in a while in space opera, if you're ever fooling around with that.

All right. Now, here we have, then, existence in one state being conditional upon a time postulate which would include a space-energy manifestation. We have to have space, we have to have energy, and now we don't necessarily have a consecutive existence, do you see? But this would be a simultaneousness. There would be no question about whether you made the postulate for space and energy before you made the postulate of time, or the postulate of time after you made the space-energy manifestation. Be no question of any postulate before or after, because you have not postulated the postulate which causes a before or after. And that postulate would be time.

So, actually, to have a game, it's a simultaneous action whereby you postulate space, energy, time – space, energy, continuous existence – which is an as-iness, space, altered; energy, as-iness altered; time, as-iness altered. Your three items there have to have the time postulate with alter-iness in them in order to get a persistence. That's how it's done in this universe. You don't just have to do this all the time, but when those three consecutive postulates are made simultaneously, why, we then have a continuum of existence demarked by differences of position of the particle in the space, and we have time being marked out for us very neatly.

We have to alter position in order to get a continuousness. We have to say, "It is here. Now it's here. Now it's here. Now it's here."

Now, there's another way of making time come true. We say "Space-no space, space-no space, space-no space, space-no space." You're postulating, however, that you can do this before you can say "Space-no space, space-no space."

Well now, this postulate is so easy for a thetan to make, it might be considered a native part of his mock-up. So here we have, however, before this, an ideal state – that is to say, an idealized or just a theoretical state – we have this theoretical state whereby we merely have a static which has no space, no mass, no wavelength, no motion, no time, which has the ability to consider. And we are dealing with the basic stuff of life, just by definition.

Now, it is very peculiar that we, mixed up in all of this energy, and so forth, and way on down the track from the time this postulate was made – you see anything specious in the way my remarks are hanging together? – very difficult and very strange that we could even discuss this higher state of existence which was made trillions of years ago. No. You see, it must have been concurrent with this, right here. And so we never say – we don't use the word *existence*, we use the word *is*. We don't use the word *then* or *will be*. See, we don't go back into the past or go into the future for this continuousness at all; it's just *is*.

Now, in past ages it was only necessary to say, "Well, reality is reality and you'll just have to accept it, you know. It's just reality. Nothing more you could know about it than that."

Oh, yes! There's a lot more you could know about reality than simply *it is*.

So, *is*, is not a complete and embracing definition of *reality*. It's not complete and embracing. Because reality has a certain mechanical structure, and that structure is composed of these four states of existence. And it'd actually take all these four states of existence to make

the kind of an existence which we are now living, and that is to say, we would have to have isness, then not-isness and alter-isness. And did it strike you before that we might have forgotten and might never have known about, and it might not have been called to our attention directly, this other state? We've always had these three states: alter-isness, not-isness and, of course, isness.

Alter-isness and not-isness, of course, are variations of isness and depend upon isness. But there was a fourth one, and that's as-isness, and that is a perfect duplicate. As-isness. And that condition natively exists at an instant of creation. It exists at this instant of creation. And it also can be made to exist again anytime anybody wants to make it exist again simply by saying, "As is."

If anybody had truly and actually sat down and accepted reality and had got all of his fellow beings to simply accept reality, we wouldn't have any. That's all.

So I think it must have been a half-hearted thing or acceptance of reality in the past must have been defined as "Let's see, now. I think everybody should be unhappy, miserable, ooh, three-quarters dead, enslaved under very thorough control. Now, that is reality and I want you to accept it."

That's what the psychiatrist does, you know? "You'll just have to accept the fact that you're a homosexual."

The fellow has made it plain many times that he wasn't a homosexual, he's a heterosexual.

"Well, you're really a... You're really a... a paleontological uh... aphrodisiac. That is exactly uh... the psychiatric classification that we got out of a Latin book and you'll just have to accept this reality or we won't have any more to do with you as a patient. We'll kick you the hell out of here." You know. Good, solid treatment. I'm afraid this was the way reality was being classified all along the track.

"I'm going to dream something up and I'm going to hold a gun on you." "And the trouble with you is you won't face reality." But whose reality? Whose reality in each case? Somebody else's! So this reality was actually another condition: other-determined as-isness, hm? Other-determined, which is not-isness.

The way you get not-isness is to say, "As is created by you." Aw, that's an awful one! That's a big curve. And that is not-isness. It's an as-isness created by somebody else, which of course isn't an as-isness at all. It's a very specious as-isness. And, naturally, the world would sort of look unreal to everybody if Joe Blow and Doctor Stinkwater and the Heavily Laden Order of Pyramids all said, "This is reality and this is as it is, and you'd better accept it." We've got a not-isness. Isn't it?

So if everything starts to sort of dim down on you and you kind of find things going out, you know, and getting sort of resistively thin... Do you know what I mean? Resistively thin; they're all sort of transparent, but they're there? Or they're all hung with black sheets. You must assume at that time that you have faced up to too many as-isnesses which somebody else created.

In other words, somebody else says, "This is the way things are and you said it." You get that operation in conversation. "And yesterday you said to me – just when I got up, you said to me, 'You never work, you are a dirty loafer.' You remember that, don't you?" I think every familial unit of thetans when they get all together, and so on, should always have, not a bible, but so-and-so's "Rules of Evidence" lying right there to be resorted to at any time. And there ought to be a court in every neighborhood to which you could repair and decide whether or not this was an as-isness or a not-isness.

Now, what is a not-isness? A not-isness comes about from that exact manifestation, or simply by the separate postulate "Well, it is and I regret it – it isn't." You know, you could have made it and then said it wasn't.

Now, the funny part of it is that if you made it and you know you made it, you can always say, "It doesn't exist now." By saying what? By saying "I made it." It as-isness'd, see? You accept the responsibility for having created it and you get a not-isness.

So there are really two conditions of not-isness: there's just vanishment or the other one, which is what we mean, which is an isness which somebody is trying to postulate out of existence by simply saying "It isn't."

A not-isness in our terminology would be this specialized case of an individual trying to banish something without taking responsibility for creating it. Definite, positive and precise definition: trying to vanish something without taking the responsibility for creating it.

And the only result of doing this is to make it all unreal, to make it forgotten, to make it back of the black screen, to make it transparent, to make it dull down, to give it over to a machine, to wear glasses – anything that you could possibly do to get a dim-down of an isness. And that is done by saying – just this, just this precise operation; no other operation: "I didn't make it. It isn't." See? "I didn't do it, so it doesn't exist."

And that will always bring about this other condition of not-isness.

See? "I didn't create it, I have nothing to do with it, I have no responsibility for this at all, so it doesn't exist as far as I'm concerned." "*Nhrrn-nrrn-nrrn-nrrn.*"

Now, built into the woof and warp of the track, the very composite on which an individual is running – he doesn't have to run on these postulates at all, you see, but he *is* running on this makeup of postulates... He of course, then, will trigger into all the rest of his postulates and they'll cross-reference into sticking him right there with it. He's got it.

Now, the only way he can get rid of it now is just to dim it down, dim it down.

Now, the funny part of it is that an individual *can* run a gradient scale of change on something if the gradient scale is back toward his acceptance of responsibility for having created it.

It would not be far enough to go, in Dianetics, simply to find out that your mother did it. That was what your mother said. That wouldn't be far enough to go. You'd have to go back this far: Mother said it – you know, you'd have to postulate that the time was now – Mother said it, and that keyed in the fact that here on the track, whether a million, two billion, eight billion, sixteen trillion years ago, "I said it."

Every time somebody else can put one of your machines or one of your engrams into restimulation, it is only because he can work on something which was natively created by yourself. All things carry the germ of their own destruction. And you have postulated the germ of your own destruction. And then later on people come along and because you're in communication with them, and so forth, they can give you a key-in.

So any engram, as we were operating with it in Dianetics, was a key-in. When I discovered that the whole track ran back-back-back-back-back – back. "No! No! No!" Back-back-back. "No! My golly!" Back-back. "Where the heck are we now? Oh? Oh!"

We're back to where the guy did it in the first place. Well, that's very interesting. And the result of that was the essay on responsibility in *Advanced Procedure and Axioms* – the essay on full responsibility.

Well, a fellow did. He created the condition from which he is now suffering. And he didn't even create it in other wise than he is now suffering it. But it has been keyed in and he has consented even to it being keyed in.

Nothing really is sneaking up on anybody. That's a horrible thing, isn't it? People haven't even made it worse. But we're having a good game. If that game is a game called psychosomatic illness, bereft lover, neglected baby, it's still a game. And as such, the individual is still playing all roles.

Now, what happens is that as an individual goes along the line, he starts identifying himself with the source point and receipt point of the communication line. As a little child, he's the one who identifies himself as the one who is talked to. Very seldom do you ever discover a little child giving Mother a *good* lecture. You seldom discover this. But if you do remember it, you probably remember it with great satisfaction of the good lecture you gave *your* mother.

Here is a condition: the individual has identified himself with a continuous-effect point or a continuous-cause point. And having said "I am now on this point," he now makes his considerations below the level of that point. See, he's considered he's on the point. Now all further considerations are monitored by this consideration that he's on the point, as long as he's on the point. Now, he'd have to recognize that he was on the point (an as-isness) before he'd come off the point. You see that?

A process immediately occurs on such a level. If you just simply ask an individual, Straightwire, this question over and over and over and over and over: "Where could you be where you would be willing to recognize and realize that you were?" "Where could you be that you would be willing to recognize that you were?" And you just run the gradient scale all the way back up the line to the point where the individual recognizes, finally, "You know, I'm sitting right here!" There wouldn't be any mysticism involved in this.

All right. Now, these conditions of existence could be composited up. They are interdependent, one upon another, you see?

An isness exists only because of as-isness – as-isness took place in the first place; it got created, then we had to alter it slightly to get an isness; we had to give up some responsibility for it and we had to shift it around. A not-isness, then, exists in order to provide a game.

A game is an isness which is being handled by a couple of not-isnesses, or an isness being handled by a not-isness, any way you want to look at it.

A football game can be added up in terms of existence, see? Here we have one side and it's got the ball, and so the other side must not-is the side that's got the ball. The side that's got the ball has to win – in other words, to arrive at a receipt point someplace along the line.

We get the communication formula itself as being lower than the conditions of existence. And we get affinity, reality and communication as simply being the *methods* by which existence is conducted. It is not the interplay of existences – so we're dealing with a higher echelon than ARC right now.

All right. Affinity really is merely the consideration of how well it's going. Agreement or reality itself, we're talking about isness. And there is where we enter the corner of the triangle. And we just slide into that triangle on that isness point and then it is modified by A and C. They, of course, come in simultaneously with it.

But those are just a way we play the game, such as some people use drop kicks and some people use punts. This doesn't matter much. We could also add other ways to play this game, but that happens to be the way the game is being played.

All right. And we discover, then, that all of these conditions of existence then would add up to all kinds of manifestations of behavior. They would add up to *all kinds* of manifestations of behavior. Oh, there'd just be lots of them. There'd be a finite number, however; it would be the number of possible combinations, singly, doubly, trebly or quadruply of these four conditions of existence.

And if you want a little exercise sometime in geometry, you ought to do that. How many combinations can we get out of any set of four? Well, we can basically get any one of the four, can't we? But we found these four were somewhat interrelated, so it'd be hard to get just one of the four. But we could recognize one of the four as being its own state. We could isolate it. So there could be any one of these four.

Now, there could be any two of these four in combination with the other two, and then any three of these four in combination with the other three, and any four of these four all acting and all in combination, and then all of these things in various degrees of action.

We get this individual: only seventy-five percent of his life he's trying to say not-is to; another ten percent of his life he's giving an alter-is; one one-hundredth of one percent he's giving an as-is, or trying to give an as-is to, and the remainder is reality, acceptable reality. And that would be just one makeup of a personality.

If we said that there was a gradient scale of isness, a gradient scale of alter-isness, a gradient scale of as-isness (which there isn't), a gradient scale of not-isness, why, we would see, then, that you could take these gradient scales and at one grade or another have a character composited from them. You see? And then we would have a characterization.

What is the basic character of anybody? The basic character of anybody must be made up in some degree *horn – must* be made up from (in conditions of existence) – some space, some energy and his considerations of isness, not-isness and alter-isness. It's not necessarily

true that any part of his considerations are made up of as-isness. Because if they were, they wouldn't be *there*. In other words, he also has been trained to believe that loss is bad. This is just a reverse postulate, just to keep life interesting. Loss is bad. So therefore, he has a tendency to avoid as-isness. So therefore, he'll avoid duplication, he'll avoid all kinds of things. He's afraid he'll unmock. There he is, stuck in eighteen feet thick, you couldn't get him out with a pneumatic drill, all scheduled to go back to the between-lives area and pick up another baby, and he's afraid he'll unmock. Silly, isn't it?

But it doesn't matter too much. Any life or continuance to him has begun to be better than no life at all.

You say, "Well, then why are you processing somebody?"

Well, let me tell you something about that. ARC Straightwire is listed in the first issue of *The Auditor's Handbook* as the third step of Intensive Procedure. In order to accomplish all three goals of getting into a two-way communication and so forth, just after the basic and most rudimentary chitterchat, I would start asking somebody why he was being processed. And you know, I'm just wicked enough to start asking a person why he's being processed for hours until he can at least find one reason why he's being processed. I would merely substitute, then, "Why are you being processed?" – or "Toward what goal are you being processed?" would be a much politer way to say it and maybe a better communication – "Toward what goal are you being processed?" as step three instead of ARC Straightwire. It's a very interesting process!

Most preclears come in, they say, "Process me."

"Why?"

You would say immediately, and you have always supposed that they must have a good idea why they want to be processed. They don't have. They don't have any idea at all why they want to be processed. Because they want to be an exterior thetan? No, they might not even know about this. They just know there's something wrong with them.

The most horrible technique you could run on anybody in terms of producing results, tearing off their heads and everything else, would be "What wrong-ness or what wrong thing would you find other people would accept from you?" "What could you do that was wrong that other people would accept?" See? "Now, what wrongness could you accept from other people?" Back and forth and back and forth. Here goes the guy's manners. His social pattern, his behavior pattern and everything else will just go by the boards running that process.

But he won't be able to tell you, first and foremost, why he's being processed. He won't be able to tell that he wants to feel freer and so forth. He won't articulate any of these things. He'll just sit there and want to be processed.

Well, what toward? Until you've gotten him to put a little time on the track, he will use forever in processing because he's sitting in forever. He isn't moving on the time continuum. He's off the time continuum. Well, if you can't get him processing toward *some* goal or other, or in *some* direction, he just makes processing, of course, the end-all of everything, and he'll just go on being processed forever. But of course if he's going to be processed forever, he'll

have to hold on to his aberrations forever, otherwise he couldn't be processed forever, could he? It's actually as elementary as that why cases stay a long time in processing.

So I've been sorely tempted to alter that step three to just this: "Well now, give me some goals you have in processing." And just keep it up.

Okay?

The Four Conditions Of Existence

Part IV

A lecture given on 23 July 1954

This morning I'd like to talk to you about the various "reasons why." We have a lot to do with reasons why in spite of the fact that a fellow who goes around all the time finding reasons why is usually not in particularly good shape.

But there are a lot of "reasons why" the states of existence and conditions of existence are put together the way they are put together. If they weren't put together in this outrageous fashion – that as-isness followed by alter-isness gives us isness, followed by an alter-isness, of course, or desire to, which brings us into not-isness and which then brings us into alter-isness, which brings us into not-isness, which brings us into alter-isness, which brings us into not-isness... There's a good reason for all this, an excellent reason for all this.

And I'm talking to you, right now, about the fundamental of all aberration which is, incidentally, the fundamental of all existence.

There is a very, very strange condition here. If a thetan were to remain with an as-isness, he would thereafter have nothing. You see, a perfect duplication of the as-isness would cause the as-isness to disappear. Therefore, immediately after the postulation of some object, it is necessary, by mechanics – and it just happens to be so in this universe. It isn't reasonable. It's not reasonable; it's just the way it is in this universe. Therefore, right in the field of mechanics we get the fact that the as-isness must immediately be altered in order to become what we call a reality. And thus people attempt various mechanisms.

One of those mechanisms is the device of God. We're not saying now that there is not a God and all that sort of thing. But if there were never any type of alter ego of this character, there wouldn't be any permanent reality.

Now, it's one thing for there to be a God and quite another thing for everybody to blame everything on him. The most barbaric manifestation that we have generally includes a deity. The savage out in the Gullaby Isles is practicing this. He says the fault is the trees and the river sprite and so forth. I'm talking to you now about the mechanism of "use of" rather than the "identity of" when I mention God.

All right. God, then, is to blame. If we make something and have some hard luck, something like that, the way it looks to us here at this stage of development, we can then say, "Well, God did it to us and he has afflicted us" and so forth.

Well, quite in addition to that, every primitive people has the legend of a Creator. They have to have a legend of a Creator, otherwise they would never have anything. The immediate and intimate use of the legend of the Creator is to continue an existence.

Whether you build it or not, you can cause something to vanish simply by looking at it as it is – whether you built it or not. Somebody else can put up a mock-up of some kind or another and merely by your perceiving it and making a perfect duplicate of it, you can vanish it. It is not necessary that you exclusively devote yourself to the vanishment of those things which you yourself have made. That is not necessary in order to carry through this cycle. Somebody else could have made it and you could have made a perfect duplicate of it – an as-isness, in other words – and it would have vanished.

Now, we're talking about something which is very, very easy to work with. We're talking about something which can be subjected to objective proof. I can ask you to make a perfect duplicate of something, which is to say, get it in the same space, same time continuum, using the same mass, and your perfect duplicate will cause it at first, probably, if you're having a hard time of it, to brighten up, and then it will fade. And the next thing you know, even though you've made very poor perfect duplicates, why, you sort of get the idea of looking through this item. And so it is with all of existence. Unless, in other words, there was a legend of other creation than your own, you would not at any time be able to have anything.

The first and most fundamental principle of havingness is it must have been created by somebody else, and thus we get business.

Now, when you ask a person to remedy his own havingness, this is perfectly all right. You're asking him to make nothing of something. He actually can, but the reason it does him so much good is he's forgotten that he can. You ask him to mock something up and pull it in. In other words, you ask him to mock it up and alter it.

Why doesn't it remedy a person's havingness simply to mock something up – just get a mock-up? It doesn't remedy a person's havingness. Well, it doesn't remedy his havingness because if he leaves it there it will simply disappear. And there's many a preclear gets very upset because his mock-ups all disappear. He puts up a mock-up and it disappears. Well, that's because he doesn't alter it in position. He puts the mock-up up and right where it is, he leaves it there and of course it dissipates and disappears.

Now, those preclears that put up a mock-up and leave it in the same place, which does not disappear, are working on a machine which does their mock-ups for them and for which machine they have no responsibility. You see that?

If you ever get a preclear whose mock-ups persist exactly where he put them, you're working with somebody who is doing mock-ups with a machine. And he's doing them with a machine, not because he's crazy, but because this is the only possible way he could make them to persist. The machine changes them. And he himself knows that he did not put up the mock-up. He knows this. If he didn't know that, the mock-up again would disappear. So it is not a very undercover fact with which we are working.

All right. Let's take this legend of the Creator and discover that it is quite uniform, it is found in every savage tribe, it is found across the face of the world and it is found throughout this universe – the legend of the Creator.

Very well. We can say there was a Creator, and he created everything and that's fine. Well, if this were the case, why, that's fine too because it wouldn't unmock. In other words, things would not disappear if there were a Creator who made everything.

You could even use this as a tremendous argument to prove that there was such a thing as a Creator and he made everything – just by the fact that it's here. And if you had made it and continued to accept your responsibility for it, it wouldn't be here. So there must have been a Creator. You could go at it with this type of logic.

However, it works this way: If somebody else, other than yourself, made a mass of energy, all you would have to do would be to come along and fish around for its approximate moment of creation and duplicate it and it would then disappear.

So whether the Creator created everything or not, it's a certainty that you, in order to continue with the physical universe, have to, to some degree, lay the blame on some other identity and say, therefore, this postulate, whether he created it or you created it, does not enter the question at all. If you duplicated it, it would go away, you see, regardless of who created it. This happens to be not too easily subjectable to proof, but we're talking now about a very basic fundamental. And it is necessary for you to carry around the postulate that somebody else created it in order for it to exist.

It's a little bit difficult to prove this; you have to work with a preclear for a short time. But the main difficulty of proof which lies on this track, the main difficulty of proof is simply proving who made the mock-up in the first place. You see, if it disappeared because you duplicated it, why, then you probably made it. But it doesn't matter, then, whether we use this one way or the other. We don't have to admit that you could make anything disappear whether you made it or not. We don't have to admit that to continue along with this proof. What we are coming down on here is this matter of responsibility.

We learned in Dianetics the fact that people would not accept responsibility for their own acts. And actually they're as bad off as they will not accept responsibility for their own acts. And everything is other-determined to the degree that they will not accept such responsibility. As a matter of fact, you can cover a complete Dianometry, Scientometry – anything you want to call it – a complete set of tests which will demonstrate that there is a direct ratio between the health and ability of the person and his willingness to accept responsibility. But the funny part of it is, is that only goes up to a certain point. And when you achieve that point of acceptance of responsibility, havingness as such, and the universe, or that part of one's interest in the universe, would vanish.

Now, here is the bodhi. Here is the individual who aspires to the attainment of perfect serenity. He can't have perfect serenity and have something, because he'd have to give away a certain amount of his responsibility in order to continue it in existence.

Do you see that? Havingness would only persist so long as he felt somebody else had had a hand in creating it. You see that? And the moment he said, "I created this, 100 percent,

all the way along the line," he wouldn't have a thing. You see that? The perfect duplicate, here, is what we're looking at again. So therefore, the condition of becoming a bodhi is the condition of having nothing.

Well now, a thetan is very able to have something or nothing at will. But it happens that he is appealed to, very often, on the basis that all something-nesses, including space, would vanish. He thinks this might be a good thing.

The only protest a thetan has, actually, is somethingness. And if you want to say what is wrong with a thetan, you say "somethingness" and you have stated it. He has something; there is something in existence.

He is perfectly willing to have many somethings but after a while the communication formula comes into effect and he becomes frantic about it. Now we're talking about something terribly elementary. In spite of the fact that it is deeply pervasive as it is in life and existence, it is terribly simple. It is one of these idiotically elementary factors that everybody could have overlooked forever. They would have had to have overlooked it; they didn't even dare tread on the edges of it for fear everything would blow up or disappear.

All right. A thetan makes something. And because he himself, natively, is a static, capable of consideration, has no mass, no form – as a spirit he has no form, he has no mass, he has no wavelength; he only has potentials: potentials of locating objects in space and the potentials of creating space, energy and objects and the action of locating those objects in that space.

And with this as his potential, the moment that he makes something, he violates his own communication formula.

Now, a thetan in excellent condition is able to communicate easily with something. He can simply change his mind about this and work it around. But the formula of communication becomes native to the creation of space, energy and mass. And that formula is, of course, *cause, distance, effect, with a perfect duplication taking place at effect of that which emanated from cause*. Now, that is the communication formula. And that becomes the formula the moment you have space. Up until that time, you have all cause and all effect capable of occupying exactly the same location, since there is no location.

So, a thetan is perfectly able, way up the scale, in order to occupy the space of anything and so duplicate that thing. But his formula, when he's doing this, is not cause, distance, effect. It's just cause-effect. That would be the formula he'd be operating with because he wouldn't communicate across a distance to something, since he wouldn't be occupying any cause or effect points.

But he can't have a game if he does this; he can't have mass if he does this. If every time he selects out an enemy and then communicates to the enemy and simply becomes the enemy at that point, he couldn't have an enemy very long, could he?

If he said, "I am fully responsible for everything and I will now make a plot of land," and he mocks up some space and a plot of land, and he's fully responsible for it and what happens? It's gone. He mocks it up – it's gone.

All right. If he mocked it up and altered it or changed it, he could then bring about the phenomenon of persistence, which is itself time.

When you say *survive*, you're saying *time*. Just put those two together and make them synonyms and you understand all you want to know about time. It's a consideration which leads to the persistence of something. And you can enter all the mechanics into time that you want to and you can paint it up in any way you want to. And you can write textbooks on it and test it and buy very fancy watches and chronometers and set up observatories to measure the movement of the stars. And you still have: *Time is a consideration which brings about persistence, and the mechanics of bringing about that persistence is by alteration*. And so we have alter-*isness* taking place immediately after an *as-isness* is created, and so we get persistence. In other words, we have to change the location of a particle in space. You see? We have to *alter position* – that's the first thing. And so we get time as the co-action of particles. Time is the difference of two positions in space of the same particle.

All right, there can be many ways that we can go about that, but we're mainly interested in how it's done in this universe and how a thetan quite ordinarily does this.

He has to change the position of something in order to make it survive. If he wants something to vanish, he will have to approximate it – in other words, he will have to make a perfect duplicate of it – use its energy, in its space, in its location and at its time in order to cause a vanishment of it. Well, therefore, his whole responsibility cannot continue the moment he moves something. And after he goes on for a slight distance with this, then he must conceive, in order to get an *automatic response*, that that thing that is moving, is moving under another responsibility. Otherwise, he'll have to stay right there and move it. But if he says it's moving under another responsibility, therefore he can set up an automaticity which will continue its motion. So he has something persisting.

This is elementary. This is elementary in terms of time, in terms of space. But every time that we *say persistence* – we *say survive*, and so on – we're simply saying *time*. Time is a continuum. A continuum of what? A continuous motion of particles.

Now, here is something very peculiar. When an individual tries to unmock himself, when he becomes very unhappy of life, and so on, he will hold himself still. When he tries to unmock things, he will try to hold them still. His idea is that if he can just reassume this basic motionlessness, then all of his troubles will disappear. He has so long practiced alter-*isness* – you see, he's so persistent on the subject of persistence – that he doesn't hold himself still at the first instant of his creation of mass. You see, he doesn't take that postulate into effect. He doesn't use that postulate. What he does is declare that something has other responsibility than himself. And then he tries to hold this thing still and in such a wise it'll disappear.

Now, let's get back to this communication formula. A perfect duplication would be cause and effect in the same point in space, wouldn't it? So communication, as we consider it through space, is not a perfect communication system.

You, on one point in space, communicate with something at another point in space. And if you continue to interpose a distance in between the things or space in between the things, you get, even then, the basic of persistence. You see? All you've got to do is get that distance in there.

And now we have this taking place: a thetan cannot duplicate a mass. That is to say, he cannot himself actually be a mass. He can conceive that he is by saying, "Now look at all of this mass which somebody else put on me." You see? "I didn't create this mass," and so forth. Well, then he can conceive himself as mass.

But he starts to get very unhappy about communicating with something-nesses because he has this distance factor and he is a nothingness.

Now if he can *be* the somethingness on the same point in space where that exists, then he feels very, very good about things. You see that? He feels all right, simply because he's occupying the same space. Well, that's perfect communication for him, that's a perfect duplicate. But if he totally occupied it at its instant of inception, it would disappear.

So he gets caught between not wanting to communicate with something and wanting to have something. You see, to really have something he'd have to occupy its same space. To communicate with something he has to stand off at a distance and pretend that he is something.

Communication as we know it, for instance, in this universe, is cause, *distance*, effect. Perfect communication, like a perfect duplication, is the point. The point. There's something on this point and the thetan can also occupy this point, therefore he can have something and he can communicate with something. But if he says it belongs utterly to him and he's occupying its basic point, it'll disappear. You see that? He has to have another Creator. He has to have some other author of the universe. If he doesn't have, why, it will disappear.

Now, we could inquire, at some length I suppose, into the tremendous complexity of this and why is this? A thetan should simply be able to say, by postulate, "Well, it's as it is and it's going to persist as it is, and we'll just make this postulate and that'll be that." But the funny part of it is, that doesn't work this way. And it looks here like we have an arbitrary which has been entered in from some quarter or other which we don't fully comprehend, even at this moment. But this universe went together on the basis of: as-ness is vanishment. You make one just as it is. All you have to do is pretend, as if you were making it at this moment. You see? And boom. It's gone.

Now, you see then the necessity – at least in this universe – to have another determinism at work. Well, that's just one point. We see it in terms, then, of the Creator. That's fine. This does not enter the question of whether or not there is or is not a God. We're just talking about whether or not people blame God or why they blame God or why they put things on to God. Well, if they didn't, they wouldn't have anything.

Now, the other point involved here is people blaming each other. They stand there and one says, "You said that, and that's your fault and this is why we had this fight," and so forth. And the other person said, "No, that wasn't the way it is. *You* actually were the one that started all this." And we get them talking back and forth.

We've talked to a preclear, we want to know what's wrong with this preclear. Well, it's what Mother did to him, not what he did to himself. And yet we can't conceive, actually, that an individual could actually become aberrated without his own consent, and sure enough, he can't. He can't become aberrated or upset or thin or lean or fat or thick or stupid or anything

else without his own consent. Because he is part of the agreement pattern. Unless he has agreed, himself, to other entities of agreement, why, he can't get stuck with any kind of a pattern.

Now, let's look at how that adds up. And we find out that if an individual, to have something, went into agreement with other-determinisms and said these other-determinisms caused all this, why, then, you see, he could sit there comfortably with something persisting.

But what did he have to do basically? He said, "In order to have anything, I've got to go into communication with these other-determinisms and blame them, or fix the responsibility of causation upon these others."

So the child blames his parents. He gets up into the age of puberty, he runs into sex, sex tells him he can't survive – that's the basic manifestation of sex; tells him he can't survive – and he begins to worry about this fact. Why, here he is all equipped to make another generation. He's hardly started living this one and that's a confusing and upsetting fact. And "Look-a-here, I am already being warned in advance that someday I'm going to die."

If you ever wanted to see anybody morbid or read any morbid poetry or anything of the sort, why, you should just dive right into the teen age. You never saw such complete sadness on any subject. Well, they've been told they can die, and the appearance of sex, physiologically, told them they can die.

All right. They become anxious, then, about surviving, so they have to turn around and blame somebody for something, anything! Simply by blaming somebody they obtain a continuance of whatever condition they are in at the moment. In other words, they can continue to survive simply by turning around and saying, "Well, the trouble with me is all what my father and mother did to me." Then they can get more survival.

So if you were to take somebody and bring him very, very close to death and cause the chilly breath to draft down his neck, you will find him, very shortly, blaming something else than himself. But he runs in a cycle on this. He discovers that the situation is untenable – well, then he'll blame himself.

Why does he blame himself at that point? He wants to unmock it. And he actually has forgotten the mechanisms of unmocking. By blaming himself, by taking it upon himself, by holding it all close to his own bosom, he thinks, "Now that it's my fault, why, it'll all unmock." And he's a very surprised person when it doesn't unmock. He merely gets upset.

And the other one is, he finds his condition of survival desirable, and when he finds it even vaguely desirable – I don't care if he's a slave in the bottom of a salt mine working out a sentence for having voted – the fact is that this individual obtains continuance by blaming others.

So we go through a cycle of blame somebody else: that means, "I've got to" or "I want to" or "I haven't any other choice but to survive and the best answer is survive, so therefore I'll just blame everybody else." And the mechanism of blaming oneself is unmocking oneself – unmocking oneself and the mass with which he is immediately and intimately surrounded. So people go through these two cycles and they invert. And that is the basic inversion.

They start in by saying, " Well, somebody else was responsible for the creation of all this," and they're quite happy about this and they stand off and look at it. And then they begin to get tired of communicating with these something-nesses because they cannot enter into a perfect duplication. They are a nothing, that's a something. They begin to get impatient about it after a while, so they decide to unmock it.

So they say, " I did it" while they're looking at it. And they look at it and they say, "Well, I did it. Well, there's something wrong here. Come on, come on, come on. I did it." Stuff goes right on. They don't fix it up in the same part of a space in which it was initially mocked up; they don't try to duplicate it with its original mass; they omit some of the basic steps of saying " I did it." And they're trying to go up against the postulate with which they did it.

Now, having made this postulate and said already it belonged to somebody else, now they try to take it back. And their next move is to try to squash up these energy masses. You know, use more force in order to flatten force. And he is on his way – this thetan – right away. See, he's on his way, because the more he tries to use energy to knock out energy the more energy he's going to have and the more dislocated the basic particles of that energy are going to be, and he'll just get more and more and more and more persistence. And if he keeps on protesting all the way on down, it'll just become more solid and more solid and more solid and more solid.

When he's protesting, he's saying it's other-determinism. He protests by saying, "It's my fault. Now I'm going to disappear and die and that will make you sorry." You see? But, again, he's entering a protest into the line.

So we get this basic thing of other man's responsibilities – that God is responsible and so forth – as being the fundamental here in terms of persistence and survival. We have to have another determinism at work or we get no persistence whatsoever. And so we get these postulated other-determinisms.

And when you recognize this very, very clearly in your preclear and in creation itself, it will cease to be as entirely baffling as it may have in the past.

Okay.

The Four Conditions Of Existence

Part V

A lecture given on 23 July 1954

Now let's talk a little bit about how your preclear might possibly recover from the state which he conceives himself to be in.

We consider now that the pattern of existence through which he has been is a very definite track. It is a track which starts in with as-isness. And this, of course, includes space.

You might possibly completely miss a case if you didn't realize that as-isness has to start with space. You see? You yourself could get so concentrated on objects and on energy, and you yourself get frantic along these lines, you might overlook this fact of space. You see, because a thetan can more or less communicate with space with great ease. You see? The body has gone too far on this track to do this easily. The body gets sick when it communicates with space. But a thetan can communicate with space rather easily.

And the as-isness begins with space. And then it gets into, of course, simultaneously, energy and mass. Now, space-energy-mass, the consideration of it, are all simultaneous. There is no consideration here related to time. Now we have to *move* the anchor points of the space in order to get a continuance of the space and *move* the energy itself in the space and change them in some fashion or another in order to get a continuance of that energy.

And it's the first moment, then, we have a simultaneous action, because we have not yet postulated time. Well, a thetan doing this would, theoretically, pass immediately from as-isness into alter-isness – just immediately. He'd have to or he would have no continuation of any kind. In other words, it wouldn't exist unless he intended to change it. You see, he'd have to make the intention of change simultaneous with the action of creation. And if he did not, he would get a disappearance immediately of that mass.

All right. He passes, then, into alter-isness, which is a simultaneous action with as-isness (at first), and then of course immediately becomes an action of continuation. And we get isness, which is this reality that we talk about: space, energy, objects. Just exactly why we consider this combination to be a reality, that reality *is isness* and so on, is a little bit dull. Because the fact of the matter is reality itself, to continue as a reality, would not be an isness at all but a continuous alter-isness. So we get isness, actually, as a hypothetical state.

Now, the fact that the thetan is a static, that's not hypothetical or theoretical. That's a fact. The fact that he is a static that can consider and can produce space and energy and objects – now, that's not hypothetical; that's a fact too. We have facts, facts, facts all the way

along here until we get to this thing called reality, and we suddenly discover that isness is hypothetical. What we call reality is hypothetical. Therefore, we'd better just keep calling this thing reality, and "everybody knows" what reality is.

The basic goal, by the way, of a barbaric cult known as psychology, which is practiced in some American universities, this stressed enormously the whole subject of reality. I mean, you talk about the amount of learnedness which has been pressed up against the cheek of reality, the tremendous quantity of discourse on the subject of: "Let's see. If there was a wood and a tree fell and there was nobody to hear it, why, therefore... And then, of course, there wouldn't be a sound, would there, if there was nobody to hear the sound. Because, you see, trees aren't alive."

Well anyhow, this short-circuitedness and complete confusion on the subject of reality stems from the fact that in the whole field of as-issness, the creation of space, energy, objects, alter-issness, isness, not-issness and more alter-issness, there is only one hypothetical state. Just one state is hypothetical and that's isness. And that's *completely* hypothetical. It *never* exists. It can't *ever* exist. It has to be alter-issness or as-issness.

And, of course, as-issness can exist. As-issness can exist. It really would have to be able to exist if you can repeat it. You see? It must be in existence if you can repeat it and cause a vanishment of mock-ups or objects or spaces. So it obviously exists.

But this is not true of isness. Reality does not exist, because it precludes a stop. You see, it precludes that there's a stop right there – zoom. There just isn't any such stop. It is continuous alter-issness.

When people stop altering the positions of things and stop altering anchor points and stop pushing things around one way or the other – whether they say they're doing it or they say it's being done on an other-determinism, or however – the moment that they just relax on this whole thing, they get the condition which your preclear quite commonly is found in, of no longer postulating time.

See, the mechanism of saying "It will continue because I'm saying somebody else is responsible" is of limited use. It's a very limited use.

You set up a machine – let's go into that a little closer – you set up this machine or something to go on and shift and change the anchor points of the space, manufacture the energy involved and take care of the objects. And you set up this machine, you say, "I'm no longer responsible for this. I have no further responsibility for this now, and therefore it's others' space and it will go on happening, and therefore I can continue to have this space because somebody else is making it." See, we could get into that rather shifty bypass. And so we could, then, have – not over too long a time – but we could have a consistent alter-issness.

And this alteration would continue to take place and continue to take place as long as we at least kept one tiny little fingernail on the machine over here. We weren't looking to see, you see, that we had the fingernail on. But as long as we had that fingernail just touching that machine we were all right. See, we said, "Just that much of it is ours." You see?

And he says, "I have everything all set up; it's beautifully set up and it'll all run automatically and I don't have to worry about it anymore. After all, a fellow created this universe,

other people are the ones who caused time to take place – they tell me when to get up and when to go to bed, and I've just got everything all set, and it's totally other-determined now." It becomes just that: totally other-determined. But it also, for the individual, passes by the boards. He's no longer postulating a persistence, he's no longer changing any objects in space, and so he will simply sit still. Everything gets very dim; everything gets very thin and so on.

Well, the funny part of it is, in that state, he couldn't even keep an aberration going. But his alter-ness has been practiced so long after the fact of not-ness, that even though he sits still, he'll keep on changing something. And that condition is known as figuring, thinking – thinking as we call figuring. He'll try to change something and he feels, "Well, I will just sit there and think and that will keep the universe moving, it'll keep time going," and so on. There's only one trouble with this: he is dealing basically with the root stuff of what makes universes. But now that he has sunk into that category where he's doing nothing but "consider" again – he is not creating or moving anything – he is going to have a very difficult time of it. In fact, everything is just going to get dimmer and dimmer and less real and less real.

Well, what *will* persist there is that which he is still changing, which is his worry about his aberration. In other words, the *only* thing – this is not esoteric or difficult – the *only* thing which goes on persisting is that which a person is actively working to change. Now, that's a horrible thing, isn't it? But that's all that goes on persisting.

Now, it is not true, then, that you get into a static, completely fixed state by changing something. You can pass up or down on the line of not-ness and alter-ness. You could actually alter conditions. Things can get better because you work at it. If you don't believe this, go out sometime and sit down in the middle of a field out on some mountainside. You just sit there, you see? And you make no provision whatsoever for work of any kind. You don't try to make a camp – you don't do anything like that. And you could make it much better for yourself and much more interesting simply if you'd go out and start dragging in some brush and make yourself a lean-to and fix yourself up a fireplace and bank your lean-to in such a way as the water won't run into it. It doesn't matter what you do. As long as you're moving pieces of mass around, you would then get up to a point, however – you think you're working toward that point, usually – where you wouldn't have to do anything else. And of course the moment when you get to the point where you don't have to do anything else, (quote)"time hangs heavy on your hands,"(unquote). Why does it hang heavy on your hands? Hangs heavy? It isn't even moving.

No, time is going to move as long as you go and move pieces of bark and trees and dig little ditches and scramble for a living, and so on, go out and fish and so forth. You're going to get time. And you can sit there for a number of years and just have a busy time of it and be quite interested in existence and so forth and go right along happily. And then all of a sudden you win – they got a carrier pigeon to you, or something of this sort – and you found out that you won the Irish Sweepstakes. And now you can hire twelve men to keep this camp. And this camp turns into a mountain lodge and you get all the machinery you possibly can from the city. And boy, while you're doing this, this is tremendous, you see? So you finally wind up with a swimming pool and a beautiful hot-water heater and you wind up with everything nicely appointed, and what do you know? You've got everything done, you see – it's all fin-

ished – and you sit back and you are just exactly in the same position, as far as time is concerned, of you sitting on a mountainside moving no masses of any kind whatsoever. (Quote)"Time is hanging heavy again on your hands."

You can only have those things which you handle; you can only have those things which you move around.

But an individual gets into a tremendous protest against mass. He has decided that continuous survival of things is very bad. In other words, he starts to fight survival itself with not-iness.

Now, as you know, not-iness is a highly specialized activity. It is the activity, actually, of causing something to vanish or dull down or become less, simply because it *is* too much. See? There's too much isness, the fellow considers, you know. He's gotten too much persistency, too much survival: Joe Jinks that got him across the barrel in a bank, you see, and took all his money away from him, and – well, there was just too much isness, you know? And the best way [thing] to do about that is to cause a not-iness, you see, and let's just *fight* everything.

Now, let's examine a war, for instance. A war is just simply each side saying the other side must cease to exist. And they are doing it with shot, shell, lead, dynamite, spears, arrows, deadfalls, and they're using energy, you see, to make other things cease to exist. Well, it was perfectly all right as long as you were building your camp, you see? But if you suddenly started to fight a war with somebody on the other side of the mountain, whereby you were saying he must cease to exist, you are fighting persistence by causing persistence. Now, get that: you are fighting persistence by causing persistence.

You want to know why a war, which shouldn't ever take more than a couple of days, goes always on and on and on and on and on. They got so bad a few centuries ago that they had a hundred years of nothing but war, and everybody was saying everybody else mustn't exist. And they kept moving *objects* around to cause existence to cease. Now, you get how these postulates could become completely tangled?

And the thetan does this because he so loves a problem. And that is the most problem there is. A thetan loves a problem. And that is the basic of problems. You move masses around – which, basically, you see, *causes* persistence – in order to cause persistence to cease. In other words, a hundred-percent paradox: cannot exist, can't ever happen, never has happened, and yet he will do this. But he is never happy doing it. There is no serenity involved in this. It becomes nothing but a complete chaos after a while.

Probably the only joy any soldier ever gets out of a war – and don't, for heaven's sakes, don't spread this around because the society doesn't believe you should do this – the only joy anybody ever gets out of a war is by kidding himself that he has made absolutely nothing of something. You know, whether it's enemy troops or tanks or ships or something like that, there's a big *whee* in this, a big thrill. (Combat troops know about this.) It's only when they *cease* to make nothing at will, apparently, that they become very downhearted.

Hardly anybody would be able to comprehend what is known as a military rout whereby a body of troops suddenly is instantly and immediately disheartened and just com-

pletely quits. It's a strange phenomenon, a phenomenon which has been rather incomprehensible: how *fast* troops will go into a complete, headlong retreat.

Well, let's say they keep shooting at a castle on a hill. And they just keep shooting at this castle and shooting at this castle, and the castle keeps shooting back, and they keep firing at the castle and the castle keeps shooting back. Well, just about that time they start to go to pieces in morale. They can't make nothing out of something, observably; the castle continues to live.

They bog down on that rather badly. They get to be rather 1.5. (And, actually, that is the manifestation of 1.5: people using force to make nothing of something which continues to exist in spite of it.) And they'll suddenly drop. It isn't a slow curve. They enter it rather slowly and then they'll just suddenly go to pieces – their morale will go to pieces and so forth. Because the only compensation they have for war is the fact that as thetans, you see, they can observe that they are at least going through the motions of, and have the manifestation of, making nothing of form. And the sadness underlying it, to them, is the fact that they don't make nothing of it, really.

Beyond this point there's still all kinds of suffering takes place, and sadness, and it goes on and on. But you start moving that many particles with that much velocity, such as a German 88, and you'll get persistence. I mean, that shell bursts. We don't find the fellow on the ground is still there – the fellow that it hit in the vicinity of – but there's persistence. Somebody has to go through his effects, and then somebody's got to write a letter home and say he died a hero, and then somebody else has got to carry the news through. And then there's people at home. And he's left a hole in the society one way or the other. And this goes on and on and on. And then years later, why, they dig up what's left of him and ship him back over and put him into a cemetery. You know. I mean, there's persistence occasioning here.

And what's persisting here? Well, there was that particle, it sure was moving fast. And any time we get a particle moving with this much velocity, we get some persistence. And in a war all they can think of is terms of more and more and more particles moving with more and more velocity to cause less and less persistence on the part of the enemy.

You want to know why the German nation keeps fighting and keeps overrunning its borders. Well, it can't do anything else by this time. I mean, from legion times forward, people have been going in there saying, "You mustn't persist. And these fast-moving particles which we're making you handle will make it so."

Oh yeah? This can't be, you see?

So we lead into anything about which we find man extremely puzzled. We lead into that one little formula there of: "We're going to take particles" – which is the mechanism of making things persist – "we're going to take particles and make things not persist." And any time you find anybody in (quote) "difficulty" or in the middle of a problem, just look at the basic anatomy of a problem, which is *that* anatomy. It's "We're going to cause a nonpersistence by the use of the mechanisms which cause persistence." You see that?

You're going to get a game. There's undoubtedly going to be a game occur here. Going to be lots of problems.

Now, you want to know how to take apart a problem: Just look where the person is using the particles which, you know, by changing them, will cause persistence in order to make a *nonpersistence*. In other words, in order to create a *not-isness*. Where is he using *alter-isness* to create *not-isness*? He'll be using *alter-isness* to create a *not-isness*, and of course will be getting, consistently and continually, an *isness*, which is a continuous state.

I say it's a hypothetical state. It's hypothetical because you can never stop it, you can never arrest it and you can never take a look at it. You know? Any time that you really recognized an *isness* and so forth that was not in a state of change, why, it'll disappear. It'll vanish or it'll dim down. Something will happen with relationship to it. So you always have to look at the change. This is the fellow living up the time track; this is the fellow living in the past, and so forth. He's looking at the changes, he's looking at the changes, and he isn't looking at the reality.

Actually, that's a very healthy state of mind. You talk about healthy mind states – that's a fine, healthy mind state: The fellow is looking at the changes, he's looking at what will be, he's very cheerful about how many particles he can move around and cause something to come into existence or persist, or he knows the proper *modus operandi* for knocking things out that he wants to destroy: just *as-isness*. And that would destroy it perfectly adequately and he could start in again.

Well, if you, as I say, want to look at the basic mechanics of any problem which is causing any trouble, why, you just find the matter of the particle motion – the *alter-isness*, in other words – which is aimed with the goal of *not-isness*. And of course that's impossible. Your preclear who is hanging fire in processing, by the way, he's doing this. He's using particles to knock down ridges, something on this order. Actually, he'd feel a lot better if he'd simply go out and trim the hedge. You know, let him move around something that is not quite as damaging, with the same goal. Because if he's all messed up with his engram bank, and he's all messed up with tremendous ridges and black ridges and that sort of thing, and he sits there as a thetan creating particles and bombarding these ridges, what are you going to get? You're going to get a persistence of ridges, aren't you? So that kind of processing won't do him a bit of good – actually, it won't do him a *bit* of good.

That's why we never use *flows* in processing. You can process objects if you want to, and you process space if you want to, but we'll just stay away, as a general principle, from flows. Why? This is a flood of particles moving this way or that, so we just won't bother with flows in processing. And, therefore, running of concepts attended by the running of flows is just something we won't have much to do with.

Now, your thetan has a great objection – because of this communication formula as used in this universe – a great objection to somethingnesses. He looks across a distance and he sees a somethingness, and this begins to tell him after a while that he has to be a something too. And he doesn't like this. He doesn't enjoy this, really, because it's an other-determined something that he has to be. It's by looking at a wall he has to be a wall, you see? And that's what this universe is dictating to him.

Well, actually, because it's all a consideration in the first place, he doesn't have to fall into that little grave. He doesn't have to fall into that one; he doesn't have to do that kind of a

shift at all. He can simply say, "I'm looking at the wall," and see the wall. You see? But after a while, he gets into the mechanics of perception, the mechanics of communication, he's using energy in order to communicate with energy.

There's nothing wrong with that except to the degree that he loses his fluidity on it. As long as he could maintain the idea that he was simply communicating by postulate, that he was communicating, he's doing all right. Well, when he drops below that level and you get enforced communication – when he's made to stand still and be talked to, you know; when he's made to stand to and hold that ridge, you know, and when he's made to sit there and absorb that textbook (you know, any one of these things; he gets under this bombardment) – and *he* starts fighting the communication formula. And of course we get a persistence, then, of this universe's communication formula.

Remember, this universe has got a communication formula. And that formula is based on the fact that two things can't occupy the same space. So, immediately, we fall away from "cause, effect and no-distance." You see? Well that, actually, is a bottom scale. But bottom-scale cause and effect occupying the same space, is *almost* occupying the same space. They're not a *complete* identification of source point and receipt point. There's still a slight distance, no matter how downscale you go. It's only way upscale that you can get a perfect identification between cause point and effect point. These two points can be coincident way upscale. Well, all right, if they can be coincident way upscale, an individual could put a distance on them or anything. But to the degree that he began to agree with this universe, he would have to have a distance across which to look. Because he can't occupy the same space as the object at which he's looking. See, that is this universe's formula.

And that's, by the way, native to a lot of universes. It's how you keep everything stretched apart. You say, "Two things can't occupy the same space. Therefore, we've got to have a lot of spaces and things more or less fixed in these spaces, and we've got to keep them all apart. And therefore they are separate objects..." And we go into a lot of stuff like that, but we also go into the communication formula. And it says, then, that cause point can't occupy the same spot as effect point. So we've got cause, distance, effect as this universe's communication formula.

Now, as the individual agrees that two things can't occupy the same space, and as he agrees with this communication formula, he then gets into a situation where he says, "Now, look at all these somethings around here. And I am actually basically a nothing, and therefore if I have to duplicate these by becoming a something, I don't like that. I can't retain my own native form and so forth. I'm in bad shape here. I can't fly around and be a spirit. I've got to be pinned down here, I've got to be an energy mass in order to look at these energy masses."

And he doesn't like this. He objects to this.

So we get to the other manifestation on the track: The only objection the thetan has to anything, if he's having a big objection, is to something – just any something.

Then this, of course, will invert. And having objected to a something hard enough, you see, he'll turn around after a while and start objecting to a nothing.

Now, how is it then that we get any change at all if not-iness doesn't work? Well, there is the system known as valences. One ceases to become himself and becomes something else as his sole method of change. See that? He's causing a persistence by saying, "Things mustn't persist." And he keeps saying, "Mustn't persist, mustn't persist," and it goes on persisting. And he uses more particles and more particles and more particles, and pretty soon the United States Army is wearing coal-scuttle helmets. See? Just like that. The government says, "Down with Karl Marx. Down with Karl Marx. Down with Karl Marx. And everybody is now going to be taxed according to his ability to pay..." See that?

So we get another type of change. If two things can't occupy the same space, therefore, we are an identity persisting. Therefore, the best way to get a change and get an utter change is simply to *be* somebody else. In other words, completely shift valence. And because we want to win all the time, why, naturally shift to winning valences compared to oneself.

Well, if one thinks one is losing, then anything can start looking like a winning valence. A beggar, utterly penniless and about to die, would look like a winning valence to some people.

And we get this valence-shifting going right along with "two things can't occupy the same space." So an individual goes out of this spot and over onto another spot. And when he is running a lot of not-iness, you can expect him to do a lot of valence shifting. He can't continue to be himself because he's in communication with nothing.

Well, at *that* time he will start to believe that he must have nothingnesses. And he goes from there into having to have somethingnesses. And he goes from there into having to have nothingnesses *by change of valence*. And, actually, no other deep significance to it.

Okay? Got it?

Time

A lecture given in July 1954

Want to talk to you now about time.

Time is a subject which was introduced very early into this universe, and it has been with it ever since.

The very obviousness of time has obfuscated time. Time is something that one can very, very easily not have enough of and at the same time have too much of and at the same time not be in.

The whole subject of time is a confusing subject because it is a consideration which took place along with – along with, not after or before, because there wasn't any time at the moment the consideration called time was made, you see? – it took place right along with space, energy. So it was space, energy, time, or energy, space and time.

Time is created immediately after these basic postulates with the postulate of change, or the introduction of policy. And as soon as policy comes in, or new considerations come in, then we begin to get consecutive time.

The first few board minutes of any corporation are more or less nebulous with regard to time. They might as well have all taken place in zero minutes at the beginning of the world. You see that? It doesn't matter. The people that elect the board of directors *are* the board of directors before they elect the board of directors.

Now, you are the space before you make the space; you are the energy before you make the energy; after you make the energy you are before the energy. The time which is postulated at that point is postulated in a time when there is no time, which is not any time at all, which might as well be now as then.

You might as well be postulating time just this very instant, which is the time you postulated at the beginning of this universe. This instant, in absence of the consideration called time, *is* the instant of the creation of this universe, *is* the instant of the end of this universe. If no time has been postulated, then all time would be one time.

A preclear who ceases to postulate time ceases to have time. And that's the first thing that you can learn about time. Unless you are putting things on the future time track, consistently and continually, you will not have any time track.

Because, was there a board of directors or a single director, at the beginning of track on this universe, who made all the postulates and then elected you to the board afterwards? Or were you part of the board? Well, you could be running on this very well, simply being recruited to this particular organization called physical universe. You could have been recruited

to it afterwards, but the moment you were recruited to it, you could *only* have been recruited to it if you had agreed to its time continuum – in other words, agreed to a uniform rate of change. And had you agreed to this uniform rate of change, then you would *then* have a uniform rate of change. Otherwise, you'd be in 1776 or 2060 while everybody else was in 1954.

Well, in view of the fact that the particles themselves of this universe are a matter of consideration, they stem from consideration, they are themselves consideration, the space in which those particles exist are themselves consideration – we are not then at any time dealing with anything else but considerations.

We are dealing with these considerations, and these considerations are only complicated and fixed to the degree that they are agreed upon. If you have agreed solidly with these considerations, why, then you have the considerations with which you have agreed. It was not necessary for you to be the prime mover to be part of this universe. The moment you have agreed to the considerations which compose this universe, you are at its inception, you are at its end, you are at its present, but you are running under the consideration that time is taking place.

And as long as you are running under that consideration, you say, "Fine, we'll go along. Time track – wonderful; time is progressing." You start looking at clocks: "Clocks are keeping time for me; the bus schedule is keeping time for me; the motion of the Earth is keeping time for me; the precession of planets and stars are keeping time for me; everything is keeping time for me; my wife keeps time for me by serving breakfast at a certain time; everybody keeps time for me."

"Time? Time? Time. What time? What time is it? Do I have any time?" No, you become motionless. You become dependent on everything else to keep time and make the considerations, and then you don't continue to agree with those considerations that are made. All you'd have to do is just go on agreeing with those considerations, you'd move right on along the time track just as nice as you please.

But you even drop out of the basis of consideration. You drop your own consideration of the fact that time is taking place at that time-moment, time ceases to take place. Do we see that clearly?

In other words, time is a consideration; these other things are consideration. And after this consideration is made, it doesn't mean then that all considerations start moving. In such a wise that we make a consideration that there is time, then this doesn't immediately put all considerations in motion or create anything more than that which is already created with considerations with a changing factor of time.

The definition of *time* itself is very important to you: *Time is the co-action of particles.* You can't have action of particles at all unless you have space. If you have space, then you can have change in space. And when you have a change in space, then you have a different time. There is the time from the moment the particle was at position A – that's one time – now another time when the particle has been moved to position B. There could have been no motion taking place whatsoever unless you have made a postulate of motion from position A to position B. And if you have made this consideration from position A to position B, then

you will have motion and you will have time. Because you said position B is then a later time than position A – a later *time*.

What is this word *time*? You might as well have said this: There is a consecutive shift of position. You ask somebody what time it is, you just asked somebody, "What consecutive shift of position is it?" And if he answered you truly, he would say – if he gave you the full date and everything else, he would say, "It is the fifteen-degree position past zenith for sun on its two-hundred revolution since its winter solstice." Quarter after twelve to you; two-hundred day of the year.

That's time. If the sun hadn't shifted two hundred times, you wouldn't have had two hundred days. But it isn't that that is doing it, simply because it marks it.

Let's look at that now. Just because it's *doing* it is no reason it is *creating* it. It is simply a particle which is moving in space. And Earth is a particle which is revolving in space.

And the sun wouldn't be there and Earth wouldn't be there and nothing else would be there unless we were running on the basic consideration and agreement that it *was* there.

Now, in addition to the simple change-of-position idea – you see, that's an idea... Here, I'll give you an example of it: I'll take this book here, and just consider, at this moment, everything is static. See? No motion at this instant – no time, no motion. Okay?

A new time. See that? It does not require an articulation, a verbalization or anything else. It's so simple that it is overlooked. In order to conceive that this book can move from this position on the desk over to the second position on the desk, one must simply have conceived a new set of considerations which are consecutive in each position of motion over to this new position, which would have brought in this play: that each one of these are *after* the consideration that the book was here.

Now, it's very embarrassing: When an auditor is running Opening Procedure by Duplication, he is using perfect duplications. Perfect duplications. He tells the preclear, every time he picks up a volume, to duplicate it. If the auditor forgets to have him consider that it's there again, because it's an invalidation of the preclear, it vanishes, you see? Makes a perfect duplicate of it and the object isn't there.

In other words, then to go back to that object a new time, the auditor had better say, if he is using this part of that procedure – "Make a perfect duplicate of it," as part of his routine – he'd better, then, also state when he sends him back toward this book, just before he sends him back toward it, he'd say, "Consider there's a book over there." Now, he'd say, "Consider there is a book over there," not "Look at the book over there," because as far as the preclear is concerned, he's just unmocked it. Actually, if you are working a preclear who is getting into good shape, that book will be invisible.

All right. So he has to consider there is a book there, then he has to consider that he has moved across to there and he has to consider that all these things are taking place. And if he considers them, then he has time. Time is the co-action of particles.

Now, the time that we're dealing with is a time with which we can stay in good agreement. So therefore, it's a uniform rate of change. In other words, we're considering and considering and considering and considering and considering and considering.

Now, we could be doing it very rapidly with regard to a particle in the wall. We consider that it's there (and let's say the wall is being pulled this way), we consider that it's there, there, there... In other words, we keep considering that that particle is coming closer.

But it takes a brand-new consideration every time to have a space to move it into. Now got that? Every time you see a particle move, actually somewhere, in some automatic fashion, and so on – we don't care about the mechanism – you have to consider space-particle-position, space-particle-position, space-particle-position, space-particle-position. You get motion.

If you look at an airplane going overhead and you're seeing that airplane (if you just see it go overhead), you'll have to be saying, "Space-airplane-position, space-airplane-position, space-airplane-position, space-air – – "and you'll see a jet plane go across the sky.

But if you aren't at least in contact with the automaticity which is doing this, if you aren't at least agreed to this, you won't see any airplane go across the sky; you won't have any space and it certainly will have no position.

Now, what happens to an individual when his time factor starts to go to pieces? He gets stuck in time. He gets stuck at those moments when he is sufficiently rattled, confused or upset – in other words, he is given a new consideration that all is confused. And he doesn't at that moment have time to make new considerations that there is time, or agree with the fact there is time. Or he resents the fact that there is time. And so he loses time. So he gets stuck on the time track.

It isn't energy that sticks anybody on the time track. It's this fact: Somebody told him to move and he resented it, so he didn't move. Somebody told him to stay still, one way or the other – he resented it, so he didn't move.

What's he done? He has fallen out of agreement about the progress of particles. Communication itself has been used to shift his consideration about considerations. Somebody demonstrates to him completely that they are time: they tell him to stay in one place.

You can demonstrate that to an individual very easily with a bullet. He's going ahead (beautiful automaticity), he's just mocking up things flying here and things flying there, regiments of soldiers marching here and marching there, and in one way or another, why, he's just as much a part of the enemy as he is part of himself. But he's got a new consideration that he is part of himself. And this bullet comes through space. And if he were able to see it – a Civil War cannonball, for instance, he could have seen very easily (they only traveled about sixty miles an hour) – and he would have done this space-particle-position, you know, space-cannonball-position, space-cannonball-position, space-cannonball-position, space – – boom!

He has just considered himself into a complete confusion, hasn't he? He's considered himself right on down the line to an impact.

So he says after a while, "Now, look. The best thing to do when you see anything that even faintly resembles a cannonball, you don't say, 'Space-particle-position, space-particle-position.' No, you don't! You say nuthin'." Fellow has learned to keep his mouth shut.

"We don't see cannonballs. Nope."

But he's in agreement with the man on the right and he's in agreement with the man on the left, and they're in agreement with the men on the right and the left. And he's standing on the ground, and he's in agreement with a body, and all these things are thoroughly in agreement with the fellow who fired the cannonball, and so the cannonball will come across any-way.

And boy, is he invalidated now. On his right and his left and behind him and below him he stayed in agreement with all of the things which were in agreement on the subject of rate of change. He stayed in agreement with all these other things which were saying "Space-particle-position." See, all these other things were saying it and he stays in agreement with them, so he is saying "Space-particle-agreement"(unwillingly, unwittingly). And this will leave him really hung; this will leave him with a certain unreality. Well, he's postulated no time, and so he can get stuck on the time track. You see that?

Only his mock-up is kind of thin because he depended for the solidity of mock-ups, such as the material universe, upon all these other people mocking them up too. Everybody is mocking them up. He is just staying in agreement with everybody and he doesn't quite have to mock them up and so forth. He doesn't have to quite mock them up, so what has he got? He's got a dependency upon the agreement to keep time for him. So if he's done this, then he's lost his power to completely unmock everything, hasn't he?

Time: As you conceive it, the time that is running on your watch is simply the motion of a bunch of little wheels and a couple of hands and a second hand. And that's just consecutive motions. Those are changes in space. And everywhere you look, mechanically, you will find that time never amounts to anything else than a change of position of particle in space or an agreement with something which is monitoring the change of position of a particle in space. See, two conditions here.

If something is postulating the change of the position of a particle in space, and you're agreeing with that something, then you will also get a change of position of particle in space. You understand that? It's just a consecutive consideration, but that is *all time ever is*, is the change of position of a particle in space.

To see anything you have to have space-particle-position. Right? All right.

Now, in order to stay in good agreement, it would be a very, very good thing to have a uniform rate of change, wouldn't it? Let's all together, now, chant – and I don't mean this as a class – but it's sort of... the universe is saying, "Let's all together chant 'Space-particle-position, space-particle-position, space-particle-position.'" And we'll chant it together so that we are all uniformly saying this, and we will then have time, because we're saying it" – not for any other reason – "We are postulating it." And so we've got space-particle-position, space-particle-position, space-particle-position as the hymn of time itself. And it goes right on running all the way down any years that are, because those *are* the years.

Now, let's not get divided up again on the subject of "Well now, there's thought." The old theta-MEST theory is a terrifically interesting theory simply because it led into this: The idea that there was a universe and that there was thought – theta, thought, without wavelength, without mass, without time, without position in space. This was life. All right. And that was impinged upon something else called the physical universe, which was a mechanical entity which did things in a peculiar way. And these two things together, theta-MEST interacting, gave us life forms.

Well, we get a further refinement of that, and we find that the physical universe itself is simply this chanted "Space-particle-position." So that is coming from thought itself.

So what do we get? We get the appearance of a physical universe which has a seniority in mechanics. See? You see that? It has this seniority in mechanics, and it appears to be above consideration. The reason it's above consideration is because of the agreement you have made with so many people concerning the continuation of it.

Continuation itself is another word which could be supplanted for time; so is *survival* – another word that could be supplanted.

All right. Now, what then would we say is the common denominator of time? Consideration.

All right. Below this level in the field of mechanics, what would we say is the common denominator of time? Change. That is the one thing we could say was the common denominator of all kinds of time anywhere, anyhow, in any universe. That would be change. You see that?

Now, let's not lose that one. A certain set of particles or a certain body of individualized life forms or an automaticity postulated by such life forms could go on saying, for a certain set of particles, you see, that there *are* a certain set of particles, that they're moving in a uniform rate of change and they're postulating the same space over and over again. And we would get, at that moment, a uniform time continuum. We would get a time continuum and that is the condition which has to exist in a universe and is that which makes a universe peculiar – it's the time continuum of that universe.

In other words, this agreed-upon chant: It's where we are chanting, with whom we are chanting that makes the universe. You get the idea? So we have the people of Earth and this universe more or less chanting "Space-particle-position, space-particle-position," or it's simply agreeing with something that's chanting "Space-particle-position," you see?

And so we've got time, time, time, time, time. If all of a sudden the chant stopped, nothing would move. You might still have some space on a hangover of a past consideration or something, but you wouldn't have any new particles moving anywhere. The walls would simply vanish. The space would go to a very marked degree. Everything would kind of look like a Step Level V caving in on himself. That's the way things would look if this stopped. It'd just look just like that, because that's what he's done.

All right. Then, in order for a person to have time, to be in present time, it is necessary to be in contact – at *least* in contact – with those particles which are being formed by this continuous hymn to time. It's *at least* necessary to be in contact with the particles. If we're not,

we're out of time. If we're simply agreeing, then we're out of time, and we get stuck on the time track; we get stuck in old facsimiles; we get all messed up. We're not postulating any time – we're postulating no time at all – and we're not looking at any time particles, not looking at any particles or their change. And as a result, where's anybody going to get any time?

Well, he has to either start chanting himself, "Space-particle-position, space-particle-position, space-particle-position," until he gets time going again for himself, or you have him feel the walls. And feeling the walls, he'll say, "Ahhh, what do you know? Getting into time."

Now, agreement is a very important thing because a thetan begins to depend upon a universe keeping its own chant and stops chanting himself.

And what happens if he does this? Then he has to agree with something which is vibrating, doesn't he? So he himself becomes mass. And that's how a thetan becomes mass. He's not chanting anymore, so he goes thoroughly into agreement, 100 percent into an agreement, with something that's doing the chanting, you see? And then he doesn't chant anymore at all, and then he falls away and he falls out of agreement with what he was depending on to keep on agreeing with him.

See, he depended on that wall and now he decides that wall is harmful to him, and he's no longer chanting; he's no longer now in contact with the wall because it's dangerous. Where's he going to get any time? He isn't going to get any.

But he may fish around and contact another time continuum in another universe and be to some vague degree in contact with that time continuum. And that's another entire body of beings, and so forth, and automaticities chanting "Space-particle-position, space-particle-position, space-particle-position." That's another song going on. A preclear gets out of time.

He himself is sort of mocked up in agreement. Therefore, he gets to *vibrating*, and he as a thetan vibrates *out of phase with*. You see? He is vibrating bop-bop-bop-bop-bop-bop-bop and the walls are vibrating bop-bop-bop-bop-bop.

"Oh, "he'd say, "what time is it?"

He'd have to get some kind of a duplication to run it out or straighten it out. Just by having him contact the walls of any universe by 8-C Opening Procedure, you therefore get him straightened out on his vibrations and he stops being so much mass, simply by getting him into good agreement. You understand that?

All right. If the common denominator of time is change, then why do you think a pre-clear is so anxious to change? What is his anxiety about change? Well, he has doubly inverted. He finally depended on just agreement alone – he was not postulating time anymore – and he was just depending on this universe alone to say, "Change-change-change-change-change," see? "Change-particle-in-space, change-of-position-of-particle-in-space, change-of-position-of-particle-in-space, change-change-change." He's depended on that. And he stopped depending on that, he fell away from it...

He says, "Look, wait a minute. To have any survival or to go on with any of these items or any of these responsibilities or anything, something has got to change around here.

So let's change. Change. Let's change other people, let's change myself. Let's change other people first. Let's change other things. Well, I can't change those, so, people are easy to change, so let's try to change those – change those. Well, I can't change those. I'll change myself-I'll change myself – I'll change myself-I'll change myself-I'll change myself. Change, change, change, change, change-change-change-change-change-change-change-change-change-change-change-change – boom!

Totally-fixed-self personal time track with no agreement anyplace else, which looks like a solid mass, because it's changing so fast. And there's nobody agreeing with it. And you've got your psychotic down at the sanitarium.

Now, there's why people have compulsive changes and so forth. 8-C Opening Procedure will get people out of that. Opening Procedure by Duplication will do this, because you're changing at a uniform rate, and you, the auditor, are in agreement with him.

And as a result, he will be able to come on up out of it until he is re-timed. A preclear who is having any difficulty at all, the first thing that would be wrong with him, he'd be out of time.

See? Just like a car falls out of time – its motor doesn't run well – well, he's fallen out of time and he's going off on his own time factor or he's done something.

His own time factor, to be aberrative to him, would have to be totally automatic, you see? He'd have to have set it up and now be unconscious of it. And he's out of time. And that's why he is obsessively changing. And why the individual who is worst off will want to change the fastest and the hardest and has the most compulsion and obsession about it.

Now, do you understand what time is? You see how you could possibly process it? And do you see that you *have* been processing it?

Okay.

Axioms

Part I

A lecture given on 20 August 1954

I would like to talk to you now about the Axioms of Scientology.

There is considerable to be known about these. The Axioms were first developed in this science a great many years ago – two years, three years ago. And since that time there have been considerable changes. The changes are all in the direction of simplification.

At present, we are operating with 50 Axioms and definitions. The original list was considerably in excess of 290, and this list of 50 is both better and simpler, and more workable of course.

Now, what are these Axioms and how do they apply? Are they something that you are supposed to read and, you know, say, "Well, I understand that," and turn over the page and "Well, I understand that."

No, I am afraid that isn't the case. You who are in training on this particular subject are not expected to read them, you're expected to *absorb* them; you're expected to be able to quote them verbatim, by number, the exact words, the exact meaning, and much more important than that, you're expected to understand them.

Now, let's take a look at these Axioms and find out what they compare to. Actually, they compare best perhaps to the axioms of geometry. They are certainly as self-evident as that, but the axioms of geometry are really much cruder than these Axioms, since geometry proves itself by itself and the Axioms of Scientology prove themselves by all of life.

Now, in geometry we have the Aristotelian syllogism being used continually, and we do not use this. We use a much better platform on which to base our understanding. If something doesn't work in Scientology, we change it and find something more workable. We are not bowed down to the great god "No Change."

Now, I know some of you watching this work going forward for the last four years or so certainly would agree with that very wholeheartedly, that we were not completely yoked by the motto "no change."

And so we have today 50 Axioms and definitions. Now, Webster says that an axiom is a self-evident truth. Well, true enough, these are self-evident. But they are not so thoroughly self-evident that they leap out of the page and introduce themselves. You have to introduce yourself to them.

The first of our Axioms is a bit of understanding which, if you do not have it and do not comprehend it, you won't be able to do anything with Scientology. I mean, it's just as blunt as that. The first one, if you don't have it very well and if it's something foggy, so that somebody came up to you and said, "What is life?" and you said, "Well now, let's see. It's something to do with electricity. No, it's a static. I mean, I heard once there was a rumor that... Understand... Let me see. Well, of course, I know what life is."

No, you don't. Man has been saying that for ten thousand years – "Well, er... uh... It has something, I guess... I understand..." "No, we're not doing that in Scientology and that's why we succeed in cases. *Life is basically a static*. That's the first Axiom. *Life is basically a static*.

What is a static? A static is something which does not have mass, it does not have a location in space and does not have a location in time, it does not have any wavelength. And that's what a static is. This static, however, of life is a very peculiar static – very, very peculiar static. And that is, it has the ability to postulate and perceive, and it has qualities.

Now that you won't find in your textbook until you get over to R2-40, the dissertation there. But it's nevertheless very true that life is capable of qualities. Those qualities are best found in the top buttons of the Chart of Attitudes.

Now you say, "Well, all right. Then how can you measure it?"

Well, you *can* measure it. When you find something that has no mass, no location and no position in time, and which has no wavelength at all, the inability to measure it will tell you that you have your hands on life.

Now, the funny part of it is, out of this static all other phenomena extends. So, naturally, you cannot measure a thing by its own phenomena. Space comes from this. You could say life is a space-energy-object production-and-placement unit. You could say that and that would be equally true, because that's what it does.

I tell you, you would not try to measure a dog by his biscuits. And as a result, why, people cannot measure this static by the phenomena extending from the static.

Well now, number 2 – if you have number 1 down very thoroughly (and you should be able to give quite a dissertation on number 1) – number 2: *The static is capable of considerations, postulates and opinions*. It also has qualities, you understand? Something, in other words, a life form, a thetan let us say who is very, very close to being pure static, he has practically *no* wavelength. He's in a very, very small amount of mass. Actually, a thetan – due to some experiments conducted about, oh, I don't know, fifteen-twenty years ago – thetan weighs about 1.5 ounces. Who made these experiments? Well, it was a doctor made these experiments, because he weighed people before and after death, retaining any mass. He weighed the person, bed and all. And he found that the weight dropped at the moment of death about 1.5 ounces, some of them 2 ounces. (Those were heavy thetans.)

Anyway, we have this thetan capable of considerations, postulates and opinions. Well now, the most native qualities to him, in other words, the things which he is most likely to postulate, are these qualities which you find as the top buttons of the Chart of Attitudes. In other words, trust, full responsibility, all that sort of thing.

So we have, then, actually described a thetan when we have gotten Axioms 1 and 2. And if you ever miss this, then you're going to have an awful hard time exteriorizing somebody, because if you think that you reach in with a pair of forceps and drag him out of his head, this is not true. What you do is you exteriorize something that can't *possibly* be nailed down. Now that's quite a trick, isn't it?

A thetan has to postulate he's inside before you can postulate that he's outside. But if he has heavily postulated that he's inside, now your trick as an auditor is to what? Override this thetan's postulates? Well, maybe you could do it by hypnotism and maybe you could do it with a club, but the way we do it in Scientology is a little more delicate. We simply ask him to postulate that he's outside. And if he does, and can, why, he's outside. And if he can't, why, he's still inside.

Now, thetans think of themselves as being *in* the mest universe. Of course, this is a joke, too; they can't possibly be *in a* universe. But they can postulate a condition and then they can postulate that they cannot escape this condition. Of course, they can't be in the universe.

Now let's take up 3: *Space, energy, objects, form and time are the result of considerations made and/or agreed upon by the static and are perceived solely because the static considers that it can perceive them.*

The whole secret of perception is right there. Do you believe that you can see? Well, all right. Go ahead and believe that you can see. But you'd certainly better believe that there is something there *to* see or you *won't* see.

So there are two conditions to sight, and they are covered immediately in that. You have to believe there's something there to see, and then that you can see it. And so you have perception.

All of the tremendous categories of perception all come under this heading and are covered by that Axiom. So you'd better know that Axiom very, very well.

Now, number 4 – we get number 4 here: that *Space is a viewpoint of dimension*. Do you know that physics has gone on since the time of Aristotle without knowing that? Yet we read in the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* of many years ago – I think it was the eleventh edition, maybe even the ninth edition – and it says there that space and time are not a problem of the physicist; they are the problem of one working in the field of the mind.

And it says that when the field of psychology solves the existence of space and time, why, then physics will be able to do something about it. And all these fellows running around getting their Ph.D.'s and Dh.P.'s, and so forth, and studying all these centuries – not centuries, actually, merely decades; it seems like centuries if you've ever listened to their lectures – the days of Wundt (the "only Wundt") back in, I think, 1867, something like that, on forward, nobody read the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* and realized that they had the responsibility for identifying space and time so that physics could get on its way. And because they avoided this responsibility, we had to pitch in here and dig up Scientology.

Now, we didn't dig up Scientology to work in the field of physics. We dug up Scientology to work in the field of the humanities. But it so happened that I discovered very, very

early while I was studying nuclear physics at George Washington University that physics did not have a definition for *space*, *time* and *energy*. It defined energy in terms of space and time, it defined space in terms of time and energy – in other words, it was going around in a circle and things were being defined by each other.

Now, I first moved out of that circle by putting it into human behavior-be, have and do (or be, do and have), which you'll find in *Scientology 8-8008*, which you can get from the HASI.

But the point is here that without a definition for *space*, physics was, and is, adrift.

One of our auditors, by the way, told somebody (an engineer in an Atomic Energy Commission plant) one time, "Well, we have the definition for *space*."

And this engineer said, "You do?" And of course we didn't invent this for nuclear physics, but they could certainly use it (if they could read).

So this fellow said, "Well, what *is* the definition of *space*?"

And our auditor said (that was Wing Angel), he said, "Space is a viewpoint of dimension."

This fellow sat there for a moment, and he sat there, and then all of a sudden he rushed to the phone and he says, "Close down Number 5!" He realized that an experiment in progress was about to explode. And one of the reasons he knew it was about to explode is he'd suddenly found out what space was. It's quite interesting.

This is of great interest to nuclear physics, but they get one of these definitions and then they start figure-figure-figure-figure-figure. They don't take the definition as such and use it as such, they figure-figure-figure-figure-figure, and so they lose it again.

When you work R2-40 as a process, you will understand exactly why they lose it every time they get hold of one of these definitions.

Now, I'm not being very kind to these people, but then I don't feel very kind today. Anyway... (I have a right to my emotions, too.)

Now number 5: *Energy consists of postulated particles in space*. Now, we got space; space is a viewpoint of dimension. You say, "I am here looking in a direction." Now, we've actually got to have three points out there to look at to have three-dimensional space (we only have linear space if we have one dimension point).

All right. The next thing is that *energy consists of postulated particles in space*. In other words, we demark these three points out there to have three-dimensional space. We say there's energy, energy, energy – particles. All right. We call those anchor points in Scientology.

Now, the next thing: *Objects consist of grouped particles*. Now, if we just kept putting particles out there and pushing them together, or if we suddenly said there's a big group of particles out there, we'd have what is commonly called an object.

Now, when an object or a particle moves across any part of a piece of space – in other words, a viewpoint of dimension – we have motion. And so we get Axiom number 7: *Time is*

basically a postulate that space and particles will persist. That's all – that's its first postulate. Time in its basic postulate is not even motion. You understand? I mean, it's not even motion.

The *apparency* of time, an agreed-upon rate of change, becomes agreed-upon time. But for an individual, all by himself, time is simply a consideration. And he says, "Something will persist." That's all he has to say, and he has time.

Now, if he gets somebody else to agree what is persisting, why, the two of them can then be in agreement, and if those two items are motionless, then they can't agree how fast or how slow they're persisting. So they get them moving. And this gives them a clock or a watch, and so you carry a watch around on your wrist.

But time is not motion. Let's escape from that one right now – an error and a heresy, an heresy to which I myself was prey until fairly recently. We can say, however, number 8: *The apparency of time is the change of position of particles in space.* Now, if we see particles changing in space, we know time is passing.

But if you had one piece of space and you had three particles (so it would be three-dimensional space), and you were simply sitting there looking at those particles and there was absolutely no change in them whatsoever, you would be very hard put to describe even to yourself whether any time was passing or not.

And so: *The apparency of time is the change of position of particles in space.*

All right, let's take up number 9: *Change is the primary manifestation of time.*

You see, if you saw these three things motionless, then you would not be able to tell whether time was passing or not, because you might be looking at one time or another. But to prove it, you could say, "They moved this far at such-and-such a speed," or something of the sort, and you could say, "therefore this much time has gone by." So we would say, then, that *change is the primary manifestation of time.*

Now, oddly enough, you have then your Case V. Right there. Case V is trying to change himself simply because he is in agreement with particles in motion. That's all. He's simply acting on compulsion or obsession to change. And if you ask him very suddenly which direction he's trying to change, he would not be able to tell you. He has no real goal; he doesn't particularly want to be better, he doesn't particularly want to be worse, but he has got to change, got to change, got to change, got to change – he's got to change, he's frantically got to change.

Well, why does he got to change? It's because he has these particles all around him which are dictating change to him. They are saying "time, time, time, time, time, time." In other words, they're saying "change, change, change, change, change." In other words, he's in agreement with the apparency of time, and he has fallen far, far away from the mere consideration of time. So he doesn't conceive what time is; he becomes a nuclear physicist.

Anyway, *the highest purpose in the universe is the creation of an effect.* Let's get on to that one – 10.

I refer you to the Factors, published in Issue 16-G of *the Journal of Scientology*, which is available from the HASI and which is also in the *Auditor's Handbook*. *The highest purpose in the universe is the creation of an effect.*

Well, we could do an awful lot with that. We could do a tremendous amount with just that one Axiom. And in processing we would see, then, good reason to have space and to have particles and everything else, and how all these things get there: To create an effect – people want to create an effect.

All right. Then people are going around looking for an effect. And they get into very interesting states of mind about this sort of thing. They say to themselves, "Well, let's see now. I caused that effect, but that effect is horrible. Therefore, I can't admit that I caused that effect, so I then throw a lie onto the track and say I didn't cause that effect."

The next thing of this is they become an effect. Therefore, if they can't be at cause, they become an effect. So they are the effect of what they caused without admitting what they caused, so now they're an effect. Now, do you know they get even worse than that, worse than being a total effect?

Well, they certainly do. They get *way* down the line to the point where they're the cause of anything that is an effect. They blame themselves, in other words. A man in Sandusky falls down and breaks a glass of pink lemonade and cuts his little pinkie, and this person who is in San Diego at the time hears about that, and they know they must be guilty. And that is your – that's complete reversal.

Now, here we have cause and effect, and the person can get into a state where he's cause and effect simultaneously. That is to say, any effect he starts to cause, he becomes that effect instantly. He says, "I think I'll kill him," and he feels like he's dead. Just bing! bing!

We've got to have time in order to witness an effect. Now, there's something else. There... oh, there's a great many things you could learn in this, and one of the things that you could learn from this primarily is that science is dedicated to observing effect. And we completely forget that it has no other goal. It does not have any other real goal. Once in a while a scientist is also an idealist, at which time he wants to use his materials to improve man. But science at large, and particularly when it got over into the field of the mind, was simply a goalless, soulless pursuit – as I've already said in *the Auditor's Handbook* – and the whole thing of it is just to observe an effect. So these people go around and they observe an effect.

You know, they're not really even causing an effect; they just go around observing effect. And they fill notebooks and notebooks and notebooks and notebooks full of effects, effects, effects, effects. And you'll find out they carry on experiments, not to prove anything, not to *do* anything, but just to observe an effect. They go around and put a pin in the tail of a rat and the rat jumps and squeaks, and so they say, "Aaahh!" And they note it down carefully in the notebook, "When you put a pin..."(they actually put the pin in the *end* of the rat's tail) and they write it down – because these people can't duplicate – they write it down and they say, "When you put a pin one inch from the end of the tail of a rat, he moans." Actually, the rat squeaked.

Well, this was observing an effect, the way it's recorded by science. This is so bad that the leading scientist of the day, a fellow by the name of um... um... Einstein... Einstein says that all an observer has any right to do is look at a needle. Well, that's all right if he's an observer, but why then does a scientist believe that all he has any right to do is look at a needle? That's the only way you'd ever get anybody to build anything as bad as an atom bomb. You'd only get them to build something as bad as an atom bomb if they were incapable of responsibility.

And if men were totally incapable of responsibility, if they were just going around observing an effect, going around observing an effect, observing an effect, why, you would eventually get them so that they could build an atom bomb. And they would say, "Well, it isn't my fault. I'm not to blame."

Now, the few scientists who did feel badly about this and joined organizations, and so forth, were promptly fired by the government – some sixty-seven of them. The actual instigators and constructors of the atomic bomb have now to date been uniformly fired by the United States government. They had some responsibility.

So, oh, the government got that out of the road. Now they've got people who just observe effects and everybody's happy – except the American people one of these days.

You could take any one of these Axioms, by the way, and blow it up considerably and make an awful lot out of it.

But let's go into number 11: *The considerations resulting in conditions of existence are fourfold.*

Now, why should I talk to you about that, the conditions of existence? Because I've spent hours and hours here in these lectures talking to you about the conditions of existence. And here they are merely stated in axiomatic form. And in case you are still confused, I invite you to look over 11 (a), 11(b), 11(c) and 11(d). And that is an exact statement of these conditions of existence: as-isness, alter-isness, isness and not-isness.

We've spent enough hours on that, so let's take up number 12: *The primary condition of any universe is that two spaces, energies or objects must not occupy the same space. When this condition is violated (a perfect duplicate) the apparency of any universe or any part thereof is nulled.*

Now, let's get Korzybski, let's look at general semantics and let's find out that he was very careful to demonstrate that two objects could not occupy the same space. In other words, Korzybski was dramatizing "preserve the universe, preserve the universe, preserve the universe."

Now, this one tells you that if two objects can occupy the same space, you haven't got a universe. And sure enough, if you just ask a preclear a lot of times what object can occupy the same space you're occupying, he'll work at it and he will work at it and work at it, and the first thing you know, why, he's capable of doing many things which he was not able to do before: his space straightens out, he can create space again, and so forth.

Merely because this mest universe has been telling him so often that two objects cannot occupy the same space, he has begun to believe it. And he believes this is the most *thorough* law that he has. So we find a person perfectly contentedly being in a body, believing he is a body. Why, he knows that he, a thetan, could not occupy the same space as a body. He knows this is impossible. Two objects can't occupy the same space. Why, he's an object and his body is an object, so the two can't occupy the same space.

Well, actually, this is very interesting, because you'll find that two universes can occupy the same space and actually *do* occupy the same space. You'll find the universe of the thetan is occupying the same space as the physical universe.

But once he declares that the both of them are occupying the same space, you get an interesting condition. Now, I'm not going to try to take up at this time the perfect duplicate with you; you will have to prove this to yourself. But it's just enough to say, "Two objects are occupying that space, *identically* occupying that space," and poof! it's gone. It's just enough. That's just the way you make things vanish, that is, to get its as-isness. And this is why as-isness works and why things disappear when you get their as-isness.

Okay. Now, here is the oldest thing that man knows. And it starts this way. This is the next one here – 13. Axiom 13: *The cycle of action of the physical universe is create, survive (which is persist), destroy.* Now, that's the oldest thing man knows. He knows that the universe goes on the basis of death – actually, he did know that, that it went on the basis of death, birth, growth, decay; death, birth, growth, decay; death, birth, growth, decay and so on. He knew that he had time involved here on a lineal line.

Now, the funny part of it is, you've got to postulate death to get a cycle of action, and you've got to postulate time to get a linear line. So we're dealing here with one of the most intimate things.

Now, in Scientology we take this old Vedic – we find this, by the way, in the Rig-Veda. It's been with man about ten thousand years that I know of. And we find that this is the cycle of action of the physical universe: create, survive, destroy.

Now, in Dianetics I isolated just one portion of this line as a common denominator of all existence, which was survive. And sure enough, any life form is surviving. It is trying to survive and that is its normal push forward. And that has, incidentally, terrific impact. But it has two other parts, and that is create and destroy.

Create, survive, destroy. And *survive* merely means persist. So all of these things are based on time. And we have the primary consideration that there is time underlying Axiom 13.

Now we can go in there with 14 and 15 and 16, and find out that the conditions of existence fit these various portions of the survival curve. And that would be as follows: that we find out that *survival is accomplished by alter-isness and not-isness, by which is gained the persistency known as time.* That's a mechanical persistency.

In other words, if we keep changing things, changing things, changing things, and then saying they aren't and saying they aren't and saying they aren't, and changing them, and then pushing them out, and then changing them and pushing them out and – in other words, re-

forming them and trying to vanish them; *pushing* them, in other words, using energy to fight energy – why, we'll get survival. And believe me, we'll get persistency. There's more to it than that. I invite you to R2-40 to understand that completely.

Now number 15: *Creation is accomplished by the postulation of an as-isness.* Now, do you know that all you have to say is "Space, energy, time. That is. That's the way it is."

And you could say, "It's now going to persist" – you've added the time to it. That's as-isness.

Now, if you immediately after that simply looked at it and got its as-isness again, it'd vanish. All you had to do was get it in the same instant of time, you might say, with the same time postulate, and it would disappear. You could create; it'd disappear in terms of as-isness.

In order to make that as-isness persist, you'd have to alter it. But we've gone into that a great deal.

Now 16: *Complete destruction is accomplished by the postulation of the as-isness of any existence and the parts thereof.* In other words, you want something to disappear, the complete destruction would simply be *vanishment*; you wouldn't have any rubble left. When you blow something up with guns you get rubble left. You can ask anybody who was in the last war, and there was an awful lot of broken bricks lying all over the streets.

Yeah, if anybody had really been working at this in a good, sensible way and he'd really meant total destruction, he would have simply gotten the as-isness of the situation and zoom! it would have been gone. That would have been the end of that. If you wanted to declare the whole as-isness of a country, if you were able to span that much attention and trace back that many particles that fast to their original points of creation, why, you would of course have a vanishment. And that's complete destruction. So complete destruction is as-isness, and also complete vanishment is as-isness.

And as-isness, of course, is simply a postulated existence. And what we're looking at most of the time is number 17: *The static, having postulated as-isness, then practices alter-isness, and so achieves the apparency of isness and so obtains reality.*

In other words, we get a continuous alteration and we get this apparency called isness. And *the static, in practicing not-isness, brings about the persistence of unwanted existences, and so brings about unreality* (in other words, it's not-isness that gives us unreality), *and that includes forgetfulness, unconsciousness and other undesirable states.* Quite an important Axiom and a very true one.

Okay.

Axioms

Part II

A lecture given on 20 August 1954

I want to talk to you now some more about the Axioms.

It's a remarkable thing that life itself can be codified in terms of axioms. It has not been done before. The first time it was attempted is when I wrote up the Logics and Axioms way back there, couple of years ago.

Well, it's more than that; that's about three years ago. And I wrote these things up simply to give an alignment to thought itself. And as a matter of fact, copies of these Axioms were sent over to Europe and just a year ago I found them in Vienna, fully translated into German, which is quite remarkable. But over there they were terribly impressed, simply because it had not been done: nobody had codified life to this degree and nobody had codified psychotherapy. And they were not impressed as to whether they were right or wrong, it's just that nobody had done it before.

Well, we are not quite doing the same thing here. Those Axioms were quite complicated, and the Axioms which we have here in the summary of Scientology in the *Auditor's Handbook* are nowhere near as lengthy, but they pack a great deal more punch.

Now, let's take up something very, very interesting. Let's take up proof of ultimate truth.

If we have reached an ultimate truth, then we have reached an ultimate solution. And who would ever suspect, really, that an ultimate truth or an ultimate solution could be subjected to mechanical proof? Who would dream this?

Well, certainly I never would have dreamed it, and yet we have done just that. I discovered the phenomenon of a perfect duplicate. Now, you'd better know what a perfect duplicate is. We get that in Axiom 20: *Bringing the static to create a perfect duplicate causes the vanishment of any existence or part thereof.*

You understand that – that if you can get a life form to make a perfect duplicate of anything, it will vanish. Now, that's quite remarkable. We have a perfect duplicate very, very clearly defined. It is an additional – now get that *additional* – it's an additional creation of the object, its energy and space in its own space, its own time, using its own energy. And we could append to that the considerations which go along with it because it couldn't be anything but considerations.

Now, this violates the condition that two objects must not occupy the same space, and causes the vanishment of the object. The second that you violate this rule which holds universes together, which is that two objects must not occupy the same space, and we make two objects occupy *exactly* the same space, why, we get a vanishment.

Now, this is quite remarkable. But if you will ask somebody to simply make a perfect duplicate of something, well understanding exactly what a perfect duplicate is, if you ask him to make a perfect duplicate for instance, of a vase, just exactly where it sits, it will start to fade out on him. And he can do that to almost anything.

Now, why doesn't it fade for somebody else? Why doesn't this perfect duplicate fade for somebody else? Well, it's quite remarkable. Do you know that everything in this universe is displaced or misplaced?

Now, when we say "*a lie*," when we talk about a lie, we really don't mean that simply changing the position of something is a lie. We have to alter the consideration regarding it to make a lie. Now, it isn't really a lie that everything is so scrambled in this universe, but believe me, it's scrambled. Just in the last moment or two, several cosmic rays went through your body.

Now, those were all particles. They emanated from someplace else and they came down where you are. Maybe they've been en route for a hundred million years – who knows. And there they are.

Now, to get one of those cosmic rays to vanish, it would be necessary to pick its point of creation. And we would have to find its point of creation, and we would have to make a duplicate of the ray at the moment of its *creation*. And then we would have to make a duplicate of having done so. And instantly that cosmic ray would vanish. There is no doubt about this whatsoever.

There is how you make a perfect duplicate.

Now, if you can make a perfect duplicate and make something disappear, why, you have of course achieved a vanishment. And this means, then, that you have achieved something which is quite interesting. It's very interesting to the physicist; it's very interesting to almost anybody. But it is demonstrable. You *can* do this.

Now, I asked one of our better auditors the other day: he was foolish enough to sit down and let me process him while I was doing something else. And I told him simply to look over to the wall over there, and pick a very small area and get the atoms and molecules in the wall there, and put an attention unit – you know, a little attention unit, a remote viewpoint – next to each one and follow it immediately back to where it had been created.

And he came off of the fender of that car as though he had been shot, because the object itself, this tiny portion of the object, started to disintegrate. And he rushed over to it to hold it into place. Well, it was an interesting experiment. Because he'd heard all this and he didn't quite believe it. But the second that he realized that, it was fine.

Well now, why doesn't the whole universe vanish? Well, let me point out to you that probably on the very site of this building there was another building once. Where's that other

building? It's been broken up and the bricks have been moved, and part of it's out here in the street, and there's part of it still in the ground below you, part of it maybe has – oh, I don't know – some brick dust got on somebody's suitcase who went to World War II and part of it's in Germany and... In other words, it's spread all over the place.

And here are all these waves and rays going all over the universe. And to get each one of those at its moment of creation, in the time and space of moment of creation, using itself as its own energy, would be quite a job. And it's not an impossible job. It merely means that it's a job that requires an ability to span attention like mad.

You would get, then, a physical object to disappear so thoroughly that everybody else would know it was gone if you got all these various parts. You see, it isn't true that an object sitting before you at this moment – or your chair – has always been in that position; nor it isn't true that the materials in that chair have always been in that position; nor is it true that the atoms which made up the materials in their raw-material form were always in that particular ore bed or in that particular tree. So you see, it's quite complex. This universe is very mixed up. It doesn't mean you can't make it vanish, however.

Now, the second that we get this perfect duplicate and the second we can produce this phenomena, we know we have an ultimate solution. Now, we will go into that much more deeply here when we get to the last part of the Axioms. But I merely want to call that to your attention right here: that the perfect duplicate was the little latch string hanging out that opened the door to an ultimate truth.

Well, what would an ultimate truth be? Well, we'll take that up a little bit later. But an ultimate truth is a static and an ultimate solution is a static. In other words, an ultimate truth and an ultimate solution is nothing. You get the as-isness of any problem, you make a perfect duplicate of any problem, and the problem will disappear.

Now, you can subject that to truth, too. So if you can make a problem disappear by simply getting its as-isness, then you've got the solution to all problems, haven't you? Well, the mest universe itself is just a problem. And if you could make it all disappear just by getting its as-isness, it *would* disappear. It'd disappear for everybody.

All right. Let's study that and get that very good and get what a definition is, there, in the *Auditor's Handbook*. And let's get that definition of a perfect duplicate and let's understand it very, very well because contained right in that is the total solution, by the way, to a mental therapy, Dianetics, of which you may have heard something.

And the vanishment of engrams, the vanishment of ridges, of all energy forms and manifestations, can simply be accomplished by making perfect duplicates of them. That doesn't mean that you should go around trying to make nothing out of everything or get your pre-clear to try to make nothing out of everything. But it just can be done.

If you wanted to make a mest Clear, you could use the principle of the perfect duplicate to do it in a very short space of time. He'd not only be Clear, he wouldn't have a body, either.

All right. Let's take up number 21: *Understanding is composed of affinity, reality and communication*. The understanding that we have of an understanding is, of course, a broad collection of data – that's what we would consider understanding. "I understand this data."

Well, let's get understanding just a little bit better. Do we understand that understanding is simply the ability to get the as-isness of something? In other words, you go around and you say, "I don't quite understand this car." And we walk around it – "Don't quite understand what's wrong with this car; it just won't start."

And we walk around it, and then we find out we haven't turned on the key. And we turn on the key; we have understood it, in other words. We have unmocked the fact that the key was not turned on and we have turned on the key.

Now, that actually is practicing alter-isness. If we walked around this car and said, "I don't understand what this object is, I don't understand what this object is... Ah! It's a car," we would feel immediately relieved; we'd feel a lot better about the thing.

But if we were to get its *total* as-isness, it would just be a hole sitting there. So understanding is as-isness. And understanding, in its entirety, would be a static. And so we have the fact that life *knows* basically everything there is to know before it gets complicated with lots of data, merely because it can postulate all the data it knows.

In other words, all knowingness is inherent in the static itself. A thetan who is in good shape knows everything there is to know. He knows past, present and future; he knows everything. This doesn't mean he knows data. This merely means that he can as-is anything. And if he can as-is anything, believe me, he can understand it.

Man's salvation, I have said several times, depends upon his recognition of his brotherhood with the universe. Well, let's misinterpret that just a little bit and say, "Well, man's salvation (if you wanted to mean *save* him from the universe) would depend upon his ability to make an as-isness of the physical universe, at which moment he wouldn't have a universe.

And this would be total understanding.

Well, this understanding has three parts, and this is affinity, reality and communication. Well, I've mentioned that to you before. And we know quite a bit about that. As a matter of fact, there's a total book on this subject. It's an old book and doesn't contain as many refinements as we have today, but affinity, reality and communication are very, very useful to the auditor. You should understand them very, very well. That's A, R, C.

Now, you can actually take ARC and you can compose, out of ARC, all the mathematics there are. You can combine ARC into mathematics. You can do anything with ARC that you want to do. Symbolic logic, even calculus could be extrapolated from ARC. It's quite interesting.

Affinity depends upon reality and communication; reality depends upon affinity and communication; communication depends upon affinity and reality. And as I used to say, if you don't believe this, try to communicate sometime with somebody and don't have any affinity at all. Just get real mad at somebody and try to communicate with him. You won't.

Try to get somebody to be reasonable when he is very angry, and you'll find out his reality is very bad. He cannot conceive of the isness of the situation. He will give you some of the weirdest things. There is no liar lying like an angry man.

Now, if you raise somebody's affinity, you will raise their reality and communication; if you raise somebody's reality, you will raise their affinity and communication; if you raise somebody's communication, you will raise their affinity and reality.

And the keynote of this triangle happens to be communication. Communication is more important than affinity and reality.

All right. Now, let's take up number 22, and find out that: *the practice of not-isness reduces understanding*. In other words, something is there and we say it's *not* there. That's a lie, isn't it? We're running down the road like mad and there's an enormous boulder lying in the middle of the road, and almost anybody, just before he has an accident, will say the boulder is not there. And by golly, it's there.

And this makes him feel that he's a bum thetan. He's failed. Well, the funny part of it is, if he were to say immediately, "As-is a boulder in the road," instead of denying the situation, and if he could do this – a perfect duplicate – well, the boulder would disappear.

But he doesn't do it that way. He sort of puts some energy up there and sort of pushes against the boulder and he says, "It's not there. It's not there. I deny it."

Well, he'll have a mighty thin understanding of the whole thing. He doesn't want to communicate with it, so he says it's not there. He doesn't want to have any affinity for it at all, so he said it isn't there. And believe me, his reality cuts down.

After somebody has lost something or been through an accident, you would be surprised how poor their perception is, how poor their reality is. Everything looks very dim to them. They don't like it. That means their communication is off, their affinity is off, they don't like the world, they feel sad and so forth.

Well, the practice of not-isness reduces understanding. And that is what man is doing all the time. He's trying to avow that something that isn't there is there, and he's trying to avow that something that is there isn't there, and between these two things – giving it no as-isness at all or alter-isness or new postulates of any kind – he's having a lot of fun. Well, I don't know; some people claim it's fun anyway.

All right, number 23: *The static has the capability of total knowingness. Total knowingness would consist of total ARC.*

Well, we've just covered that. Here we have a condition of existence which is as-is. That'd be total knowingness. Well, if we had somebody who could say "As-is" to everything and trace all parts of everything back to the original time, spot, and so forth, and simply get them as they really were, we of course would have nothing left but a static. Naturally. We would not have anything else but a static. We would have zero. We wouldn't even have space.

Now, that's why we say the static has capability of total knowingness. Total knowingness would consist of total ARC. By the way, if you wanted to make this whole universe *vanish*, you would have to be able to *span* this whole universe. You would have to be as big as

the universe. And that isn't, by the way, very hard to do. You can drill somebody up to a point where he can do that.

But if you go into that to get him to make an as-isness of it, would you please let me know first? I've got a couple of old hats and a motorcycle, and so forth, that I'd like to alter very quickly at the moment he does this, so I'd at least be left with those.

Now, number 24 is: *Total ARC would bring about the vanishment of all mechanical conditions of existence.* Now remember, all *mechanical* conditions of existence. It wouldn't bring about the sudden *death* of everything. It would bring about the exteriorization of everything. It would mean the vanishment of all space and all form. The mechanics.

Now, you want to differentiate between a consideration and a postulate and a mechanic. Now, you want to get the difference between a quality such as complete trust, a quality such as full responsibility, and the mechanics.

Now, you get somebody who is a Step V or Step VI or Step X... And you'll get one of these fellows, and he will be all out for mechanics and he won't have anything to do with considerations. And he will believe completely that considerations are – well, they're no good: "Mechanics are the thing. You know, you can put your hands on it. You can feel it, you can touch it."

Well, he has to be made thoroughly acquainted with the existence of these mechanics before he could as-is them enough so that he could get up to a point where he would have the ability to consider. That's why Opening Procedure of 8-C works. He has sunk below the level of mechanics.

Well, when we say mechanics we mean space, energy, objects and time. And when something has those things in it, we're talking about something mechanical.

All right. That's all that would vanish if you as-ised all of existence. It would just be the mechanics. And you could turn right around and postulate them all back again, too, with great ease.

Only, if you do this, why, don't postulate them back with any politicians. We've had too many of them. Generals, too – you can omit the generals. Don't give them any mechanical forms.

Number 25 of these Axioms and definitions: *Affinity is the scale of attitude which falls away from the co-existence of static, through the interpositions of distance and energy, to create identity, down to close proximity but mystery.*

My, isn't that complicated? That is very, very complicated. Well, let's get this fairly straight, and let's realize that we probably could simplify that particular Axiom. If it's complicated like that, we probably don't know all there is to know about it. I probably got a blank spot here someplace.

But affinity is simply a matter of distance, in terms of mechanics. Now, the second we get out of considerations and go into mechanics, what is affinity?

Well, affinity is basically a consideration, so it isn't a mechanic at all. But it does represent itself mechanically. There are mechanical representations of it. For instance, total

knowingness goes down to lookingness. You have to look to find out. Well, that's different than simply knowing without looking.

Now we go down to looking.

And now we go just a little bit lower than that – this is, by the way, an affinity scale – we go into emotion. And look, and then we no longer have knowledge by looking, we have to have knowledge by emotion. Do we like it, do we dislike it – emotionally? There are particles in emotion. "I don't like it. In other words, I have some anger particles about it or I have some resentment particles." By the way, a preclear has his bank full of these emotional particles.

Now, if I have to feel it to know it's there, I've gone immediately into effort. My affinity for something would be good if I could feel it and it would be no good at all if I can't feel it. You get a Step V who is swearing by mechanics and swearing at all life forms (and who builds atom bombs and things like that), and we get this Step V telling you that he cannot contact life. He cannot contact life, so therefore – you know, we can't contact this thing called static, so therefore he can't believe in it.

Well, this is very interesting. You ask him why. And he says, "Well, I can't feel it." Well, he's twisting the snake around so it'll eat its tail or something. He's proving it all upside down and backwards.

He says he can't get the existence of something he can't feel. Well, the odd part of it is we can measure electronically the existence of life. There is a little meter which we have run some tests on, and we can actually demonstrate that one individual can turn on in another individual, at some great distance from him, a considerable electrical current – enough to make this little machine sit up and sing. And the other person can turn it on at will, and the person on whom it is being turned on can't stop it. Here's a manifestation which can be measured. We've done the impossible there, too. We've done the impossible in many places in Scientology.

You can't measure a static, but we've done so by making one person at a distance bring a mechanic into being.

Now, affinity is this scale. It goes down through effort. When a person gets down to effort, then he's into a level where he's got to work, everything has got to be work; he's got to touch everything and feel everything before he can know anything. A person in that band, by the way – as he gets to the lower part of that band – has facsimiles. He will even do weird things like this: he will get a picture to know what's happening to him. In other words, he will get a picture of an incident to get an idea. He gets the picture and then he gets the idea. He doesn't get the idea and then get a picture.

You want to watch that. Sometime or another you'll find a preclear who is doing this. You'll be saying, "All right, now get the idea of being perfect." And your preclear will sit there and say, "I got it."

You want to ask him "How did you do that?" – that's a wonderful question to ask a preclear at any time – "How did you do that?"

And he will say, "Why, of course, just like everybody else. I got this picture and this picture came up, and I looked at it, and the picture said, 'Be perfect' and so forth, and it showed me a circle. So a circle, that's perfect, so..."

That's the way your preclear was doing that. He wasn't making the postulate at all; he was waiting for a picture to come up and tell him what it was all about.

Well, now we go down from effort into thinking. And we get our figure-figure-figure-figure-figure case. Now, he's a hard boy to get along with because he can't work. His thought... Thought, by the way, is a colloquialism. Life is not composed of thought, particularly, it's composed of space and action and all sorts of things.

The static can do all these things. It's not necessarily pure thought. If you've got a hangover about pure thought from a field of Christianity, why, get rid of it. Because thinkingness comes in clear down below effort. And it comes in as figure-figure-figure-figure-figure.

Now, a person can postulate without thinking about it. If that's what we mean by thought, that's fine, but usually what people mean by thought is figure-figure-figure-figure. I'll just figure this out, and I'll get a computation, a calculation, and I'll add it up to "Now, let me see. Can you go to the movies? I don't know," they said when you were a little kid. "Now, let me see. I'll have to think it over. Give me a couple of days."

We don't know how all of this mechanic got into a postulate, but they've let it get in there. So that's our level of thinkingness.

Now, we go downstairs from thinkingness on this scale, and we get into symbolizingness. Symbolizingness is very interesting. A symbol contains mass, meaning and mobility. What is the definition of a symbol? A symbol is something that's being handled from an orientation point – a point which is motionless in relationship to the symbol (you know, it's motionless; the symbol is in motion) – and the symbol of that orientation point has mass, meaning and mobility.

"Where are you from?"

"I am from New Jersey."

This fellow is telling you that he is from an orientation point called New Jersey, and it's motionless. And as he runs around the world he's always from New Jersey. He has mass, meaning and mobility; he has a name, he has mass, and so forth.

Well, when a person drops down the line below figure-figure, they're into a point of where they figure with symbols. Now, that's a condensation, isn't it? Now, each one of these was a condensation.

The next one down the line below symbols is eatingness. You know, animals eat animals. Animals are symbols and they eat other symbols. And they think they have to stay alive merely by eating other symbols.

This is real cute, and eating is quite important (of course, it can be a lot of fun). But here you have a real condensation. In other words, effort got so condensed that it turned into an inverted kind of thought. And that became so condensed that it packaged thinking, is what

took place there; it became so condensed it became a symbol. A word, for instance, is a whole package of thought.

So packaged thinking is a symbol and packaged symbols are a plate of beans. Got that?

All right. Now, below that, when a person doesn't believe he can eat anymore, when he thinks he's not going to survive and so forth, he will go into the sex band. Now, as a witness of that, oh, if you starve cattle or something like that for a while, they'll start to breed. And if you feed them too well they'll stop breeding. It's quite irrational, but then who said any of this was rational?

Cattle who are starved or lacking certain food elements will decide, "Well, we'll live again in some other generation," and they'll breed up a lot of calves. Of course, there's nothing to feed the calves on, but they haven't paid much attention to that.

Now, here in Arizona we have an interesting fact. We have some very beautiful cattle who have stopped breeding. They've just been too well fed. The way you'd get those cattle breeding again, is you'd simply start starving them and you would get them breeding.

Down below sex, then – Freud, by the way, he was so condensed, he had to get clear down there to that condensation of sex – and down below sex we have a new level of know- ingness. Only that, this time, is mystery and the level of mystery.

Now, mystery, of course, is a complete displacement of everything, which is in a terri- fic confusion. The anatomy of mystery, by the way, is unpredictation, confusion and then total blackout.

You see, at first he couldn't predict some particles, and then this seemed awfully con- fusing to him, and so he just shut it all off and said, "I won't look at it anymore." That's what mystery is, and your Step Level Vs, by the way, are very, very concerned about mystery. They are very concerned about thinkingness. They're trying to solve the mystery. Well, the mystery is already solved in an ultimate truth. An ultimate solution, of course, is simply the as-isness of the problem. And the as-isness of mystery is simply mystery, and that's really all there is to it.

There really is nothing to know back of a mystery, except the mystery itself. It's just its as-isness, but it's always pretending there is something to know earlier than the mystery.

Okay.

Axioms

Part III

A lecture given on 20 August 1954

I want to talk to you now some more about the Axioms.

We've gotten up to the Axioms of affinity, reality and communication. These subjects are very inherent. For instance, in Scientology they're terrifically useful. If you want to find where a communication line is breaking, why, look for some affinity that is off. And if you want to audit somebody who is having a rather rough time, then you'd better audit them with considerable affinity. If you demonstrate enough affinity one way or the other, why, you will be able to overcome their communication reluctance.

But it's very important that you understand that all these things are basically a consideration. We have to consider that they exist before they exist.

Now, we are covering on this track the considerations which man has composited into an existence. Man has decided that certain things existed, and so he has agreed upon this very thoroughly, and so they exist for all of men.

And if he had never decided upon these various existences, why, they wouldn't exist. So we look at this affinity and we find out that – we look at reality and communication, too – and we find out that we are looking at a long series of considerations which man holds in common. These are not considerations simply because we in Scientology consider that they exist. We can do enormously important things with this information, this codification, organization of this universe. It's been going on for about seventy-six trillion years, and to be able to bust it loose and knock it apart is quite an interesting feat.

All right. Let's look over affinity and see that the first thing about affinity is the fact it's consideration. And then that in the ARC triangle, the distance of communication is represented by the affinity to a marked degree, and the type of particle – the distance and the type of particle. For instance, they say absence makes the heart grow fonder. That happens to be a lie, but you could postulate it that way and make it come out. And you could also say that if you get two people far enough apart, why, they are liable to get mad at each other. The main reason you have wars is because Russia is a safe distance from the United States. It can afford to get mad.

Did you ever notice that somebody was very furious at you as long as they were on the other end of a telephone line, but when you went around to see them they weren't mad at you

anymore? Well, that's an inversion on the situation. You closed the distance and so you achieved a better affinity.

Many ways that you could handle this, but again, basically, it's a consideration.

Now, let's look at reality. And we find out that reality, in number 26: *Reality is the agreed-upon apparency of existence.*

The whole subject of reality is a baffling one to people who do not add into reality, affinity and communication. If you simply said, "Well, this is reality, and that's your reality, that's somebody else's reality," and so forth, why, you would just be talking, that's all.

In the first place, a person can postulate anything he wants to postulate, and he has a personal reality. He could simply say, "It's there," and he'd say, "That's real."

Or he can have a facsimile appear which is more real to him than the actual universe around him. Many times you'll run into a psychotic and his facsimiles are far, far more real than anything else.

Well, these are two conditions which we don't recognize as reality. In the one hand, the person merely postulates reality and so that's his reality, and other people don't agree upon it, and the other part is also a not-agreed-upon reality, and that is this reality: it's an other-determined reality. Somebody has given him a facsimile and has really impressed him with it and so this looks more real to him than reality. In other words, we have complete self-determined postulation and complete other-determined postulations, neither one of which are what we consider to be reality.

Those are extremes. What we consider to be reality is in the mean of this. That is, what do we agree is real? You and I agree there's a wall there, well, there's a wall there. And we agree there's a ceiling there, there's a ceiling there. And we agree that you're sitting there and I'm sitting here, well, that's real. That's simply because you and I safely have agreed that that takes place.

Now, if somebody else came in the room and looked at all you people sitting down and said, "What are you all standing up for?" why, you'd have rather a tendency to believe there was something wrong with this fellow.

And as a matter of fact, do you know what we do? We use natural selection to take out of the lineup people who have too much personal reality and too much other-determined reality. If this person walked in and said, "What are all you people standing up for?" why, if he did that consistently about a number of things and said, "What is that lion doing walking on the ceiling?" we would have a tendency to lock him up. In other words, we would move him away from survival and he wouldn't procreate. In other words, we'd move these people actually out of the... at least the genetic lineup (the insane).

Now, here we have in reality a very embracing subject, because reality is actually isness. Reality is isness and unreality is not-isness (our effort trying to make something disappear with energy). And, by the way, that's very amusing, trying to make things disappear with energy. They used to talk in the Bible and other places, and they used to say, "He who lives by the sword dies by the sword," and somebody said once, "Turn the other cheek." And what

these people were actually saying was fighting force with force does not bring about anything like a perfect duplicate. Only they maybe didn't know they were saying that. Using force to fight force brings about an unreality. But, oddly enough, using force to build force brings about a reality.

Isness is a continuous alteration; a continuous alteration gives us an isness. A not-isness (saying it doesn't exist) gives us an unreality. So there we have *reality* and *unreality* defined.

Now, how could you use this principle of reality in auditing? Do you know reality is basically an agreement? A mechanical agreement is for two forms to be exactly similar; one's a copy of the other form. That's mimicry. And we learn by mimicry.

If you go in and find a psychotic prancing up and down a sanitarium room and you simply start prancing up and down the sanitarium room exactly like he's doing, do you know that he'll stop and talk to you?

Well, maybe he hasn't talked to anybody for ages, but certainly, he now has an agreed-upon reality. And having agreed upon reality, he can get into communication with it. In other words, mimicry is the lowest level of entrance of a case and is a very good thing for an auditor to know.

Now, what we know then as reality is the agreed-upon apparency of existence. All right.

Now, let's take up number 27: *An actuality can exist for one individually, but when it is agreed with by others it can be said to be a reality.*

And let's find out that those things which have become solid to us, which have become very fixed to us, must have been agreed upon by others.

And we get something very interesting there. The anatomy of reality is contained in isness, which is composed of as-isness and alter-isness. An isness is an apparency, not an actuality. The actuality is as-isness altered so as to obtain a persistency.

Well, this agreement is part of the as-isness of this whole universe. If you ask somebody "Give me some things that you wouldn't mind agreeing with," "Give me something that you could do that other people would agree with," and so on, we'll notice some change in the case. Why? We're changing his level of agreement.

He is actually bound by certain considerations. And until he postulates otherwise, he will continue with that agreement. This is how we fix somebody into something.

The whole of existence, actually, is run very much like an hypnotic trance.

How do you hypnotize somebody? Well, you get them to agree with you. And then you get them to agree with you a little bit more. Oh, most people think that it's done by watches or something or other. It's not done that way. It's done in a very interesting way.

I don't know much about Western hypnotism. I myself studied hypnotism in the East, and when I came over to America again, I wondered what on earth this strange practice was that these people were practicing and calling hypnotism. Because it wasn't even vaguely what

is taught in the East to induce trances. It's quite remarkable that hypnotism is inducible on small or large groups.

Now, the worse off a group is, which is to say, the less communication they have, actually, the more communication can be forced upon them. And you can get a form of hypnotism there. But the interesting thing is that they must have been prepared by an enormous number of agreements before they got into that state. In other words, somebody else prepared them, so they didn't care *who* they agreed with after a while.

Anybody in a uniform walks up to a soldier, if that uniform has a higher rank on, the soldier will obey them. Well, this is a form of hypnotism.

Now, you can take an audience and simply get them to agree with you. And you get them to agree more and more and more and more and more, and the next thing you know... And, by the way, when I say "agree with you," I mean you could get them to agree first that you were simply standing there.

And then the next thing that you could get them to agree to is the fact that they were listening to you. And then you would give them a few little things on which they would agree with. And the next thing you know, you could tell them that the world was on fire and the audience would rush out to find out. Or maybe they'd just sit there and burn. It's quite interesting. But you could move it out that way.

Now, what is this all about? Does that mean that anybody bringing about an agreement would bring about hypnotism? Oh, no. The reason why in Scientology we do not bring about an hypnotism, even by Opening Procedure by Duplication – every Case V that's had this run on him claims it's a way to induce trance – but every single one of the tenets of Scientology could be reversed and, with a bad intention and so forth, could be worked out in the opposite direction.

We are undoing the agreements which people have been making for seventy-six trillion years. Only we're undoing them, so this makes them freer and freer and freer.

Now, show you this fellow on the stage who simply gets the audience to agree and agree and agree and agree and then tells them the place is on fire. Oh? He isn't really going in the direction of making them freer, is he? His intention for this is entirely different.

It isn't that an intention is above agreement. It's that consideration is always above agreement. He is trying to work them into a situation where they will accept what he says without question. We're not interested, in Scientology, in anybody accepting what we say without question. We ask them to question it; we ask them to please look at the physical universe around you; please look at people, at your own mind, and understand thereby that what we are talking about happens to be actual. This *is* the series of agreements. These *are*. They aren't just fancy ideas.

Now, I could get people to agree with me about a lot of things. And every once in a while I could throw them a curve. I could quite imperceptibly introduce a false idea into the science and maybe somebody less scrupulous might do this. But over a period of four years, you can trace back and you'll find out the only arbitraries I've introduced into the science that are completely false are "the psychiatrists are no good" and "the psychologists are stupid."

And of course those are completely false. I mean, the fact that psychiatry kills two thousand people a year with electric shock machines of course means that they're bettering the community, and they're doing what they should do and they're humanitarian. And they're not out for money.

But introducing ideas like this, I would be apt to get more agreement from people than otherwise. But what I am giving you is not counter-thought. If you just kept, you know, fighting the concepts that I gave you all the way up the line, you would just be re-agreeing all over the place. What we're doing here is laying out the map of what has happened in seventy-six trillion years, and your agreements have finally mounted up to a point where you believe this is – this universe is all here and what you're agreeing to, fortunately, are the very things which you agreed to.

We aren't giving you new things. We're giving you *old* things. And by understanding these old things which we have rediscovered, why, you become free.

Well now, what is this feeling of unreality that people get, this unconsciousness and upset condition of forgetfulness, and so forth? Well, actually, forgetfulness and so on stems from an effort to make things disappear by pressing against them with energy. We push against a thought – if you can imagine this – and if we push against it hard enough and then say it isn't there while it's still there, why, we will become forgetful, believe me. And if we push hard enough, we will become unconscious.

But remember, we had to postulate that we could forget and we had to postulate that we could become unconscious before either of these things could happen.

You know, people roll around waiting to go to sleep? Then they say, "I am *going* to go to sleep." Well, inspect R2-40 and you'll understand why the proper thing to do is to simply say "I am asleep."

"Well," they say, "that's a lie!"

No. No, it isn't a lie unless you considered that you were awake. Now, if you said, "I am awake and now I am going to sleep," why, of course, you wouldn't go to sleep. Or you might – if you could induce a self-trance you could.

But the point I am trying to make is that you can make at any moment a prime postulate. Well, more about that later.

Well, now you've had considerable about communication. Oh my, the communication... and the formula of communication and duplication and so on in Scientology that we have covered is *very* great. But let's read again this formula on communication:

Communication is the consideration and action of impelling an impulse or particle from source-point across a distance to receipt-point, with the intention of bringing into being at the receipt-point a duplication of that which emanated from the source-point.

Now, understand, we are using this word *duplicate* as copy. And we have a *perfect duplicate*, which means as-is. Now, that's the way we're using it today. When we say *duplicate* we merely mean a copy. We say *copy*, *facsimile*, *duplicate*, we mean pretty much the same thing. And when we're saying *perfect duplicate*, we mean as-is, and we mean the object

in its place, in its time, with its own energy. But a duplicate, that is another piece of energy in another space and so forth, but it's a copy.

So we send a telegram from New York City and it says "I love you," and it arrives in San Francisco and it says "I loathe you." Something has happened there, that we don't get a perfect duplicate.

Well, the more mechanical an individual gets, the less he can make a perfect duplication, and so he can't as-is. And he falls even off to a point of where he can't make an exact copy.

So you say, "Go around the corner and tell Betty I love her." And he goes around the corner and says, "Joe said to tell you he loathes you." And he's perfectly happy doing this.

We get a line of soldiers and we whisper a message, "H-hour is at ten o'clock." Now, you're supposed to whisper that to the next soldier. And when it goes through a dozen soldiers this way, we find out at the other end "We had beans for supper" is the message which they claim was put on the lines.

This is an inability to make copies. And this is the most disruptive thing and the most significant thing about communication. The formula of communication, for your own use and so forth, is simply cause, distance, effect, with a good copy at effect of that which was at cause. That's all you really need to know about communication.

All right. There's much more to that in the manual, and you will understand much more about communication.

Now, 29 is another Axiom about as-iness and persistence. And it tells you why people have to mock up another creator, and so forth, than themselves for their own creations. In order to get a persistence, they have to assign another authorship to the creation, and so on. They have to say it's other-responsibility. That's so that when they look at it they won't make an as-is of it. You see, if they'd have said that "I made it and now I look at it," why, that would be very bad. But if they said – if they created something and then they said, "Bill made it," then when they look at it, why, they say, "Bill made it." But that's a lie. So we get persistence stemming out of a second postulate, a lie. They made it, then they said somebody else made it. And so we get persistency stemming out from any lie.

Now we get number 30: *The general rule of auditing is that anything which is unwanted and yet persists must be thoroughly viewed, at which time it will vanish.* And we know that, of course, in the line of duplicates – perfect duplicates.

Now 31: *Goodness and badness, beautifulness and ugliness are alike considerations and have no other basis than opinion.*

And 32: *Anything which is not directly observed tends to persist.* In other words, if you don't as-is it, and you've already said it's going to be there, why, naturally it will be there.

But this is worse than that. You get somebody working at his work and he's never paying any attention to the machine, he's always paying some attention to the work, we'll find he has facsimiles of the machine just all stacked up like mad. He's never as-ised the machine.

We get somebody who has always looked at lighted objects in dark rooms, has never looked at the darkness, he will eventually see nothing but darkness when he closes his eyes. He'll have a black bank, in other words.

Thirty-three: *Any as-isness which is altered by not-isness tends to persist.* In other words, if we use force on something, we will get a persistence.

Now we're going to go into something which is tremendously interesting, because it is the proof of the fact that we have reached an ultimate truth and an ultimate solution. And that ultimate truth, and so on, is itself very, very important to an auditor. Because that tells you whether or not Scientology is a total subject.

I used to show you a circle and showed you just before you got to the top point of the circle, all data was known. When you got to the top point of the circle, no data was known. And then you had to start out with a new data again.

You went around the circle and up to the point where all data was known. Then you came up to the top again, and then you got no data known, and one datum known.

You see that? It was a circle. Everything known and nothing known were adjacent. Well, we've reached that point in Scientology. That's because all truth is a static and the ultimate solution is a static. Naturally, the solution to a problem is the as-isness of the problem. By solution to the problem, we mean: What will cause this problem to dissipate and disappear?

Well, the as-isness of the problem will cause it to dissipate and disappear. So therefore we have reached the solution of all problems; we've also reached an ultimate truth.

Now, let's go into this ultimate truth just a little bit. The remainder of the Axioms are devoted to this. I'm just going to take it up with a very fast explanation, rather than go into the remainder of these Axioms, because you have them, after all, in your *Handbook*.

It was entered like this: *Stupidity is the unknownness of consideration* – suddenly realized that. The stupidity, that's the unknownness of the consideration: you don't know what he was thinking about; you don't know what he was talking about; you don't know what it meant. Well, that means it's the unknown-ness of consideration.

Well, mechanically, the mechanical definition of *stupidity* is the unknown-ness of time, place, form and event. See? A fellow is really stupid. He knows something happened, but he doesn't know what happened, he can't add it up, he can't do anything with it.

All right. Now we say: *Truth is the exact consideration.* That's the consideration. Now, mechanically, truth is the exact time, place, form and event. Ah-ha! Truth is the exact time, place, form and event.

Well, wait a minute. We say truth is the exact consideration. Well, all right, it's the exact consideration. The truth of the fellow saying, "I am a man," the truth is "I am a man." That's the first postulate.

Now he says, "I am a man," so he's a man. That's the exact consideration. He cannot tell a lie until he has said, "I am a man," and then he has masked or hidden the fact that he is a man and he says, "I am a woman."

Now, the odd part of it is that he made a truth when he made the first postulate. And that which denied that truth then persisted. The second postulate always persists. I give you R2-40. The dissertation in R2-40 in the *Handbook* makes this much clearer. But just look at that. The second postulate persists, not the first one.

The second postulate introduces time. Now, *persists* is time, that's all. Mortality, immortality – this is a matter of time. It's also a matter of identity, but it's basically a matter of time. That which is persisting means that which is "timing." And if you have assumed that after you made a postulate, you then had something which permitted you to make another postulate, you'd have to postulate time there, wouldn't you?

Ah, it's quite interesting. So that's your second postulate, then, introduces time. Merely because it's the second postulate, you had to introduce time. See, there is no time in the static natively. Time is just a consideration. All right, so you introduce time, you get a lie.

This is mechanical, by the way; this is the way it works. You make a second postulate in front of the first postulate, it's the second postulate which persists. But it derives its strength from the first postulate.

There is a large dissertation on this in R2-40, and I give you that for your consideration. But the way we entered into the solution of the subject of Scientology and life was this – again, I give you this: *Stupidity is the unknownness of consideration*.

Well, then truth is the knownness of the consideration, isn't it? Well, right back there we have that perfect duplicate; right back on the line, we found out that when you got the as-ness of anything, if you made a perfect duplicate of it, it would disappear, wouldn't it?

So, truth is a perfect duplicate. But that's a disappearance! Well, if that's a disappearance, then all you've got left is the static. So truth is a static. And it follows through just as clearly as that. It's a mechanical proof. It's as mechanical as any kind of proof you wanted, in any field of mathematics – it's totally mechanical.

Now, again: *A problem is a solution only when you get the as-ness of the problem*. That right? A problem is a solution when you get the as-ness of the problem. Therefore, what have we got left? We got the as-ness of the problem; we have nothing left.

Oh-oh, but we don't have nothing. We have a static.

So, we find out that the ultimate truth is also the basic truth, contains no time, no motion, no mass, no wavelength. And we find the ultimate solution contains no time, no mass, no wavelength. Very interesting, isn't it?

Very, very fascinating. So we've come back to something which is not an imponderable. *Does* and *can* one of these statics exist? Yes. That, too, we can subject to proof. And we could subject it to proof immediately, instantly and easily. Nothing to it.

You just ask somebody who's not in too bad a condition to "be three feet back of your head." You can ask him to be anywhere, to appear anywhere in the universe, and he can. You ask him to manufacture space and energy, and he can.

In other words, you can inspect, actually, whether or not this is taking place and you will find out that it is taking place. And you will find out that man is basically a static. So he doesn't move, he appears.

Now, therefore, we have this thing called the static, we have this thing called the perfect duplicate, the as-isness, so therefore we have this thing called an ultimate truth and we have an ultimate solution.

Now, I say in Scientology that we have wrapped it up. There are a great many strong points on the track where there's a lot of data hidden in chaoses and confusions and that sort of thing which we've bypassed, a lot of things which we haven't described adequately. For instance, I am not even satisfied at this moment completely with affinity and our description of affinity. But I can tell you this: that they are bypassed points.

The other evening at two o'clock in the morning I suddenly found myself out at the edge of a cliff, looking at end-of-track. It is end-of-track. That's right – there was no more road. There isn't any more road out there, that's all, because we've come back to the static.

And we find out what this static is, we can demonstrate its existence, we can demonstrate what it does, we can prove it and we can all agree upon that proof. And we can do wonderful and miraculous things with it.

The forty processes contained in the *Auditor's Handbook* can do those things, just like that.

Now, if you can do the first few of those processes well, certainly up to process 20, you will be doing *very, very* well. If you understand this whole subject, why, come down to Phoenix and I will give you a D. Scn. But if you could pass the CECS with great ease, without any further training, we would be very surprised people – very, very surprised people.

Okay.

Axioms-Part IV

A lecture given on 20 August 1954

Now I want to talk to you a little bit more about the Axioms and to take up particularly this matter of truth and its use in auditing.

You see, any problem of any character is the basic business of the Scientologist. So therefore, if he wants to know about solutions, you had certainly better give him the solution of problems. And that, of course, would be a basic and ultimate truth.

Well, if we could describe a basic and ultimate truth and describe it exactly, why, we have no problem at all in solving problems.

All right. Now, let's go over this again. We see that failure to discover truth brings about stupidity. Person begins to believe he's stupid if he can't as-is truth. All right.

Now, we see that the discovery of truth would bring about an as-isness by actual experiment, and thus we see that an ultimate truth would have no time, place or form. In other words, it would just – whatever we had there would simply disappear if we discovered an ultimate truth. So the ultimate truth is a perfect duplicate and therefore the ultimate is a static. And the operation to achieve a static would be a perfect duplicate.

Now, we see very much, then, that lying as we understand it is an alteration of time, place, event or form. And that is a lie. And only lies persist.

We have to have a basic postulate and then another postulate before we get time; have to have two postulates to have time. We can't have time with one postulate unless it is the postulate that there *will* be time. That could be one postulate. But normally in operation we find that two postulates are necessary to achieve time.

Well now, which one of these postulates is going to persist if the two postulates deny each other? The second one is going to persist because it is the *time* postulate. It said there was a second postulate, so therefore we have time taking place.

So lying becomes an alter-isness and becomes stupidity. In other words, we don't discover where the thing is, we don't discover exactly how it was, so we can't unmock it, so there we are. And the only thing that we can do with it, possibly, is to not-is it or alter it some more or stir it around or do what a Black Five does with it: just stirs it around and hopes it'll disappear and so forth. He doesn't as-is it and so it doesn't disappear.

Well now, the funny part of it is that lying will develop into a stupidity. It also develops into a mystery and it also develops into this blackness which individuals are so upset about. And it's just an alteration of time, place, event or form, after the fact of its having been created.

This is a mechanical lie and, by the way, does not lead to blackness. It would be two kinds of lies here.

Mechanical lie: We mock up some space and we put an object in that space, and then we move it. Well, the moment we've moved it, we've lied about it. We've said, "It's over there," where as a matter of fact, it was created in location one.

Now, in view of the fact that there's only consideration, this of course would bring about a lie. But, really, it doesn't disappear, it doesn't do anything peculiar simply by moving it around. We say it's in another location, and that of course gives us a mechanical lie. So that the mere handling of energy does not bring about a lie. It takes another consideration than simply moving something to bring about an occlusion.

All right. Now, anything which persists must avoid as-isness, and thus anything to persist, really to persist, must contain a lie.

Now we get Axiom 39: *Life poses problems for its own solution.* Ah-ha! Life poses problems for its own solution.

Now, what do we find here in a problem? We find something which is persisting, the as-isness of which cannot be attained. And that would be the definition of a problem: Something which is persisting, the as-isness of which cannot be attained (easily be attained, that is), and that would be a problem.

Now, to solve that problem, it would be necessary to get its as-isness. Well, how do we prevent, then, something from being as-ised – in other words, vanished? We introduce a lie into it. So all problems contain a lie.

Any problem to be a problem must contain a lie. If it were truth, it would unmock, and that's Axiom 40.

So we get that any problem to be a problem has to contain a lie. So, actually, when you're studying the preclear's bank and you're trying to process a preclear, and yet preclear is being a problem, we know very well that there's a lie someplace on the track that he's trying to obtain the as-isness of. It's not necessarily his lie, but it certainly *is* a lie.

An "unsolvable problem" would have the greatest persistence. It would also contain the greatest number of altered facts; and to make a problem one must introduce alter-isness. In other words, this problem must have been moved and shifted and shoved around considerably to be unsolvable.

Now Axiom 41: *That which alter-isness is introduced into becomes a problem.*

Anytime you alter something, you've got a problem on your hands. Thus, this whole universe, then, is a problem. And, also, this whole universe must contain a lie to go on persisting the way it does. Well, believe me, it contains enough alter-isms, so it certainly does contain a lie. It also contains a variety of lies about its creation and all that sort of thing. I mean, there's a lot of things about this universe that make it persist. And all of those things boil down to one fact: that it must be based upon a lie and it must be very definitely altered.

Now, Axiom 41 tells us that it was alteration which brought the preclear into being a problem. Thus, we find any child that has been moved extensively, who has had its home

changed, who has been shoved around to various parts of the world, eventually becomes a problem, first to environment, and then to himself. Naturally. He's just been altered in space a lot, so he becomes a problem.

Now we discover in 42 that *matter, energy, space and time – MEST*, in other words – *persists because it is a problem*. And your physicist is busily at work trying to unmock this, but he's unmocking it by not-issness: he's using force to alter force. Because he keeps altering it, it naturally will get worse and worse.

Now, he will solve nothing with an atom bomb. He will simply make things worse, more complicated, more confused and more dispersed.

The atom bomb is a dead-end track and is folly. It is great folly. It would merely add more confusion.

If an atom bomb were introduced into a war, by the number of particles and the amount of mest which would be altered, we would discover immediately that it would have introduced a great number of lies into the situation. It would have deteriorated the society and everything else.

If we were foolish enough, for instance, to atom-bomb Russia or if Russia were foolish enough to atom-bomb the U.S., enough confusion would have been introduced into the cultures of earth so that probably there would be no other choice but to sink into a barbarism. In the absence of an understanding of life itself, this is exactly what would have happened.

Now we get here number 43: *Time is the primary source of untruth. Time states the untruth of consecutive considerations.*

And I call your attention very definitely to interest as an interesting thing to observe.

Now, there are two classes of interest. And we want to know why we're thinking about this in terms of time. It's because time is the basic lie behind all lies; that is to say, that you have consecutive moments. We believe they're consecutive moments; we see consecutive motions, and so forth. And this is all very pleasant and we agree to this. It's only when we have masked them with some vicious intent that we really get a kickback from the progress of time.

But we discover here in the matter of interest that we have two facets: one is interested and the other is *interesting*.

Now, a thetan is *interested* and an object is *interesting*. A thetan is not *interesting*, he is *interested*. And when a person becomes terribly interesting, he has lots of problems, believe me. There are lots of problems whenever somebody becomes interesting.

So that is the chasm which is crossed by all of your celebrities, anybody who is foolish enough to become famous. He crosses over from being interested in life to being interesting. And people who are interesting are really no longer interested in life.

It's very baffling to some young fellow why he can't make some beautiful girl interested in him. Well, she's not *interested*, she is *interesting*. And so, of course, she can't be *interested*.

Now, let's take Axiom 44 and see how all this adds up here in processing: *Theta, the static, has no location in matter, energy, space or time but is capable of consideration.* Now, we've already had that, but we put it in there again just to drive it home in this regard: hasn't any time. There's no time in this static. Time is a lie. But time can be postulated by the static, but is only a consideration, and thereafter a static gets the idea – a *thetan* gets the idea that he is persisting across a span of time. And he's not. He's not persisting.

Objects are going across time, and energies and spaces are changing and so forth, but he isn't. At no time does he ever change. He has to consider he's in a head before you can put him out of one. He has to consider he is out of his head before he can *be* out of his head.

A Step V is quite interesting. He's always thinking that the auditor is going to reach in and pull him out of his head. You know, he's waiting for something else to do it. How could anything else do it? Nothing else could do it. Nothing under the sun could do it.

Of course, you could probably hypnotize him and tell him that he was, and he'd probably react in various ways, but he has to say, "I am now out of my head," and he will be out of his head. But if he waits to see whether or not he's out of his head or not, why, it becomes complete nonsense.

The only way that he can get anything done is to consider that it is done or consider that that is the condition which exists.

All right. Number 45: *Theta can consider itself to be placed, at which moment it becomes placed, and to that degree a problem.*

Ah! Any time we fall away from Axiom 1, which is repeated as Axiom 44, we discover that we have less of a static than before.

In other words, we just place this static, and it's less of a static than it was before. Fascinating, isn't it? But a *thetan*, then, can have a problem just by being placed and, quite in addition to that, he ceases to be quite as interested.

Now he himself, for instance, placing himself, can get away with this – this isn't very hard for him to do – and he can perceive from this new place and so forth. But as long as he is placed, he will be less than a static. Just remember that.

Now, it is to that degree a problem. To the degree that it has time in it, it's a problem.

Now 46: *Theta can become a problem by its considerations, but then becomes mest.* What is this *mest*? What is it? Let's look at that *very* closely, and let's find that an interested *thetan* is a *thetan*, but an interesting – *thetan* has become *mest*. What is *mest*?

Well, it's actually simply a composite of energies and particles which are – and spaces – which are agreed upon and which are looked at.

Now, we have the difference between inflow and outflow. A *thetan* who is being interesting- – pardon me, is interested, he's outflowing: interested, outflowing; interesting, inflowing. See, he wants the attention of others to flow to him. Interesting. That's *mest*. Attention of others flow to it. That doesn't tell you that all *mest* is a series of trapped *thetans*. It says that it is a type of life which is being interesting as opposed to something which is being interested in *it*.

Now number 46: *Theta can become a problem by its considerations, but then becomes mest* is followed by this: *that mest is a problem and will always be considered a problem and is nothing else but a problem.*

mest is that form of theta which is a problem. That's all. Therefore, it's that form of theta which has a lie introduced into it. And so, of course, it's a problem.

Now number 47: *Theta can resolve problems.*

And 48: *Life is a game wherein theta as the static solves the problems of theta as mest.*

Now, that means that theta *is* the static, and theta *is* the object. Yes indeed, it can be both ways. Just depends on which one is being interested and which one is being interesting-. And we find then that a preclear gets more and more solid and more and more solid the more interesting he becomes. And the more problem he becomes, and the more problems he has and the more figuring he does on these problems, of course, the more solid he is going to get.

Now 49: *To solve any problem, it is only necessary to become theta the solver rather than theta the problem.*

Now, believe me, that's a very, very important Axiom. That tells you why SOP 8-C Opening Procedure works. The main form of theta which *we* find desirable, which has mobility, which has freedom, which is happy, which is cheerful, which has all those points on the top of the Chart of Attitudes, and so forth, is an *observer* of problems and a *solver* of problems.

So if you get somebody simply to look around the environment, he will cease to be a problem and become the solver of problems. That's all.

Get him to look around and recognize a few problems, and hell feel better. You get somebody working, then, who is worrying about himself – worry-worry-worry-worry-worry-worry-worry – well, he's all mixed up in a problem; he's right next door to a problem; his affinity is a closure with this problem. He's having an awful time. He's all bedded down and so forth.

Well, let's take this and turn it around the other way and let's have him observe himself as a problem. And we get that part of the process which is problems and solutions. And, naturally, if we ask a thetan to be a solution often enough, he would eventually become a static. That's all.

If we ask him to observe problems long enough, he would simply become a static. In other words, he would go out of it both ways.

A theta could become a problem, more of a problem, more of a problem, more of a problem, more, more, more, more, more and more and more – static. See, he could go out the bottom. Or he could say less of a problem, less of a problem, less, less, less, less, less – static. You see, he could go either ways. So there's no hope for you. You're going to survive anyway and so are your preclears. But we're going to have a better world doing it.

Now number 50: *Theta as mest must contain considerations which are lies.* In other words, there isn't a single piece of mest in the world which isn't to some degree or another lying.

All right. Now, let's look at that then and find, then, the only crime that you could possibly commit is being there. I don't care where. This is the only crime that you could commit. And this is all your parents objected to, and this is all your preclear's parents objected to, and this is all a preclear objects to when you're auditing him and he growls at you. They add tremendous significances into this, but all they object to is being there.

Now, if you run SOP 8-C Opening Procedure, and you run it very definitely with that postulate, "Get the fact that the wall is there," "Get the fact that the chair is there," "that something else is there," you're liable to knock your preclear practically flat. I'm not advising you to use this as part of Opening Procedure. It's a *violent* process.

Now, you get almost any preclear and just have him stand up in the middle of the room and just say, "Get the idea to that empty space out in front of you there, that it's there."

"It's there. It's there."

My goodness, his mother will show up, and eight or nine of his wives, and all sorts of things will show up all the way down the line. He'll have all kinds of people standing in front of him. They're all *there*, you see? But that's the only crime that theta can commit. That's a lie.

You see, that theta can be there is a lie. And that's the only bad thing that anybody has ever done is be *there*. Now, that's all, actually, that the GE is doing. He stands there. He's visible, he is being there. And we must have introduced a lie. The basic lie which is introduced is time.

Now, it's interesting to note that it's the second postulate which persists, *because persist* means time, and it's the second postulate which introduces time, so this becomes elementary.

Let's look at this one: let's find this fellow who's awfully sick. Oh, he's terribly sick! Boy, is he a problem!

Oh, he's a problem to himself and a problem to his family and a problem to his auditor. Oh, he's a problem! He's terrific. Do you know that he must have had an original postulate that he was well before he could make a second postulate that he was sick? And do you know that the postulate that he was sick must have denied the postulate that he was well? And so his original sickness was a falsity, and he knew it at the time he made it, darned well.

He knew when he said he was sick that day to keep from going to school, he knew it that it was a lie. He knew it was a lie and he got a persistence of the sickness. And now here he is eighty-nine years of age and all crippled up, and we find out that the basic postulate was the fact that he was well, however.

Now, how could sickness ever get any power except through wellness? Now, we look underneath every lie to find out that it was the truth, the static itself, which gave it power.

The lie has no power because it is a perversion; persistence has no power that is not based upon the static itself.

So, we have the basic lineup at all times and in all places that the lie is empowered by truth. Truth must have existed. And a good condition or quality must have existed prior to a bad condition or quality, and vice versa.

If a good condition is existing, very possibly the basic postulate was a lie – pardon me, a bad condition – the basic postulate was a bad condition.

All right. As we study the problem of goodness and badness in the world, we find out that we must be studying the second postulate because it is all that persists. If we have a situation which is very, very good, it probably was based upon a primary postulate which was bad.

But do you know that you can't make a prime postulate which is a lie? If you'll just get the idea that there are no postulates, that you've made no postulates of any kind, that there are no postulates which have been made – now make a postulate.

Now, can that postulate be a lie? Can that postulate be a lie? If you wiped out all postulates, you just said "They don't exist," but you just laid them aside; you didn't even postulate them out of existence. Now you've made a prime postulate. That can't be a lie.

All right. Now make a second postulate denying the one which you just made. That's a lie. Now, which one of these two is going to persist? The second one. And where is it going to get its power? From the first one.

So we're trying to cure somebody who has been jilted. We're trying to cure him, and we would then have to get him to postulate that he was in love. And this young man rushes in and he is all ecstatic and his head is going around in circles because of this gorgeous, gorgeous creature that he's just fallen in love with. And so he's going to hock his father in order to take her out. Just what would we process on him to save Father? What would we process?

We would process his dislike of women. You see, it doesn't matter what the prime postulate is. We're not going on the basis of badness or goodness – a consideration is a consideration.

The first consideration, the prime consideration as we call it, cannot be a lie until it is denied or masked or changed by a second consideration while still existing. So, you've got your second consideration there which is the persisting one, and it's deriving its power from the first one.

This fellow says, "I'm never going to fall in love. I'm never going to fall in love. I'm never, never, never going to fall in love – ever." And then he falls in love. Well, he gets it real bad and this persists for a long time. And to audit it out, as I said, we would have to get him to postulate that he was in love.

Now, do we mean reach back on the track and find out where we were going to get that? You know, I mean, reach back and straightwire it out? No, because there is no time. And all address to the past, every address to the past and every address to the future, actually, is validating a lie.

There's only now, there has never been anything else but now. But there's a consistent change and a consistent series of postulates going on which gives a continuance of now. But the continuance of now is a lie. Of course, it's not very bad. You can move objects around, and that's quite honest. I mean, compared to a cross-contradiction (two kinds of lies there).

And we discover that when we are trying to make a condition change, that we simply have to postulate, as though it exists in present time, the opposite condition. And we go on postulating it and postulating it and postulating it, and it will take place.

But what happens as we postulate it? Why does a preclear get sick when he is sick, and says, "I am well, I am well, I am well, I am well"? Because he's already running on the postulate that he's sick, of course. But much more important than that, he is sliding into the second postulate. He's making the first postulate that he's well, and sliding into the second postulate and it restimulates him.

All he's got to do, though, is this a few times, and he will slide out of being sick. He has to do it a few times because he's got to undo the duration or get the time postulate out. In other words, he's got to create time with a postulate, the basic postulate, in order to recover from the second postulate.

If anyone is being continuously sick, then, he is being continuously sick because he gave a counter-postulate to being well. Therefore, we have him postulate "I am well, I am well, I am well, I am well." And we just don't get him to say that, we get him to *feel well*, you know? "Get the idea of being well," we'd say to him. "Get the idea of be..." Believe me, he's going to get a lot sicker before he gets well, because he keeps sliding into the second postulate.

Now, we in Scientology go out and we tell the world, "Now look, be healthy. Be strong. Be bright. You can be exteriorized," and so forth. And they listen to us. And for a moment they listen, and the next instant they feel kind of sick.

You see, they're sliding into the second postulate. So we give them the first postulate, they go into the second postulate. If we just told them that enough times and often enough and hard enough, they would slide *permanently* through the second postulate and wipe it out and they would be well.

All we'd do is have to keep telling them they're well. We would accomplish it that way. We'd make them run it out themselves. And so this is, actually, a very superior therapy. This is R2-40 in your processing, immediately derived from these various Axioms.

Wherever we have in Scientology a condition existing, then, it must be deriving its power from a prior postulate of an opposite nature. In order to get a persistence or continuance, we must have had a denying postulate.

So we get somebody who hates the human race, he must have loved them desperately by postulate. You see?

We get two brothers. There's a proof of this, by the way: there's no hatred as that which can exist between two brothers or a nation torn asunder in war. Well, that's because they loved each other so well, you see? And so they can hate with violence! But what is their hatred depending on? Their hatred is depending on the fact they loved each other.

So if we have somebody hating madly, let's say he's hating somebody named Bill, we would say, "Now, get the idea of loving Bill."

"Rrrrrrr!" he'd go.

"Now get the idea of loving Bill."

"Rrrrrrrr."

"Get the idea of loving Bill."

"Rrrrrr."

"Get the idea of loving Bill."

"Rrrr."

"Get the idea of loving Bill."

"Well, he's not too bad a guy..."

"Get the idea of loving Bill." "Get the idea of loving Bill." We wouldn't necessarily restore love for Bill, but we'd certainly run out the hatred for Bill – *not* because we're running it off the track!

Now, let's get out of our minds right here and now the idea that we *ever* run anything off the track. We never do.

We're running it in present time, we will never run it otherwise than in present time, and although we can address the track, we are actually validating time. And the more we validate time, the sicker our preclear is going to be.

Okay.

Two-Way Comm And The Present Time Problem

26 July 1954

7ACC-31A, PRO-17*

I want to talk to you about Step I of Intensive Procedure, two-way communication.

Although you discover in the examination of existence that consideration is senior to all other things, you have in any preclear who is living in the physical universe who is still associating with a body, an enforced mechanics. In other words, mechanics of existence are enforced upon him consistently and continually. Therefore mechanics are much more important to this individual than considerations.

He goes on an inversion. He first is found considering, only he's not really considering. He's not making a postulate and having something come true, he's trying to figure out who's to blame. That's one of the main things he's trying to figure out. He's trying to figure out when that ridge in front of his face is going to go away. He's waiting until the auditor does something spectacular.

He's doing a lot of things, but first and foremost he is contactable in the field of mechanics, not in the field of considerations. Considerations are prior to mechanics. This is obvious. But your preclear has gotten to a point where he is inverted on the subject and by his day to day living he is closer into contact with mechanics than he is considerations and yet there he is, considering.

Well, he's never going to recover from anything considering. He might figure his way out of the trap, he might think his way out of it, but as long as we approach the problem as really a purely mechanical problem of a set of convictions rather than considerations, we'll be successful with the preclear.

And the first and foremost of those is that, of his convictions, is that it is very aberrative to communicate. This he's certain of. Now, he may have lots of other certainties but that one he's actually very certain of and we discover that the only thing that is punishable in this universe is communication. Non-communication is not punishable.

We discover that the inanimate object is not guilty, it was the animate object which was guilty. We discover that the driver who was going faster than the other driver was always to blame. This by the way is not even vaguely true. That's just the way people look at things

* Editor's note: This transcript was transcribed from the "modern" version recorded by Golden Era Productions. As these have time and again been proven to have cut out paragraphs and other alterations, it should be replaced one day by a transcript of the original recording.

to keep them turned around so that they don't have to take responsibility and make everything disappear.

So we discover as we look over this problem that our preclear is certain that if he communicates he will be punished. He has communicated in the past, he tried to talk to people and like the greatest contribution of psychiatry, for instance the prefrontal lobotomy. I don't know why they don't go down to the butcher shop and set up a business there in earnest instead of hiding behind a medical license. But it would do just as much good to cut up some calves' brains lying in the butcher's counter window as it would be to cut up some psycho's brains.

Now psychiatry knows this, they know it very well, they have never made anybody well with prefrontal lobotomies or transorbital leukotomies. And yet they go on doing it because the psychotic's condition is desperate, you see, they of course have to be desperate in treating it. They've never won, they have nothing but solid failures behind them. That is not a condemnation, that is just another truth of the matter. Alright.

They operated on a fellow one day at a well-known sanitarium and this fellow had a large chunk of his brain sawed out and he was put on display as an object which had... By the way, the only reason they do a prefrontal lobotomy is because people can survive it. Anyway, they say so. The original case history on the thing, just as long as I've mentioned that subject I might give you a little data on it, the first and original case history of this and the only case history that's quoted in psychiatry is that an idiot blacksmith one day, a blacksmith's helper approached a forge and the forge exploded and a crowbar flew through the air and drove in at his right temple and came out at his left temple. And he survived this. You look in vain in that case history to discover whether anything happened to his idiocy. And we find that no change occurred with regarding his idiocy, but a part of his brain had been removed and he did survive and this is the sole authority, believe me this is the sole authority for doing prefrontal lobotomies.

Alright. They did a prefrontal lobotomy on this fellow and they put him on display and somebody asked him after he had been put on display if he had noticed any change in himself as a reason of the prefrontal lobotomy. And he looked very solemnly and somewhat covertly around and he said, „Yes. I've learned to keep my mouth shut.“

So, that is the basic lesson that anybody learns in this universe. They learn to keep their mouth shut, and it's the wrong lesson. When in doubt, talk. When in doubt, communicate. When in doubt, shoot. And you'll be very successful all the way along the line if you just remember that. There's no, there's no compromising with this. A thetan is as well off as he can communicate and he's no better off. And when a restraint comes upon his communication line, then he starts to wind up and finish up and that is the end of him.

So, our preclear sits there, and he knows that if he communicates he'll be punished. Anything he says will be used against him, they've told him so for many lives. Anything that he cares to bring up, he knows that the person he brings it up to is going to make fun of it, is going to dive on it and going to challenge him with it and so on. He's certain of this, and that if he happens to impart any immediate secret of his existence, he knows it will undoubtedly

be on the radio by four o'clock that afternoon. So, he will approach a session with considerable diffidence. He will not be sure what he should say.

I know one very, very bad psychotic for instance, that... all this psychotic; it's not that your preclears are psychotic, we've got no business processing psychotics, but it's just an extremity of human duress which can be used to illustrate some points because there's nothing worse. Alright. This person had this as a terrible obsession, it was just a fantastic obsession. They would not talk because they knew that if they said anything, the person they said it to would carefully store it up and wait for the right time to use it against them. And this was all this person would say. This person would utter that sentiment in one way or another.

It was a dramatization a hundred percent, but it lay straight across their communication line. This person was utterly insane, completely insane, I mean this person could not take care of the body or perform menial tasks or anything else. And yet this person'd just go over and over on that record. Just over and over on it. „Well, if I said anything then you would store it up and then you'd wait for the right time and then you'd use it against me,“ and then the person would clam up. And you'd try to get them in communication again, they go through this same routine.

Well let me assure you of something. A person doesn't have to be psychotic to have that basic manifestation in this universe. They're not even vaguely psychotic when they have it. They adjudicate their own sanity by knowing when to talk and when not to talk, and it starts to peel down to a point of where they know [speaks louder] when not to talk, you see, and [speaks softer] when to talk. And then they know [speaks much louder] WHEN NOT TO TALK, you see, and [speaks much softer] when to talk, and then silence. And that's the way the track goes.

So, don't for a moment suppose that Step I is included as just a handy way to start a session. It is not a handy way to start a session, it's processing. This person is accessible, ordinarily, your preclear, on the third dynamic. This is probably the last dynamic to fold up. They carry a social dynamic all the way through. Processing itself is a third dynamic situation and so is aberration. Third dynamic. It's the thetan plus the body that can bring about an aberrative state, it's the thetan plus the sixth dynamic, the universe, that causes the difficulty and so on.

Alright. We have then Step I as this first step simply because it is the most difficult step. It is the most arduous step and it is the step which the Asclepians, the goddess Febris – I had a talk with her the other day, she said she could never crack it either – that was Roman psychiatry and medicine. And the boys around the time in Germany when they started up the first idea that psychology could be approached on a, I mean the mind could be approached on a scientific basis. That was the original premise of psychology and a very, very good one, brought up by a fellow by the name of Wundt. And, there's nothing wrong with this, I mean it was a good hunch, never been followed by that particular field, but it was a good, a good way to start. Scientific methodology was not there and then immediately classified. And if he had sat down and classified scientific methodology at that moment, he would have been all right, but after that they did unregulated experiments, uncontrolled experiments, wild cat fuddling around, collecting enormous quantities of data, which data was supposed to amount to some-

thing one day. But that field was never able to do anything in the field of a two-way communication. Never knew the parts of communication, doesn't to this day. They, they're more and more the only one.

Not only is psychology the only one which belongs to nobody, but it's the only one in every university in the world where it is taught. That psychology department is the only psychology department. I mean it's heaped up this way further and further, an incredible thing. But these people are what? They've never solved communication so they don't go into communication. And the main thing they never solved is that Step I, communication.

Alright, we come on up to psycho-“anal”-ysis and we get into that field and we find out that they used various methods there, originally Breuer and Freud did, to produce a two-way communication. And then they went all out and they decided, gee, if they could just get somebody talking and they'd just talk, why, that's just fine. But the first approach to it was hypnosis and that is a very poor approach. Not only a very poor approach, it's a very inhibitive approach. If you've ever had anybody as a preclear that you've been running 8-D on, you will appreciate this. 8-D on the hypnotist, „Where would hypnotists be safe?“ You'd get some sort of an idea of the aberrative quality.

Alright. There we didn't actually solve a two-way communication. We got a system, a system by which somebody simply talked endlessly, and talked and talked and talked. And there was no communication from the analyst. I saw a cartoon one time and the, one analyst is all bright and cheerful and fresh and he had been so every afternoon at quitting time and the other analyst said, „My goodness, how can you be so bright and fresh sitting there all day long listening to those patients?“ The other analyst says, „Who listens?“

Well, they had it in reverse. You see, they had this idea that if they could just make the person outflow, outflow, outflow, outflow, outflow, this would solve it. It doesn't solve it. It's a two-way communication. So they just went all out in psychoanalysis and what success it had was just the fact that they did specialize in trying to get somebody into communication one way or the other. But, they again didn't have any anatomy of communication.

And we move on forward to various thoughts and philosophic endeavors and so on on this subject and we discover that an individual very rarely is found in a good state of communication when he sits down on the couch. And I don't care who this person is, they're just not in a good state of communication. They're either obsessively communicating or they're inhibited, they haven't got a good balance on this subject. And you take the most average preclear in the world, he'll give you ordinarily just social responses. You say, „How are you?“ he'll say, „I am fine.“

Forty-five minutes later, the oddity is, this person says to you, „I feel terrible.“ You got a social response, and then the preclear answered the question. This question is sometimes, if you'll notice it carefully, will come up as non-sequitur entirely. The person, forty-five minutes after you asked them how they were, they tell you how they are. And the gap is filled with a social response, it's just a trained response so you triggered a little machine. So that isn't a two-way communication with the preclear at all, is it? You're talking to a bunch of social machinery.

Well, you've done this all too often much longer than you should have, in plain social activities. You went around to ask somebody about a loan or ask him about something or other and you went on talking and this person went on talking and actually you were not talking to anybody. And some time or other you wake up with the great shock that you have just been arguing with somebody or been trying to make somebody be better or be nicer to you, or be kinder to their neighbors or something of the sort, and after a long dissertation on the subject and you think you've had a two-way communication with this person, they come up with some completely disrelated remark. Or, they simply don't pay any attention to what you were saying. Although they seem to have agreed with you, they seem to have said, „Yes, that's fine, I will be a better boy,“ or something of the sort, they just never, you just never reached an agreement, because the actual truth of the matter is, if you would've reached an agreement with them they would've been a better person. Do you see?

You weren't talking to anybody. Let's just put it there. You were talking to some social machinery. Well, that's just in the social world. How about an auditor? Should he be able to spot this? Well, he sure should. But he would never spot it if he didn't recognize that there was something very definitely there to spot. And that is, who's talking? Are you talking to the preclear? Or are we talking to an education from Harvard? Are we talking to the preclear or are we talking to Mama?

See, it's a nice thing to have a very, very high toned attitude toward preclears and so forth across the board, but there's one point there where the column reverses and that's where it's trust at the top, you know, and distrust at the bottom. Well, when you're working preclears you keep with all the top buttons of the Chart of Attitudes except that one, you just reverse that column, it goes right straight across, distrust is the top for an auditor as far as a preclear is concerned. It's a remarkable thing how many times you can actually crack a case up if you'll just simply say, „How are you doing that?“ or, „What are you doing? Who is talking? Did you do that? Who touched the wall? How did you do that? Where do you get the clues for what you say?“

Once in a while in a preclear's communication you'll find out there's a file clerk or something and he's taking every response he gives you as a flash answer from the file clerk. If he's been trained in Dianetics, he's liable to do this to the exclusion of any answer himself. Well, these are social responses and that is not a two-way communication, is it? It's not a two-way communication, that's a two-way communication between you and a circuit maybe, or between you and a machine, but it's not a two-way communication between you and the preclear. And it says specifically in Step I that we begin a two-way communication with the preclear.

Well, how many ways could there be to start a two-way communication with the preclear so that you could really get away with it and have a good two-way communication with the preclear? Well, one of the ways to do it is to talk about his problems. He's fairly interested in these and you get away from social responses. And he's there because he's being a problem so we get Step II as an assist to Step I.

Step II, Present Time Problem. But of course Step II is more important than that. You sometimes miss on a preclear by processing him when he's dog tired or he's emotionally up-

set or something very bad has just occurred and he wants to be processed so that he can run away from it or something and you don't ask him whether he has any present time problems, you will miss sometimes and have a whole session or maybe two or three sessions wasted.

I remember processing somebody who seemed to be rather frantic and they finally came up with this astonishing fact that they were all the time... the case was not making progress, you see, and I got very interested, and this person would not, just would not give me any clue. And I just kept pounding it and pounding it and talking about it, any upset the person had in his current life, you know, yesterday or today or something that's going to happen tomorrow. I just kept talking about it, you see, and saying, „Is anything that is occurring that I should know about?“ and so on, because the behavior of the case just simply said, „This case is so restive and so upset that they just don't seem to listen to my auditing orders and they seem to be distracted all the time by something, and certainly this person is either completely off his base or he's really a psycho or he has some very bedeviling present time problem.“

And finally the guy, the guy got the communication and gave me an answer. That processing session series was being very badly interrupted because he was being sued for divorce. He was being sued for divorce over the period I had been processing him. And he would leave there and go down and talk to lawyers and so forth and he wanted to keep this very secret. And he thought there was something very horrible about this happening and so he wouldn't even tell his auditor about it.

Now, you see? He's punished for communicating and we get right back to that. He doesn't impart the data about what's going on because he'd be punished for communicating. Now once in a while you'll run into somebody that medicine can do something for. They have an acute illness of some kind or another that they're so afraid of any possible treatment that would be offered to them medically because medical treatment is not particularly kind, that they avoid it completely. And you find out that you may be processing somebody for an ailment they have not told you about.

Well, it's all right for you in your position to treat anybody for any ailment under the sun because illnesses are subdivisible into three conditions. And that is predisposition, precipitation and in the final, prolongation, perpetuation. And you know, the fellow is upset nervously so he gets sick, that's where the bugs came in. And then he continues to be so upset nervously that he does not recover from those bugs. The three conditions there.

And so, by taking off some of the burden of existence, you actually can put a person into a position where he can heal more rapidly or kill the bacteria that he's associated with. Well all right, that being the case and people knowing something about this may come to you to be processed through an acute illness of some remarkable nature such as a tremendous infection of the ear or something. You see? And you're processing somebody who could be handled much more easily with simply a shot of penicillin and then you process them after the infection's cleared up and they make remarkable progress.

They're so undermined, and again, present time problem, that's all it amounts to. They're so distracted by this present time problem they actually don't do anything you ask them to do. They're again, momentarily, and you might say acutely, psychotic. You know, a fellow who goes into a violent rage, he's a fairly kind guy most of the time, and all of a sud-

den something happens and he goes into a violent rage, a psychotic rage. He's psychotic actually for ten minutes and he's never been psychotic before and he maybe never would be afterwards.

Well, illness can do this to a person. A person could have a cyst of some sort of such pain and pressure and so on that if it could be handled in some other fashion, you might make faster progress. And in view of the fact that modern medicine can do something or other for acute illnesses, it's sometimes a good idea to, you know, talk to the preclear about this. And you know, look it over.

This was called to my attention very violently since I found myself one day processing a criminal who was acutely ill of syphilis. Well, that's interesting isn't it? He was trying to get processed rapidly enough so that he wouldn't go crazy because he'd heard people went crazy when they had syphilis, you see, and so therefore the person to go and see would be somebody that'd keep him from going crazy. But all the time, he was going crazy with the amount of worry over this thing, you see? His case was just getting no place. Actually, a shot of arsenic is highly therapeutic in this particular direction and that was where he should have gone.

Now, somebody with a broken bone is liable to pull the same stunt on you, but all I'm sizing up here is the fact that they will often do it without giving you any word about it. Here sits this person and there's something acutely wrong emotionally, something wrong in their environment, something wrong with them physically, and they never give you the word, they never tell you. So completely aside from its therapeutic value, it's very dangerous to go on processing a case without opening a two-way communication, isn't it?

It's quite dangerous for the excellent reason that your preclear is liable to get, to be getting auditing for some kind of a condition that his grandma ought to be audited for or something. Actually, I had one fellow apply because his wife had just gone to an insane asylum. He wanted processing because his wife had just gone to the insane asylum. Well, this is all right, the fellow, that adds up sensibly, the fellow'd like to get the incident knocked out and so forth, and get the stress of it off. That wasn't the idea at all. He was actually so foggy that he thought if he would become sane it would make her sane. The fellow had evidently studied voodoo or something of the sort, you see, and there was a transference and you could heal at a distance if you just held your right toe pointed east and held your mouth in the right position. You know? This was the condition of a preclear. Well, that's no condition for a preclear to be in.

And a person who is in that kind of duress, he might have been sane for the last eight years you see, and never had an irrational moment. Now he has a tremendously irrational moment, some kind of an occurrence of that character. Well, maybe you started processing him two days before this cataclysm and you process him and this cataclysm is occurring in his life that neither you nor he had anything to do with, and all of a sudden here's his case. You're processing somebody and he's going downhill, downhill, downhill and you say, „Look what I was doing to this fellow. Just look at the horrible things I'm doing to this preclear. The preclear's getting worse.“ Well, you haven't got anything to do with it.

The truth of the matter is that he's just been barred from ever again practicing law in the state of New York or something of the sort. See, I mean he's going through some crisis or other. Again, if you had not established a two-way communication, you'd have a rough time of it.

Now, there's a thing called a confessional which was the basic psychotherapy that man had. The catholic church rather monopolized this, they, I don't know if you know how a confessional is carried on or not but it's a... I could go into this in considerable detail but won't. But the priest sits in a little booth and he has a curtain drawn there and he is not visible to the communicant or the penitent or whatever they call him. And he's not visible, and this person sort of whispers his various sins and so forth through a crack in the curtain or a little box. It's a highly rigged affair. He's sort of passing his troubles on to god, you see?

Well, they're fond of telling you, they're fond of telling you that this confessional is based on the fact that if you can get anybody to talk about his troubles, he will get better and that's why a confessional works. No, that isn't why it works. It's putting the blame on god is how it works. This is to say, „We'll just pass our troubles over to god,“ because again, it is not a two-way communication. Follow this, it's not a two-way communication.

In order for any therapy to take place by reason of communication alone on any kind of subject, there has to be a two-way communication, not one. You see that? Therefore the neatest trick in the whole book of tricks of auditing is knowing how to start and continue a two-way communication. It is dependent in its skill on the auditor's ability to grant beingness and actually talk on both sides of the conversation. Communication is opened first and foremost by any sensory perception, any sensory perception. You could get the preclear to touch something, you have opened communication with the preclear. See that? If you could take his hand, and he could register the pressure of your hand on his hand; and this in the case of a semi-conscious person is very workable; you would be communicating with the preclear. A two-way communication doesn't have anything to do with, and quite incidentally when it does, with words. It's a communication. You're there, he's there. His trouble is inhibited communication. And the trouble you're going to run into is getting a two-way communication started.

Now, any perception can be a two-way communication. Now sight is enough. If he simply registers the fact that you are there in the room with him, if he'll just look at you, that is a communication. So let's define communication by awareness across a distance, no matter how minute that distance is between the preclear and the auditor. And we discover that starting a two-way communication is actually, now that we know that, much easier, much, much easier.

If you want to start a fairly perfect communication of course you would simply duplicate what the preclear is doing with your own body. He's lying still, you just lie down and lie still. You'll be surprised how odd this will seem to him after a little while. He'll get real curious about you. He'll go into communication with you once or other. He picks up the stool and he heaves it at the door with a terrific crash. You pick up the stool and heave it at the door with a terrific crash. That's a psychotic level entrance into communication, mimicry, because of course duplication enters into the formula.

But your preclear is sitting there in complete silence. Well believe me, do you think that if you pour out a whole bunch of words, you're going into communication with this preclear? No, because he's putting out a communication already: silence. If you suddenly admit that as a communication it will disturb him a little bit and it's liable to stir him up into a communication. If you will sit there silent while he sits there silent, sooner or later you are going to go into communication. But you can make a preclear enter into communication with you simply by doing whatever the preclear is doing. If he's talking, you can talk, too, at the same time, and you still made him make a communication.

Now it's necessary for you to turn around and have him register one back. You see that? It's just as important for the auditor to go into communication with the preclear as it is for the preclear to go into communication with the auditor. And the auditor can do it by mimicry and because he knows how. It's harder for the preclear to do it. Sometimes a long time spent at the beginning of a session, just getting a two-way communication going until you really know you are talking to the preclear and he's talking to you is some of the best time spent you ever saw.

But Opening Procedure 8-C of course is a considerable assist to this. Improvement of communication is the keynote of all auditing. OK.

Types of Processes

A lecture given in July 1954

This is types of processes.

Various types of processes fall into two categories, two general categories. And one of those are those processes which process considerations; and those processes which process changes in space, or mechanical processes.

You see, even if you *made* the space and then put something in the space you would still be running something under change of space. It'd have to change slightly in order to persist at all. (You get that, under alter-ness.) So then it's considerations or change in space. And you can just say those are the two processes – two classes.

And as we look over considerations, we find that all we have to do with a thetan is get him to change his mind and he becomes well, and therefore, apparently, the easiest way to process anybody would – just get him to change his mind.

The funny part of it is, is he is depending on so many mechanisms and machines and he is so closely in communication with things which have considerations about it that he feels himself very often overpowered.

When you run into an automaticity, you can take it or leave it alone or process it or otherwise, but the rule is *you simply make the preclear do on his own decision what is happening automatically*. That is just a basic rule.

And all of a sudden the fellow says, 'And the room keeps spinning and spinning and spinning and spinning.'

And you say, "Say to yourself, 'Now I am going to spin the room.' Now spin it."

"Oh, I can't do that. It just keeps spinning."

"Well, say to yourself, 'Now I am going to spin it faster,' and make it spin faster."

And finally get him to vary the speed a little bit and then slow it down and then faster and slower and then faster and faster, and then slower and slower and slower, and stop it, see? We put it under his control.

The way you get anything under control is, on a gradient scale, make the preclear do it. That is the law back of this.

All right. All of these processes, then, actually stem from consideration, even though they are mechanical processes. So we find that although we could divide processes and do divide them into considerations and mechanics, or change of space – although we do divide the two into such a thing – we discover that the monitoring process is consideration.

But strangely enough, we find out that when consideration itself is immediately addressed to a person who is already in a body, and who is interiorized very thoroughly, we find out that it does not work.

In other words, the mechanics have taken precedent over considerations. And his changing his mind is only resulting from a mechanical manifestation. So you sit him down and make him change his mind and change his mind and change his mind and change his mind and change – and nothing is going to happen to the case at all.

Why is he changing his mind this way? Well, other things, including the auditor, are simply telling him to change his mind, so he changes his mind, he changes his mind. He has arrived at no basic consideration that he has the power to originate or handle mechanics.

So, in order to get around this factor, we discover that the first echelon of processing on *Homo sapiens* happens to be mechanics. Although it is the junior manifestation to considerations, it is the first one addressed. And of all these mechanics, we discover that time, of course, is the common denominator. Persistence: repetition of change of space. Change in space.

All right. Now let's take the most elementary of these processes: We simply ask an individual to pick up a matchbox – notice where it is, pick it up, find another place, put it down. You know, not do it again. I mean, there it is. Now we ask him to take a cup and pick it up, find another place, put it down.

And he does this a few times and the strangest thing comes over him. He says, "You know, I can change the position of things in space." If we carried it along far enough – but how long would it take him to make that consideration? Whee. With some preclears, they are running so much on their highly individualized time – they are their own time factor and the physical universe has nothing else to do with it – they have to at least come back into agreement before they can run anything like a consideration. So you have to get them back into agreement at least with the walls. And you get them into agreement with them and you will find out that they will start changing their mind.

So with most preclears, the time that you would care to process them, they are so far gone that getting them into communication with the walls is sometimes quite a little process. And as an auditor you are liable to say, "Hadn't I better shortcut this? After all, there is some better way to get this fellow to change his mind."

Why don't you go out in the back yard and set up some pipes and things, and make a little gunpowder, and so on, and get all set to send a rocket straight up to the moon? You might as well – might as well spend your time doing that. It will probably be less harmful on the preclear.

He is completely out of time. He is completely just as out of time as though the distributor cap was off of an automobile, you see? Just as mechanical as that. He is out of time. He is lost, therefore how can he possibly come into this space if he is not in the time of this space, you see? He is therefore lost, and you say, "Change your mind."

"Oooh, yeah."

Well, after all, it is experiment that tells. And believe me, if there is any consideration process that we haven't covered or any type of concept of existence that we haven't yet approached, and so forth, I suppose someday we'll find it out. Having found it out, we'll probably file it where we have filed every other type of consideration process: in the unusable basket, as leading to no stable gain for the case.

Interesting, isn't it? So our first approach is a mechanical approach: Not because mechanics are true; not because we have "no better way to go about it"; but we have – for heaven's sakes, we have to get our preclear into the same space we are in. And we have to at least occupy the same room with him, we have to give them processes which won't immediately spin them. And if we take, immediately, cases that we intimately know about, we find out that those cases apparently were doing all right, they were apparently perfectly rational people, they were in not too bad shape where *Homo sapiens* was concerned. And we find out that these people were run on such things as Exteriorization by Distance, which was a mechanic.

But remember, that's not a close association with walls or actual physical-universe barriers. It's with the body. And we found out they didn't get well, and they felt worse. We did strange and unusual things, connection to the body. And every time we addressed the body we found out the body was out of time, too. See? So just running the body didn't do much good. We've run concepts on them of one kind or another, which didn't immediately address the environment. And again, what did we discover? We discovered, just in no uncertain terms, that these cases either hung fire or got worse, or if they got a little bit better, why, it was just by sheer luck or something of the sort – or because the auditor was pleasant, or because they were simply talking.

But as therapeutic as that might have been considered by some old-line priest or somebody (or, witch doctor) – probably considered the amount of therapy administered there pretty doggone good, you know? But it wasn't, not compared to the gain and stability you could have achieved simply by getting them to touch the walls or do Opening Procedure by Duplication, which is touch repetitive objects – which is a much tougher one, of course, than touching the walls. Much tougher!

And we found out that by getting them to touch the walls and to walk around, they were at once moving a particle in space by moving the body around, and they were actually in contact with things which were themselves doing pocketa-pocketa-pocketa-pocketa, time-time-time-time-time-time-time – uniform rate of change of space which was itself the present time, so that they did not then feel this weird one. that they were out of time.

Of course, a person couldn't get out of time, actually, he could only consider that he was out of time. Well, you'd say, "Well, a good thing to do then would be to sit the preclear down" – you wouldn't say this, but somebody would – "and just give him a good talking-to on the subject of being out of time and things, and just tell him to change his mind about it."

Oh, yes. Now, of necessity, then, a direct change of position of a particle in space – i.e., a body in a designated space, intimately in contact with the barriers and positions at that moment of the particles, which themselves said time-time-time-time-time – put him back into

agreement at least with this universe. And having gotten him into agreement to some degree with this universe, we at least got him back on something besides an individual time track.

You understand that a preclear's time can be so bad that it's all a black chunk in the middle of his body, and he is in contact with that time, and that time is going so fast and so furious that it appears to be a solid object?

Did you ever see something turn so fast that it appeared to be a solid object? Well, the same manifestation is taking place with this fellow's facsimile bank. You see? It's on its own time, and its timing is so fast and it is so out of pace with the walls and everything that he puts his attention on that, because that is his time factor that he has to stay in communication with, in order to stay in communication with it, I guess. He is out of contact with the walls.

What happens to all that mass as you get him to touch walls? Well, in view of the fact that it isn't there, it isn't too unnatural that it goes away.

Therefore, we got him into agreement with present time – pardon me, got him in contact with present time a little bit. Now let's make him tolerate exterior time manifestations, and let's do something like Opening Procedure by Duplication, very arduous, very monotonous.

The trouble with our case is, he doesn't *dare* go through a monotonous and repetitive line. He can't go bop-bop-bop-bop-bop. So how can this preclear have any time? Because time is going bop-bop-bop-bop-bop, you see. So he can't have any time. And so we get him on such an arduous process. We could run him on that until he is fairly comfortable in it. And we'd probably go in there, into something like Exteriorization by Distance, because by this time he'd have some space.

Well, there are other things which we could do – other things which we could do. But, as I say, all processes falling into this bracket can be divided into these two blocks. And these two blocks are simply classifiable this way: Considerations independent of time, and considerations which include time.

Considerations which include the consideration of time are themselves mechanics. So the first processes that we hit with a preclear is to get something resembling time going. And get him up so he is comfortable about the whole thing. That is just by Opening Procedure 8-C, and Opening Procedure by Duplication. He is comfortable about it. Now we can start to consider something else like a more complex consideration.

Now, if you were to walk up to somebody who was being chewed to death by a lion, and you were to say to him quietly, "Now, where did you put the frying pan when you were back in the tent, there?" do you know you probably wouldn't get him to change his attention at all?

He just wouldn't change his attention. In fact, he probably wouldn't answer you. He would probably be completely unmannerly and ignore you – even if you shouted at him. Why? That's because he is being eaten up by a lion.

What do you suppose this thetan is having happen to him? He has resisted agreeing with time so often and protested so often about time, and his body has protested so often

about time, that at length he is a total protest against time, which of course is a total closure with time.

Boy, you'd certainly better get his attention somewhere in the vicinity – at least off of that lion. There would be various ways to do it. You could take the lion off of him. You could do all kinds of things. But then ask him where he put the frying pan or ask him to remember something or calculate something, or change his mind about lions.

Yeah, after he was nicely in the hospital and he was lying there and he was all patched up, he was getting well, and he had hot and cold running nurses taking care of him and life seemed to be very pleasant indeed, you could probably come around and talk to him for a little while and get him to make up his mind that lions weren't so bad. All depended on how pretty his nurse was, actually.

But you could get him to change his mind about lions if he was far enough from lions. But not thoroughly – not thoroughly. So immediately that he went back and saw a lion, hmmm. That would be something else, wouldn't it?

All right. Now let's look, then, at an entire bracket of processes. If we are going to talk about mechanical processes, there are four conditions of existence. And these conditions are (and they occur in this order, really) as-ness, alter-ness, isness – what we commonly call agreed-upon isness is reality. Now, between this isness and the next one we have another alter-ness. And then we have not-ness. And not-ness is "with energy we are going to make it cease to exist." So that, of course, is a kind of a not-ness, too. Only it is liable to result in a complete stick of not-is.

And then we would slide over into another bracket of alter-ness, and then we'd go into another bracket of not-ness, and then we'd go into another bracket of alter-ness, and maybe then into a bracket of isness, by the way – how bad it is. Because he has now confirmed in existence – by trying to change it – a horrible condition. You have to get this very clearly. Otherwise isness and not-ness just don't make sense. It would seem to you that any time you tried to change something, you would immediately get yourself stuck with it. You see? And that isn't true. You get a continuing reality on something by altering it. But remember, you can always as-is it and cause it to cease to exist and always mock up a new one, and then alter it and keep it going.

So this is not a trap. See, you could always say, perfect duplicate, you know? As-is. *Zzzzmp*. And there's a condition – okay. Now, here is an as-is. Now we will change it. Now, we'll change this as-is and change it and change it.

By the way, I was quite interested the other day on an experimental session – totally experimental as a session – just running this as that basis. We got what this fellow's ideal was in terms of his intellect. You know, how bright he ought to be? It was unattainably brilliant. I said, "How long have you had this ideal?"

"O-o-o-oh, just for years and years and years. And I just get stupider and stupider and stupider."

Of course. Of course. He is saying, "My stupidity must not be," is the way he was going about it.

So I had him sit there and cogitate on the idealness of being stupid and the sadness of being stupid, and got him to look at stupidity.

"Now, how does it look to you now?" you know? "How does it seem to you now?"

His stupidity "seeming" to him? How could he possibly be "seeming" anything out of the fact it's... You know. He wouldn't be looking at a stupidity; stupidity is a consideration. Only there happened to be mass around there, and boy, this was stupid mass.

In other words, what this fellow had been doing all these years had been unmocking any brilliance he had, see? Any brilliance he had – that was the as-isness. But his stupidity was a must-changeness. And he just got dumber and dumber and dumber.

Any time he would show up a brightness he would say "Well! That's as it is." See? Gone. And any time he would be stupid about something, "Oh, I have got to change this." Do you see?

So I had him – *rowww*, how stupid he was, see. And then I had him do this: I had him mock himself up, you know, "Just get the idea of being very bright." "Got it now? Got the idea of being tremendously brilliant? People coming from all over the place to ask you about things? All right, get the idea of being tremendously brilliant – not about anything in particular, just very brilliant."

And he would say, "Yeah, I... Yeah, I can do that! I can do that! But it fades right away."

"Now, all right. Well, just get the idea, now, of being tremendously brilliant." "Now try to get stupid." Hung him with it!

All right. There would be a whole battery of processes, and these things would address immediately, one after the other, these things: as-isness, alter-isness, isness, not-isness, and that's all.

So there'd be those types of considerations, you see, so there would be a type of process to each one of these things.

Well, we've never really talked about alter-isness to any great degree. And I want to mention it very rapidly. "Start lying" is an alter-isness process. You understand that. You get this individual to be able to practice alter-isness. Unless he can practice alter-isness... If he has to tell the truth all the time, that is to say, he'll just keep everything unmocked, won't he?

If he told *exactly* how it seemed to him every time, he would wind up – he would never have a thing, would he? All right.

So this is the processing of significances. I am going to tell you about this very rapidly, but it is a very important process. It is very easy to do. "Start lying" is one of the simpler methods of doing this. Another method of doing this is show a guy an object and have him call it other things, start naming it and calling it other things.

In other words, seek to change it. And you know, that object gets solidier and solidier. That's alter-isness.

We pick up a book and we ask him – the way we run this – we say, "What is this?"

And he says, "It's a book."

And you say, "What is this?"

"It's a book."

Well, he may keep it up for an hour. He insists it is a book, he insists it is full of print, he describes the style, and it is getting fainter and it's foggier and all kinds of things are happening there that are unappetizing, and so forth.

He finally gets a little bit disgusted or something of the sort, and he says, "Well, it's a giraffe."

You say, "Well, that's approximately what I see here too." And you show it to him again and say "What is it now?"

"It's a car." "It's this. It's that. It's this. It's that." And you know, he will get sharp, he will get bright. And the first thing you know, it will go back into its proper proportion in the room and it will sort of occupy the rest of the universe, and it won't be very prominent, and so forth. Because he's willing to let time progress as far as that object is concerned.

He is willing for that object to change. And if he is not willing for that object to change, it will stick on the time track. That is what sticks most of your preclears in childhood: They don't want their mama to change toward them. And Mama, when they get to be five and six and very combative and destructive, no longer cuddles the little child to her bosom. And ail Freudianism actually is just out of that one fact, you see – I mean, childhood is everything.

Mama changed. *You don't want Mama to change!* Papa changed. *No, you don't want Papa to change!* You saw all of a sudden that beautiful diamond ring you had going right off of your finger and into 150 fathoms of water. *You didn't want that to change!* Did you?

Well, this is right on the borderline between consideration and mechanics. And that is the processing of alter-*isness*. And it's right on the borderline. If you get your preclear perfectly free to call everything anything he cares to and he doesn't care how much it changes, it will then be permitted by him to go pocketa-pocketa-pocketa-pocketa-pocketa. He will at least stay in communication with the time track, because the time track itself is alter-*isness*.

And change and alter – and we could call it change-*isness*, if we wanted to, you see? Time-*isness*; shift-of-position-*isness*. And if he is unwilling to let the environment around him change, the environment around him will hang up at 1770 or something. And here he is in 1954, but back in 1770 he decided it was all going to stop and change. Now, do we get that clearly?

We just have him name objects, name objects. We don't even tell him to call them something different than they are. We just have him name the object and name the object and name the object and name the object. And that's really all there is to the process, any significance, there.

You could have the objects name him, too, but that is very circuitous. And I do that, by the way, when I process that process. Because, occasionally, *bing!* It will produce a fabulous change of consideration. Have objects name him – he has always been naming objects – have objects name him for a while, just for variation. He gets quite a kick out of this. (Not a

necessary part of the process, you understand. But it can simply be done.) The basic process is simply have him name it and name it and name it and name it and name it and name it, until he doesn't care what it is known as.

You will get, by the way, an individual right straight and immediately out of stuck on the time track with this, because time is change. Time is not an is-ness. Time is not an as-ness. And time is not a not-isness. See? Time is an alter-isness. And if you want the individual up in present time, you'd better process in the direction of alter-isness.

Now, you could strip away a whole bank by processing as-isness. "ow does it seem to you now?" is the total command. Except you just keep talking to the preclear, saying various things, but remember that that is the command.

"How does it seem to you?" And you mean right now, and the next thing you know, his engrams and various other energy masses and so forth will disappear. Right?

Okay. How do you process an isness? You can't. Because of all things, that one doesn't exist. An isness cannot exist in the absence of an alter-isness, so we have to assume that it's an alter-isness. Right?

How do we process a not-isness? The best way to process a not-isness is to have somebody feel the walls. We got that now?

Now, all mock-up processing belongs in the bracket of as-isness. It belongs in that bracket, except when you change the position of the mock-up in space, which went into alter-isness.

So you could say existence is made up of these factors: As-isness, altering. See? As-isness, alter-isness. So we get an as-isness, and then all we've got thereafter, really, is alter-isness, alter-isness, alter-isness.

But isness is a hypothetical consideration, and not-isness is an energy prevention of the hypothetical situation from taking place. So what people think of as not-isness and isness – they think of these things and they recognize these things as great truth. Well, that's fine. Only, they are not true, either one of them. There is just this *action* to make things not-be with energy pressing against them, and there is this other action of saying, "Well, it is. That's the way things are."

That is an as-isness, isn't it? It is just right like they are. Well, you say, isness, in terms of reality – we think of reality as a static thing. It's not, it is totally changing.

The fellow says, "That's the way things are," and points out to the universe. And you know, two seconds later you can still see the universe! And five minutes later you can still see it, and an hour later you can still see it. Did he really say "That's the way things are"?

No, he sure didn't. He said, "That's the way things are altering."

"This constancy is the way things are altering" is what he said. Now, do you see that? So our processes boil down, actually, to as-isness and alter-isness.

Okay. Now, with this time, and with these other considerations and processes, there is one datum I am going to give you awfully fast, and I hope you will keep for quite a while.

And that datum is simply this: The trouble with the preclear is he thinks he is a symbol. He has ceased to be an orientation point, and he thinks he is a symbol. And he contains mass, meaning and mobility. If he himself has mass, meaning and mobility, he is therefore a symbol. What is wrong with your preclear? He has mass, meaning and mobility.

Whatever process strips those out will, of course, make him well, because as long as he has mass, meaning and mobility he is agitated and does not himself have possession of and is not an entire static. He considers already that he is *less* than a static. Now, you got that?

Okay.

Opening Procedure of 8-C

A lecture given on 26 July 1954

Want to talk to you now about the Opening Procedure of 8-C.

This is a very, very interesting subject – a tremendously interesting subject. It's fascinating, utterly fascinating, exactly what you can do with a process which is apparently as permissive as Opening Procedure of 8-C.

Now, there's no need for me to go in, particularly, to the exact way that... It's all written up; you'll find it in Issue 24-G of *the Journal of Scientology*. But it is very fascinating the number of side effects which are cared for because you are processing straight toward simplicity.

We know that what is wrong with a person is his subjective universe. That has gotten into trouble. Now, in view of the fact that he could mock up a tremendous amount of space if he had to, he could mock up lots of energy, he could mock up objects and he could follow the same procedure all over again, why he's lugging around something called "his universe" is a little bit difficult for a reasonable man to understand. And yet people do this. A thetan gives a sort of – the idea of somebody walking around with a great many clanking chains all carefully hidden away, even from himself – old tin cans, old cigar butts, so forth. And these are possessions. It looks like a kid's toy box. If you've ever looked into a three-year-old's choicest possessions, that's strictly about the order of havingness that a thetan pulls.

Well, this is quite interesting because he gives them up with the greatest of reluctance. And yet he could make others. And his total health, you might say, is dependent upon his ability to make others – to have new, fresh things, to do almost anything he wants to with them. But remember, it was always very, very difficult for him to get an object into such a circumstance that it was actually somebody else's object. Do we see that? To procure an object which was somebody else's object is what he has to do in order to have that object.

Now, if we look at the four conditions of existence – the "is-es" – we will discover just exactly why. And these things are very valuable to him because they mean a period when he was actually in communication with thetans as such. And he could blame them, you see? And if he could blame them, then he could have something, and if he couldn't blame them, then he couldn't have anything unless he duplicated himself and so had another thetan in order to blame the other thetan for something or other. In this way he would get a persistence: he would get survival, then, in terms of motion. Otherwise, it would all seem completely motionless to him.

Now, again, all of these things are simply considerations. And in view of the fact that they're all considerations, we're enormously baffled as to how considerations could be so im-

portant. Remember they're only important because of the considerations which one held in common with others.

Now, it'd be one thing simply to change one's considerations all over the place, and it would be quite another thing to have a series of considerations which had been thoroughly agreed upon with others. And so your thetan with his old cigar butts, torn playing cards and clanking chains – he's been in communication, one time or another, and the system of communication was established and therefore he could have an other-determinism so true and so convincing that even he, you see, would not be able to question its convincingness. And therefore nobody could possibly question the validity of these objects which he's carrying around.

Now, you'll find out in some areas where thetans have been in concourse with nothing but thetans, there's such a thing as engram police. And there's all kinds of mechanisms that they use in order to steal mock-ups from each other, and it's really fabulous. They try to get an overt act done to them – in other words, get a motivator. Simply, then, they will have some reason to blame somebody else, you see, for having put that mass of energy there, and then that energy mass will persist. If they can't blame anybody else, why, it can too easily become an as-is and so disappear. Other-determinism becomes vital.

Now, when we look over this problem, then, we discover that an individual can go so far on this line and become himself disabled. How does he become disabled? He begins to count on other-determinism more and more and more heavily to produce his own survival. We see this in terms of attention: an individual in this society without any attention from anybody else would not have much chance of surviving. An individual just on the basis of food alone would have a great difficulty.

But he's gotten down to where those objects really have to be solid, and so we get this physical universe. And the particles of this physical universe are so beautifully lost, so completely confused, so misplaced away from their point of origin, that they can be subjected to a law in physics known as the conservation of energy: Energy cannot be destroyed, it can only be converted. Now, of course, anything *that* lost can only be converted, you see? Unless you discover the point where it was actually manufactured. And so this universe becomes valuable. It becomes valuable because we've gone to so much trouble to lose enough things so that we then have a continuance of objects.

Now, a thetan who has become upset about the various agreements and so on believes that he no longer can communicate with something. He is a nothingness, therefore he has to communicate with a nothingness, he thinks. The communication formula is at fault.

Here we have an individual who is living by the communication formula and yet cannot recover his own ability, easily, to follow the basic of communication, which is all things are on the same point. When you consider a consideration, you find out it doesn't have any dimension whatsoever and a thetan has no dimension whatsoever.

So he's gone to a lot of work to make a universe that's as heavy as this one. And he's blamed it all on God and he's blamed it all in various directions and he has made what amounts to a *considerable* investment – he has a big investment. And now he has gone so far that, having made this investment, he can no longer look at it because he has to follow the

communications formula. He cannot occupy the same space as an object – two objects cannot occupy the same space – so, therefore, he is a body. He is not a thetan-plus-body, he *is a* body.

And every once in a while we run into some materialist in processing and just the bar-est thought, you see, that he is something else other than a body is *completely, completely* contradictory to him. It's utterly assaulting. You'd think that you would have held a gun on the man and asked him for his money or something. He'll become excited. "I am a body. I know I am a body. That is all I am. I am one!!!" exclamation point, exclamation point. He gets real worried about it.

This person at the same time is liable to be that person you will run into who is most concerned with God. This is real curious, isn't it? Well, he has to have another determinism for responsibility. Also his field will be relatively black. No criticism of the individual, that's just the state he's in. Why? He knows two things can't occupy the same space! So obviously if he is there and the body is there, then he must be the body! That's the most elementary thing we could possibly put together! That's very observant, isn't it? Well, this individual has himself mocked up as something and is being something so thoroughly that he cannot disassociate himself. So you tell him to be three feet back of his head and he can't be three feet back of his head.

Now, we are processing something which has four parts. There is the the-tan and his machines – now, that's two parts. And the other parts are the body and its reactive bank. You see? Now, there are actually four parts. There's the reactive bank, a stimulus-response machine of some magnitude, and the body, which actually is capable of collecting an enormous amount of molecules and electrons and converting energy and doing all sorts of interesting things. Well, that's one unit. And the other unit is the thetan and his machines. But we're actually processing four things.

Now an auditor, occasionally, makes the gross error of processing *one* of these things not the thetan. See? He processes the reactive bank. This is a mistake today – I mean, the technologies which we have, and so forth, do not justify the processing of the reactive bank. Just doesn't justify it. So there's that many engrams. So there are that many engrams! Well, does this so assault our sensibilities, that these things exist, that we must vanquish and make every one of them disappear? Well, if he got another body, it'd have another reactive bank. And so what we want to do is improve the thetan's ability to handle reactive banks, to be in association with them or not, at will. That's what we want to improve, not knock out a whole reactive bank. You see, that'd be silly.

Now, the next thing: the body. An auditor comes along and he starts processing the body, the body, the body, the body, the body, the body. "Oh, my, our preclear. Look-it – he has a slight cold today! Uh-o-o-o-h-hh, wonderful! Now we've got something to process!"

Well, what kind of an auditor would this be? It'd be an auditor who had to have something. This auditor couldn't possibly have nothing, because he's actually processing nothing – he's trying to free a nothingness. And if he can't conceive of a nothingness, if he has to go in the direction of a somethingness – even though he is making nothing out of every somethingness he runs into (you know, with energy; a not-is) – this auditor, of course, will process

straight at this case of sniffles. And you know what he'll do with that case of sniffles? *He 'II* have it next! But what's he doing processing a body? They're easy to make, patch up, do almost anything with – if a thetan is able.

All right, now, let's take this next thing: machines. Now, every once in a while some preclear has such an observable surplus of machinery that an auditor just can't stand leaving that machinery alone. He just can't stand it. He's got to get in there and get all of those mechanisms out of the road and get them all mopped up and wiped out and so forth. Next thing you know the thetan is very, very sad indeed. Because what would this thetan do? Look at all the years he's spent blaming this machinery on somebody else! Hm? He's got this little voice and it keeps piping up every time he says something, saying, "Heh, heh, that was a smart one, that was!" You know? And this little voice does this. And it's very worrisome to him. That's his mother's voice. So it's obviously his mother that's doing this. He made this machine a long time ago and put it off on somebody else. He even made a machine to make machines so that he wouldn't be responsible for it, and he even makes machines to add to his machines, the machine duplicates of other people. Oh, he's got complex machinery. But when you've gotten through processing all this machinery, what have you done? You've just processed some machinery. And it wasn't sick!

So we have these four major parts. And of these four parts, what are we trying to process? We're trying to process the thetan. Well, of course, he doesn't have any mass, but he can make space and he can make energy and he can locate objects in space. And he has certain very definite capabilities – very positive, definite capabilities. And by the improvement of these capabilities, we improve his ability to communicate. And so improving his ability to communicate, we make him able to handle not just the reactive bank he's mixed up with at the moment, not just the body he happens to be inhabiting or hanging around at the moment and certainly not his bank of machinery; we make it possible for him to handle large quantities of, well, other people's machinery and various other things. It's very interesting what he can do. But he cannot possibly be hung up on the basis of "two things can't occupy the same space" – he couldn't be hung up on that one. Another thing he mustn't – he couldn't be hung up on, if you're going to separate him easily, is that "it's all other-determined." You see, if it's all other-determined, then he would depend on other things to place him in space. And if he's depending on other things to place him in space, he will sit there and wait for the auditor to exteriorize him. But the auditor is not going to exteriorize him.

So our point of approach here is the thetan. Now, the easiest way to approach this is simply on make and break communication with the immediate environment.

Now, I'd better define *environment*: environment is the physical universe, security, gee whiz it's right there, it's solid, this is the space of the room, the floor, the ceiling, the walls, the objects there, and if we happen to get looking through these things, then it's the walls in the next room and up through the roof, why, it's the air above the house and down through, it's the earth underneath the house. But this is still environment, you understand. And *environment* means "how far can this individual perceive with great certainty in the physical universe?" And that's what we're interested in when we say *environment*.

Now, we don't have the preclear in Chicago and, because he is an inhabitant of Iowa, then process him in the environment of Iowa. Now, this sounds too utterly stupid, that nobody could do this but, believe me, auditors have done this. Process him in the environment? Well, this fellow's environment was New Mexico, so they process him one state away. And what will they be processing? They'll be processing a set of facsimiles. Are we interested in this man's facsimiles? No, we're not.

Now, there's a direct ratio between the amount of facsimiles or energy masses a person has and his ability to communicate. There's a direct ratio between these two things. The more energy masses and more facsimiles which a person has, whether white or green or purple, or whether they're black curtains or actual, apparent, solid objects – we don't care what these are – the more energy mass the individual has, the worse off he is. It's a direct index.

This fellow, he runs a concept and gets a flow past his face. You know, he feels something moving past his face. Ah, we've got a case of energy masses. How did they get there? They got there by the thetan directing his attention in various directions, manufacturing energy the while. And you're going to process this case, as a preclear, this thetan, in such a way that he sprays out new energy masses around his body? Hm. That would be a curious thing, wouldn't it? And yet, you know, there are processes that you could run – not any listed in Intensive Procedure – which would lead an individual to immediately mock up more and more and more and more energy masses in the vicinity of his body. You could actually artificialize his condition. He's as well off as he doesn't have to have energy masses. He has to have energy masses to the degree that he believes he cannot create a space and energy. See? Now, it's a direct index.

So we find somebody who has large floating ridges, and that sort of thing, and this individual is having just that much difficulty – just that much; direct index. No question about it and no exceptions. Doesn't matter what manifestation we're exhibiting at the particular moment: a person is as bad off as he has these energy masses which are not placed but are floating. You could say they're floating energy masses, because everywhere he walks he's got them.

Now, he's as well off as he can simply take or leave the walls and other items of the physical universe where he finds himself. See, he can take them or leave them; see them or not see them at will. Now, he's well off when he can do that.

Now, what process would you tailor up in order to accomplish this? Well, you could just simply have a preclear sitting in a chair and looking around the room spotting spots. You know, you just spot spots in the wall and spot spots and spot spots, spot spots. It's a fantastic technique; it'll do quite a bit for a preclear. Just have him sit there and look at the walls and spot spots.

Well, actually, you can start adding to this the moment that you have him get up and walk around and pick out the spots and touch them and then break communication with them. And 8-C is actually a gradient scale, and 8-C's Opening Procedure is a gradient scale of getting this done.

There is an additional process that could go along with this: You could make him close his eyes and have him start checking off spots in the environment. The case that has had

his perception turn on very fully and then promptly turn off – and it's never been on since – has practically scared himself out of his wits. See, his perception turned on and that was too much isness; he could see everything too clearly. And this made him nervous, it upset him, it disturbed his thetan digestion; and has made him very, very unhappy.

And what is this? This is just simply a case of too much, and he said, "It isn't!" See? He said, "Not-is!" and took a look at all this environment and said, "Dull down. Get real dull. It better be unreal around here. It's just too bright, it's too loud," and so on.

Well, what happens if we have this person sitting there in the chair with his eyes shut and we just have him look around the room? You know, have him look around and spot spots in the room. All right, a facsimile shows up. We just have him go on spotting spots in whatever he can see, which is – we're still heading at the room; we don't suddenly stop and say, "Oh, you've got a lot of blackness; let's spot some spots in the blackness." No, you just keep hounding him for some sort of a perception of the room. That's what you want. And he keeps spotting spots in the room and spotting them and spotting them and spotting them and spotting them. Just that and no more – spotting them behind him, above him, below him. If you don't watch him a little bit, he'll spot them all in front of him. You've got to direct his attention behind. A thetan has a 360-degree periphery of vision. There is no "Get thee behind me, thetan," situation.

Now, here we have in a thetan, then, a possibility that the moment he really saw the room, he'd turn it off again. That right? He'd flinch. Well, the funny part of it is, they do. They do flinch. And then you keep right on processing the room. You see what this would be? I mean, they'd flinch, their perception would go off and you just take it from there and have him spot spots in the room. So he says his perception is all off. Well, you just have him find something he *can* perceive.

If he says, "I think it's a facsimile. I don't know what it is, really. It doesn't seem to me to be terribly real," yap, yap, yap, yap.

You just say, "Spot some more spots."

Now, in other words, we could go at this, then, on this basis: We just simply have a fellow, a preclear, close his eyes and start spotting spots in the room. And the auditing commands that go along with it, "All right," and you'd say, "Just close your eyes. Okay. Now, let's spot some spots in the room."

"Oooh," the fellow says, "I can – what do you mean 'close my eyes and spot

"Well, can you see anything when you've got your eyes shut there?"

"No! Of course not!"

"Well, why don't you look around? Do you get an impression of anything?"

"Hmmm. Well, what do you know! It's all black." He never noticed this before.

You say, "Well, all right, how about this, now? You say it's all black. Well, is there any place that's thinner? You know, behind you, for instance, or above you or below you? Do you make out anything at all about this room?"

"No."

"Well, as you're sitting there with your eyes closed, do you know the location of anything in this room?"

"Yeah. Well, I know where my body is." Of course, a case like this would probably assert to you violently, if they weren't prepared otherwise, to tell you that they were a body, they had always been a body, they would always be a body, they've never been anything else but a body, that you live but once. And they would also tell you that during their study of Korzybski's *Science and Sanity*, they agreed with him utterly that two things could not occupy the same space. They tell you all these things. It'd be a very informative conversation if you let him proceed. You only let him proceed on such a conversation, by the way, long enough to keep the two-way communication going. Then you get him doing something. "All right," you'd say, "well, do you know of the location of any object in this room?"

And the fellow says, "Well, there's a table right over there. I know that."

"Well, why don't you look at it?"

And if you don't catch him real quick, why, his eyes will pop open, of course, and he will stare at it. But you keep him with his eyes closed. And he knows there's a table over there and you say, "All right, spot some spots in it."

"I can't possibly spot any spots in the table if I can't see it."

"Do you know it's there?"

"Yes, I know it's there. I saw it when I came in."

"Well, all right. Spots some spots in it."

"But I'll have to open my..."

"Go ahead and spot some spots on that table."

He finally does. And it starts to get a tattletale gray around him, and then it flickers on and it flickers off and perception comes on and all of a sudden he's aware of the fact that it's all real. And then he convulsively shuts off all of his perception, then he lets it turn on again, and then he shuts it off again, then he flinches in this way and flinches in that way. Why? He knows it's dangerous to look at things. He knows that. He knows, again, it is dangerous to communicate. He shuts it off before something else shuts it off. See? He's there ahead of them. But after it goes on and comes off and goes on and comes off a few times, it's liable to be more and more upsetting to him all the time. It's because it's liable to be getting more and more real. The room is liable to be getting more and more real, more and more solid.

Now, if you let him continually and completely fly out through the doors and the walls, and so on, and let him spot at unreal distances (such as spotting at a thousand yards for somebody who, actually, if he hadn't come to you for processing, he would have been using a tin cup shortly and a pair of dark glasses and some pencils). This character, and so forth, spotting at a thousand yards – oh yeah? A thousand millimeters would be much too great, and three millimeters is about what he can tolerate. So we keep him in the immediate environment – and we mean the physical universe when we say environment, and we mean objects

that he's fairly sure are there – and we just work him on that basis. And the first thing you know, why, the walls will start to disappear, and then they'll flicker on again and they'll flicker off, and it gets more and more real, and he gets upset about it, and then he becomes calm about it and he goes through a lot of variations. Doing what? Just sitting right where he's sitting – and you don't care where that is – spotting spots in the room, whether the room is black, green, purple or whether he's got facsimiles that he's really spotting or not. We don't *care* what this preclear is doing as long as he continues to spot spots.

If he's got a facsimile sitting there and he shifts his attention on the facsimile, he'll let go of it. You see? If he's really just spotting into blackness, and so forth, if he's really changing his perception direction, you see, why, boom! He'll start looking through the blackness. If you have him look *at* the blackness and spot spots *in* the blackness, you are validating these masses of energy I mentioned to you. And a thetan is as bad off as he has them. What he's witnessing with all of these possessions and masses of energy is his own inability to really mock up something and have it belong to somebody else. That's what he's witnessing when he can't do it. So, there is that process.

Now, out of these two processes you can do Opening Procedure of 8-C. But you can also do Opening Procedure of 8-C with the thetan, without moving the body. You can have the thetan touch things in the room. But actually, you don't have him touch things and let go, you have him look at and look away. And you can carry through all the steps of the room by more or less drilling the thetan in the room, preclear sitting there with eyes closed. And this becomes a tremendously workable procedure. Actually, its most simple form is just tell him to close his eyes. If he knows of any object in the room at all while he has his eyes closed, spot spots in it.

Now, the classic group example of this is a very simple one. And that is: three spots in the body, three spots in the room, three spots in the body; you have him spot three spots in the body, three spots in the room and three spots in the body, three spots in the room, back and forth. And at the end of this time, at the end of an hour's group processing on perfectly green people of a bunch of twenty, something like this, you will have four or five of them exteriorized – usual run of people that you run into, unless you're dealing, of course, with mystics 100 percent of the time. That's a little more difficult.

Now, 8-C done with the body, however – 8-C done with the body and with no further tricks with its most elementary auditing commands as given in Intensive Procedure's text – is the only process... Oh, please, mark this one down, please remember this: *It's the only process which can be safely employed and beneficially employed on psychotics, neurotics and people with psychosomatic illnesses.* Let's put that down. And recognize that when a preclear comes in with a psychosomatic illness, he has already determined exactly the processing he's going to get.

And I call your attention to the Chart of Human Evaluation, to the place where it says "Neurological and endocrine ills." Well, that's where they sit on psychosomatic ills. It's down below 2.0 on the tone scale. And they *are physically* off their base. And what it takes, and what will make that psychosomatic ill go away, is Opening Procedure of 8-C. And it'll cure

psychotics and it'll cure neurotics, because in essence it is a purity of communication and is a very simple process to use. But that doesn't mean that you don't have to be an artist to use it.

Okay.

Opening Procedure By Duplication

Part I

A lecture given on 31 May 1954

This is a discussion of an auditing procedure which is based upon various data which has been assembled, and which I've been discovering, putting together, testing out and so forth, during these professional units, mostly on this basis: What have people been getting big results with, you know? What's causing a change of case?

Now, if we were to put all these things together, one after the other, then we would have a process which we would simply call something like "Effective Procedure," or something of that sort.

Well, this is actually no effort to do that. One of these days I'll probably come up with something like that – I mean, which is just a summation of processes which are effective at various case levels, string them all out from the worst-case level forward to the best-case level and call it a procedure.

But this is, you might say, a selected procedure out of selected procedures. And this would be a very arduous discipline, as a process. This doesn't say there are many procedures that don't work, and maybe some per preclear would work better than one of these. But this particular procedure certainly has two characteristics: One, it produces results, it produces an effect – different thing, you know, a procedure which produces results and one which produces effects. Did you ever realize that's not necessarily related at all?

I have to laugh at somebody, they got ahold of a piece of Scientology and call it Buck-sology or Hexogomy or Purselectology or something, and just because something creates a tremendous effect, you see? And then they call this a procedure. And you as an auditor will run into this – well, it's just something that goes along with any push in a society – and you'll find out that the procedure created an effect, it didn't create a result.

And so you have a long, continuing, boggy sort of a thing, usually, or very spectacular. Of course, shooting a guy with a shotgun produces both effect and a result. It kills him, and removes him from the environment. This, of course, is both combined in one.

We are not interested in that type of therapy because it has already been taken care of by Mr. Winchester. He has it patented. We shouldn't be concerned with that.

Well, this procedure we're talking about, that we're going to call, just for no really good reason, Procedure 30. Just going to call that Procedure 30. Of course, there is a radio

significance to this, but the less significance there is to a title the more likely it is to stay around, so we'll just call this Procedure 30 and let it go at that.

Now, how would this procedure go, and to whom would it be addressed on, and a bunch of other questions: Well, let's take these things up in order of importance. What will it do and how easy is it to use? Well, it'll produce a Book One Clear out of a Resistive V. That's what it'll do. And how easy is it to use? Well, it'd probably do this in maybe less than twenty hours – maybe – if you were using *really* Procedure 30. That's a slight difference, if you were really using Procedure 30.

Now, this procedure to date has been addressed, actually, only to *very* difficult cases. That's the only test series that the procedure has had. It has not been applied to Step I's. Why? Well, one assumes, rightly or wrongly, that a procedure which works well on a Resistive V, of course, would improve the case of a Step I.

Now, this may or may not be true, and it may or may not work out this way. That's up to you. Why don't you look it over and find out if that's the case. But I think you will discover that is the case. I think you will discover, too, the reason why a Step I comes up just so far and then moves no farther up, is another case of having hit this particular set of buttons.

What we were doing really seems to be, we were making people well, within this perimeter. In the absence of this particular process, the inherent recovery of the individual was being tremendously consulted by the auditor.

The potentiality of recovery of the case was a monitoring factor in the auditing. You see that? So we had a condition which might be over into a condition of no return. And we had that rather easily and rather soon. We'd been advancing that into the dark unknown – and I do mean dark unknown – of the point of no return on cases quite readily.

Well, now this procedure does seem to go way in past the points of no return, you see. But it also, more importantly, seemed to be sitting as a roof on how high cases would go. And if these elements weren't handled in the case, then the case would simply get as well as the case could get within the potentials of the case to get well.

Now, up to this point, you see, then, a case was sort of bound down. Well, what would happen if you as an auditor were able to monitor how well this case could get? See, that's a new look. You see, the case wouldn't be getting as well as the case could get; the case would get as well as you could make the case.

That enters in auditor determinism. Now, that *seems* to be present in Procedure 30. Now, this procedure has not been used (at this moment that I'm giving it to you) by any other auditor than myself. Thereby and therefore, it has to be used a bit to find out if it has to be altered. But I don't think it has to be altered, because I have seen its various parts and types of processes like that being used capably by auditors today.

Now, the one thing it would require from the auditor is a tremendous stick-to-ivity: How easy is it to use? It would require a *tremendous* stick-to-ivity – quite a bit of patience, mostly because of its opening steps. And if an auditor has a tendency to be flighty with a case, you know, and to be upset with a case he should tend to stick to other procedures, lighter procedures – if he himself can't duplicate – until he's had this procedure run on him. Because this

procedure evidently will knock out certain of the blocks that haunt auditors, such as not being able to duplicate commands, only being able to give a preclear a command a few times, only to have a certain span of attention for the case.

The attention – span of attention – of an auditor is a factor with which we have to deal. And the span of attention of an auditor sometimes is *very* short. I know of one auditor who is – oh, is he good for the first twenty minutes, and for the remainder of a two-hour session, he just fixes up the poultry business and creates an enormous abundance of eggs.

Well, for those first twenty minutes, boy, is he hot! What's this? His span of attention is very short. Well, we'd have to have something, then, that would increase his span of attention, wouldn't we, to really be getting there?

Well, sure enough, this Procedure 30 does that if it doesn't do anything else – it increases the span of attention.

Then, too, somebody ought to be able to say, "I *can* turn on sonic and visio with this technique because, what do you know, it improved, or turned on, my sonic and Visio." See, so therefore he has a lot of hopefulness about the case.

Well, I give it to you now, without any further window dressing, simply as it has been worked out, and don't in any way assure you that this will be a final form. This is Procedure 30, Issue I.

It goes this way: We get into communication with the preclear. Naturally, if your pre-clear is psycho, getting into communication will require mimicry and other such activities on your part – anything that would be communication.

But we get into a two-way communication with this preclear, and then we sort of talk to him, you know, to keep up the communication to get some sort of idea of some sort of a present time problem, if he has any. You're interested in him and you are in communication now about something which is real to him.

Well, having proceeded that far, we would then tackle this problem bluntly and head on: We would tackle any possibility that this individual was unable to duplicate a command many times. And we would go into Opening Procedure and we would do Opening Procedure, just as such, very lightly, for a *very* short space of time.

We would have him go over and put his hand on the desk and locate something that's real in the room and go over and take ahold of it and withdraw from it. And we'd march him around the room for a very short space of time – and I do mean short space of time. Because what we're getting down to is the reason he won't be able to perform Opening Procedure very easily. We're going to find two locations in the room and – let's just codify this – and we'll have an object in each location. We will have a book on the table and on another side table or window sill, something like that, we will have another object, preferably a dissimilar object. Oh, we might have a hat or an ashtray or any kind of an object like that. One object on the table, one object in some other location in the room-dissimilar, whatever they are. Don't have them, two books.

All right, we've got these two objects. Now, we ask the preclear to go to the first object and pick it up, ask him to describe it, ask him how much it weighs and what its temperature is. Then we have him put it down. Of course a repetition of "Put it down" is possibly not good, being a repeater technique in itself, but believe me, that command will work out as the case proceeds. So we have him lay it down. We have him put it down in the same place, by the way – this first object – that he got it. He'll have a tendency to put it in some other place. We want it put in the same place exactly, to the millimeter.

And then we have him go over to the window and pick up object two and have him look at it, describe it. Why do we have him describe it? That's to keep him in a two-way communication system. See that? We have him describe it verbally, and have him feel the weight of it and have him get its temperature, and then we have him put it down *right where he picked it up*.

And then we have him go to object one. And we have him pick it up and describe it and feel its weight and feel its temperature. And having really ascertained this – we want to make certain that he did ascertain this, and that's the one thing we hound him about through this process, is make sure that he really feels the weight of it, you see, that he really gets what temperature it is, that he really tells you what the colors are and the appearance of the object is. And put it down. Then go over to the position two and pick up that second object and get what its weight, its color and its temperature is. And we have him put it down in the same place that he picked it up – be very insistent on that – and then have him go back to position one.

How long do we do this? We do this till he can do it happy as a jaybird for about ten minutes without a single upset – till he can do this time after time and just be just as cheerful about it!

Well, how long is it going to take you to do this? Fifteen hours? Well, of course, you realize that an individual would die if he were asked to do this for fifteen hours and that the auditor would commit suicide long before that time.

You realize this to be the case and then go right ahead and do it for fifteen hours, if necessary.

Well, let's be factual. How many hours do you think it would take to get a rather bad case – I mean a pretty bad case – squared away with this? How many hours would it take, really? Well, the shortest time I have been able to do it effectively has been one hour. And I got the character all the way from apathy, tears – real tears (real apathy, too, by the way, you know) – a horrible stomachache, feet fell off at one point (preclear was absolutely sure of this), through rage, antagonism, contempt, boredom, apathy again, fear, anger, antagonism, contempt, apathy, grief, fear, antagonism, enthusiasm, apathy, and so on up again to – first time the guy had ever been on the first-level Know to Sex Scale – to sexual excitement, to symbols, to anger, to laughter, to apathy, to sex again, eating (showed up there just as plain as could be). "Well, I suppose I could eat the book. I suppose that's what you want me to do *now*: eat it. Well, I won't eat it. So there!" And another time, by the way, the other object: "I suppose you're supposed to use it for sexual purposes now. That's what you want, isn't it?"

These various manifestations, until finally the case simply booted right on up the tone scale and stayed up there.

I mean, they went through sex and then they went into effort and they said, "Well, I don't know, it's exercise walking back and forth," and so forth. He went up to emotion. He began to be very interested in the fact that he had had emotions regarding this process. That this process would make him emotional was now curious to him. He became rather curious about the process – the first time we had gotten into curiosity, even vaguely. And all of a sudden, tremendously brilliant visio turned on, and then went on some further till their sonic picked up and became intolerable and then shut down again to a tolerable level.

But what's the longest I myself have done this on a case? Five and one-half hours is as long as I have done it on a case. That's a long time. Of course, I have a slight advantage there: I can set the GE up automatic and go off and lean on a chimney or something, you know, and just let it run.

But actually, I didn't ever, while I was running this, have any real tendency to, you know, myself, get awfully bored, or upset with it, because it's enormously interesting how many kinds of reaction this simple process produces. It's *very* interesting.

One of the things that they ascertain is – immediately – that you are trying to get them under complete control. They are sure of this. They become sure of various things – all of them bad – concerning you, an auditor, if they're having a bad time of it.

Now, a case that is under good control may do this for a half an hour; he may do this for half an hour – well controlled, emotionally stable, doing it just fine, and then go to pieces. Just goes to pieces; he just can't stand it anymore, that's all.

And so you can expect, I suppose, that the entrance to many cases would be that you got a very well behaved preclear for a little while. He was being social and then, boy, did he go antisocial.

Now, this procedure, of course, utilizes duplication to an arduous, wicked extent. Duplication is an essential part of any communication. And if you want to get in communication with your preclear, you'd better get him so he can duplicate.

Well, this is the kind of a process where you practically lay somebody down and chop their heads off. I mean, it's this order of magnitude. But it does two things: It produces an effect; you can be sure of that. But it also produces a result (which is the only reason we're using it), and produces that result *faster* than any other process I know.

Now, what do you know? It produces the result faster.

Now, we've all known that Opening Procedure was pretty good. But what part of Opening Procedure was really hot, since you could run anything in 8-C – any step of 8-C could be run by Opening Procedure? You could make a fellow move around and do whatever that step was; take a little figuring on the part of the auditor to get this done, but that's a fact.

Well, duplication is tremendously important – tremendously important. It just can't be overemphasized in a case.

Well, when Opening Procedure ran into duplication, we got an enormous effectiveness, and where it was not used to level out duplication but was used to produce random activity, it was *not* as effective – anywhere near.

So, we have this Procedure 30 built up this far, now. We have it built up to, first, two-way communication – find out if there's a present time problem. Then we can do just a little bit of common Opening Procedure, you know, just to get him used to the idea of moving around and not being embarrassed because they're doing something kind of silly (they often think it very silly, some fellow, that he moves around the room, puts his hand on the table; he can do that, and so forth) – into duplication by Opening Procedure with two objects, picking them up, feeling them, describing them (that makes him communicate, see, he has to describe them) and putting them down in the same place, picking up the other object, describing it and putting it down in the same place, and so on.

All right. So far so good. What would be our next step? Problems: How the preclear is being a problem. He should recognize that he's being his own problem and that he's liable to sit there and be a problem to the auditor.

His total feeling for the race is that it's in such horrible state because it has so many problems. He has never realized that every man is being his own problems, and without those problems he'd have no randomness.

He hasn't realized, for instance, that the physical universe is there to create problems, and life is there to solve them. So, when a person is creating problems, he is just to that degree (that he is creating problems) enmeshed with the physical universe. See that? That's an exact ratio; it's an exact geometric progression. It's just to the degree that he is creating problems that he is enmeshed in the mest universe. This is direct coordination.

We take some little girl, a maybe juvenile delinquent, something of that sort. You could say lots of things about why she's a juvenile delinquent, but certainly it would be this: she's certainly creating a problem. You see? And so therefore, she is being the problem, not being the solver of problems. Well, we want this preclear to be the solver of problems because that is life – where that's the person that adds up and summates ideas and problems – life, the livingness of a person.

The physical-universe part of a person sets up problems. So when our preclear has become totally an unsolvable problem, what have we got? We've got somebody who has completely closed terminals with the physical universe, you see? Can't solve the problem. Somebody else will have to solve him. There he sits, ready to be solved. And he doesn't get solved, because you don't solve him.

Now, one of the ways to audit this fellow – and psychoanalysis has made, I would say, somewhere in the neighborhood of eighty, ninety million dollars doing this – is for somebody to sit there and tell him what's wrong with him. He'll go for this. Somebody will solve his problem for him.

"Now, the reason and the trouble with you is that so-and-so, and so-and-so, and your Oedipus has crossed with your Electra. This is very causative and your reconscious has oblongated. And we recognize this, and at all times you realize that you have problems."

Well, they actually wouldn't buy that as well as they'd buy the statement "You are a problem, you are a problem, you are a problem" – which is what they tell little kids. This is how you get kids under control. You keep saying to them, "You're a problem."

"Oh, I get so discouraged with you. You're always creating some sort of an upset." Of course the kid is creating an upset. If he isn't permitted to solve upsets himself, he'll create an upset. And there's how he got back into the mest-universe valence.

Well then, life is winning as long as it's solving problems, and life is losing as long as it is being a problem. When life itself becomes a problem, it is itself losing. Because he just goes on, it loses sight of the fact that it's a solver of problems.

So what do we do with this case? We could handle him Straightwire. And the first question we'd ask him is "Give me some problems that you don't have to solve at this moment." "Oh, yes, you can certainly get one. Get one problem that you don't have at this moment." "All right – you don't have to solve at this moment, you don't have at this moment." And he could think that over. He'd finally find a series and he'd probably line charge on this, who knows. But he certainly would get a series of these. Now, this takes a little bit of an edge off of it.

And then you would go immediately into this one – *immediately*: "Well, let's see what kind of a problem you can be that would cause trouble to – – – – " (preclear's name). Preclear is named Joe. You say to him, "Now, let's see what kind of a problem you could be that would cause Joe trouble."

And there's your immediate question; you ask him this question quite a few times.

Now, you could search into this considerably more, and always with benefit, but we're trying to get, in this Procedure 30, maximum benefit. So we don't fool with it very long.

Now, we did stick with this Opening Procedure Duplication for quite a while. We stayed with it until our preclear could do it calmly – not apathetically, in an apathetic obedience, but till he could do it, you know? Didn't worry him a bit.

Our next up was to solve this business of him being a problem. Because, listen, if you don't solve that, you might have improved his communications a little bit, but if this individual is totally convinced that *he is a problem*, he will go on looking for you, the auditor, to solve it.

All solutions are other-determined to himself, which means all life is other-determined to himself. So he's in a horrible state. And he'll just sit there in that auditing chair as a problem till the end of time.

Now, let's just blast in and just blast him out of this idea. Well, how long do we run this? We would certainly run it until he got the idea very clearly – without our telling him any further than that – that by golly, he was being an awful lot of problems for himself to solve. But he thinks of himself as somebody else who has to solve him as a problem. And this is a very cute gimmick. And until he recognizes that other people are doing this... And that's the important one! It's really not the important one that he himself is doing it, but that other people are doing it too.

We'd find this a very conversational process, by the way. In our conversation as this goes along, we discover that our preclear is inclining more and more on the third dynamic and less and less on the first dynamic.

Of course, where he is being one thing and the problem is being something else, we've already given him an edge up on the third dynamic. There's two present: there's Joe and his problem. And he's probably being the problem.

We get him to be all kinds of things that he could be that would create a problem for Joe. Well, we could ask him, of course, amplifying the procedure, "Be something that would cause a problem for Mother," "... for Father," for this, for that. Anybody, you know – a teacher.

We could ask him these things, but actually not with the degree of profit when we actually work him out of his own bank. How do you work a guy out of his own bank? Well, that's where he is. He's in the bank.

Now, you'll occasionally find that he's being a series of pictures which cause him trouble. He's being the facsimiles, you see, and the preclear is somebody else. And this is this funny, detached thing that we get in these preclears.

And that brings us up to *the piece de resistance*. That at least gets our case into some degree of workability. We've gotten him over the central hubs. He's been using a computing machine up till the time when we ran problems, and after that he might think.

We get problems out of the road, he'll stop using that computer and he'll start thinking about himself. And so we've got him ready and set up in order to shoot the business to him on granting of beingness.

Now, we work that out. And, of course, when he's willing to go into granting of beingness widely, why, he is really evidently, from what I have observed, a terrifically solved boy.

Now, this is really all there is to Procedure 30.

Opening Procedure By Duplication

Part II

A lecture given on 1 June 1954

A talk to you this morning about manifestations, variations of Procedure 30. I think you've already had a few manifestations. In running this process, now, why, we've had a veteran Scientologist – after fifteen minutes, something like that, of Opening Procedure by Duplication – get up and walk out of the room and say he was leaving Scientology, and so forth. And his auditor was not a part of this unit, who did not hear the lectures, called up to find out "What do I do now?" And he was told in good standard American, "Go out and get him, you son of a b – – . Get him back and finish it off!" Remedy of process.

Now, when it comes to running a procedure, when you don't know really the total liability of the procedure, you can get into some interesting situations. For instance this auditor had completely missed what I was telling you yesterday, which is that you can run this procedure in such a way as to, shall we say, upset a preclear – sometimes even an auditor. It is nothing to have a preclear threaten to leave a session, but to have one actually get out of a session, the auditor, I guess, would have to be in a boil-off or something of the sort. Because you can always stop a man before he reaches the door. You can always tackle him around the knees or pick up a club and say, "All right. Get that book now."

This will take any case that has hung up and is having difficulty, and will blow him up through successive tones. So don't expect that a case will remain static. Now, some auditors have the goal of an auditing session of a good, quiet, orderly preclear. Never have had that goal, particularly, but I scrupulously avoided techniques which merely produced an effect and didn't produce a result.

But here we have a technique which produces an effect *and* produces a result, because when you get through with this, somebody's communication level has been raised.

When you've done this Opening Procedure by Duplication for any length of time whatsoever – above a half an hour – you will see a change of tone in the case.

Now, this change of tone may be the change of tone of the GE. The GE, you see, can change tone. The thetan can change tone. But where we have a GE changing tone, we can then be prepared to have a little bit of a skid on this tone.

When we've done, let's say, Opening Procedure by Duplication on this person, what we were doing was changing the GE's tone. We did it for one hour with considerable pyrotechnics. We laid off at that time and did not do it further; we did something else. Fellow

seemed to be in fairly good shape and so forth. We can expect a few days later to have some semblance of all of this in view again, because the GE is in revolt – at which time you would simply do it again.

This doesn't mean that a fellow slumps because he is run on this. He never returns to the same state that he was in. But the condition deteriorates slightly which you attained by running Opening Procedure, if you do nothing else in the session but Opening Procedure by Duplication. So we shouldn't consider Opening Procedure by Duplication a finished and final thing with a case until we've done it several times.

That even makes it worse, doesn't it?

Here we have our poor preclear and we have processed him for an hour and a half on Opening Procedure by Duplication. We had him picking up a pocket comb and picking up his hat, one after the other, two dissimilar objects. And after he had done this for an hour and a half, examining minutely each one, back and forth, why, he was evidently in pretty good shape. It was a horrible grind; he has emoted all over the place. We find out he's in pretty good shape now; we let it go till the next day or the day after, and we discover that he has deteriorated a little bit from the state we did get him into. You see, we got him into a markedly improved state. All right, this markedly improved state will coast along for a little distance and then will deteriorate somewhat. It doesn't go all the way south.

So we pick him up and we do it some more. Well, this time we get him into pretty good shape.

I didn't want to tell you all this in earlier lectures, because I didn't think you should have all the bad news at once. But we do it some more with him. We find out that this time he emoted more rapidly and he really got even more bombastic, but he came up to a point where he seemed to be higher than he was previously. This state will not deteriorate to the degree that the first one did.

Now let's say we let him go a day or two, something like that; we find out that this tone that we have brought him to has deteriorated to the top tone that we reached in the first session. I mean, he has only come down that far.

Well, we could do it again, couldn't we? But would you actually have to do it longer in order to produce the same result, or shorter? No, you would do it shorter. You wouldn't do it the same length of time, the same grind, because you are not trying to attain an end-all in this procedure. This is not a finished, final, ending procedure which fishes up all of the stuff in a case and throws it away, for this reason (now let's look at this *very* bluntly): A thetan who is exteriorized shows a great proclivity for going out and looking at a grain of sand. He will stay there and look at it for just hours. He will find more and more interesting things to see in this grain of sand. He doesn't have a tremendous thirst for randomness because, mainly, he doesn't have any tremendous pressure in the business of living. His body might, but he's now separate and he feels fine and there's nobody going to bawl him out if he doesn't get up, or nobody is going to bawl him out if he doesn't wash his face; he hasn't got a face. He's in pretty good shape, so his pleasure is in studying something, looking at something, getting interested in life.

The most relaxing experience that a preclear (who had, by the way, been utterly psychotic, had been completely raving mad) had ever had in his whole life was when I got him exteriorized, which I did almost by mimicry. What I did was make him move back of his body as a body. You see, I got him to – he could get mock-ups. He was utterly mad but he could get mock-ups. And I had him stand his body up against the door, you see, and then move back from his body standing up against the door, leaving a mock-up there. See, we did this several times. In other words, we had him stand at the door, had him put a mock-up exactly where *he* was as a body, you see, and then move out of the mock-up as a body.

Did this two or three times and he said, " Well, I can move out of the body." Nothing much to that. So I got him exteriorized, started chasing him around here and there, and he got out to, of all oceans, the Indian Ocean. Got out to somewhere in the middle of the Indian Ocean and he found out he had a lot of lines on him, of one kind or another. And he called them by various names. So he dropped these lines into the water to let them cool off. Well, his body was simply parked right there, you see. And I could stay in communication with him if I wanted to, but I asked him how he was getting along and he said he was getting along fine. I asked him if he wanted me to do anything as an auditor and he said no, he was doing all right; soon as he got these lines good and cool, why, he'd feel better about it.

So I simply left him in one of my rooms and went on about my business. Didn't pay any more attention to it, and I expected of course that he would get up and go home sooner or later – he'd re-interiorize, something of the sort. It didn't matter to me, we had obviously broken his psychosis. And if he got along all right, he'd get along all right. But he was certainly in much saner condition than I'd ever seen anybody in. (I was working at that time in a foreign country whose home secretary and I had a little bit of quarrel.) He was real sane, and I left him there.

And that night after supper it suddenly occurred to me, I wondered whether or not the fellow had taken his hat and so forth, because you know, sort of looking around, I felt there was something a little bit vague here. And I looked out in the hall and here was his hat. So I said, "Well, that's real peculiar. There's the fellow's hat. He has obviously left his hat." And I looked around a little further and I said, "By golly, he has left his mock-up here too."

And I went upstairs and went in and talked to him, and he said, " Hello."

"Hello. What you doing?"

He said, " Well, I got them pretty cool now."

This was six hours later. He had just stayed in one place for six hours about a foot above the Indian Ocean, which was mighty calm at the moment – no sea running to amount to anything. And there he was, cooling off some lines. Wasn't even interested in his environment, see, as far as the body was concerned or anything like that. But he wasn't even looking hard at the Indian Ocean; he just set himself a job to do. Well, he felt real calm and he felt real pleasant about the whole thing.

Well, I ran some – working at that time, first time I was working with duplication. You saw it, by the way, in *Six Steps to Better Beingness*. Of course the hard run that duplication was getting doesn't reflect in *Six Steps to Better Beingness*, but it could. You could just

run Six Steps to Better Beingness duplication too, you know? One object and then another object and the first object and the other object.

Well, you know, this fellow was in good communication, and he was able to stay in one place, and he was just able to just do fine. And he was trying to pick himself out a mountaintop so he could stay there for a while. Well, he thought that a couple of centuries would be enough, kind of rest him up a little bit and, you know, let him think over the situation somewhat. And his measure of time was quite fabulous. His idea of being bored wasn't with him anymore because he had of course licked the barriers. All boredom is, you see, is just the threat of a barrier.

Pulled him back close to his body again, he reactivates the GE. Zoom. The GE starts to go into a flat spin, one way or the other.

We found out that we had to audit his body just as such. (This is a very early experimental process.) We had to audit his body as such. This was the condition. The preclear as a thetan wasn't crazy, but the body was. And every time he started pouring a little energy in the direction of that body, whatever ridges it had that would go into insanity would simply go insane. Now, he could control this body if he tried hard, but it meant that he had to approximate it. And we had quite a problem on our hands, and we did a lot of thinking this thing over, until we finally decided that it would be a very good thing to drill this body very arduously until whatever force it had in it that was kicking up would itself go into apathy.

Well, we did just that, and boy, that body went into apathy – *believe me* – and went down through apathy into a controllability.

What happens to a body when you run too much Opening Procedure on it, however? What happens? You're bringing the body up scale as a thetan. How long will it come up scale as a thetan? Till it's damned restless.

Well, there's our point. There's where your Opening Procedure collapses a little bit or comes back. Therefore, it isn't an end-all process, is it?

You could actually, evidently, run Opening Procedure long enough on a body to finally exteriorize the body GE from the body, if you can get that kind of a complexity. But however you run it, everything the body has been revolting against is liable to come to the surface immediately and intimately and abruptly. That's liable to be quite violent. What's the body doing? The body has been threatening these revolts for a long time. The thetan quite ordinarily has the body in indifferent control. And the body, of course, runs up through these things, blasts through some of its ridges and the thetan discovers that he can handle the body regardless of what it is doing – and that is what the thetan discovers.

And that's why your Opening Procedure is effective. It is *more* effective with the thetan *exteriorized* than interiorized – much more effective. But if we ran it long enough on the body itself and if we addressed the body itself, to run it, we would probably get some weird manifestation of some new thetan showing up or something weird happening. We wouldn't quite be prepared to say exactly what would happen.

First place, it's not a possibility to audit this straight on the body. The body itself is an animal. On a stimulus-response level it has some intelligence, but you start to drill that intel-

ligence in any way, shape or form and it has to come up through too many strata. Well, so much for that. There's no reason to belabor the point.

The main point I'm trying to make is: (1) Opening Procedure is violent. Opening Procedure by Duplication is violent. (2) The condition attained after an hour and a half or so of Opening Procedure by Duplication can be expected in the next day or so to deteriorate, but not to the level where the preclear's body was originally, and would have to be done again to that degree in order to pick up and stabilize the tone.

Now, I've done it three sessions running, each one about five days apart. See, that is to say, three sessions: Run a session, then five days later run a session, then five days later run a session. And on the last session there was a stability attained simply by this process.

But this is not an end-all process. This process gets the case into shape so the case will do a good job of following your instructions and will do a good job of communicating, and picks up the communication tone of the individual.

Therefore, the length of time you care to run this as an auditor is markedly shortened from the degree that you're running it now. If it was an end-all process, which itself went for broke, this would be the way you would run it: You would run it an hour and a half, or something like that, or two hours. You would wait a day, two days, three days, something like that; you would run it for another hour or two. And you would go three, four days, something on that sort, and you would run it again on the preclear for a half an hour or an hour. And you'd go a few more days and you would run it again on the preclear for fifteen minutes or a half an hour. And then you would have attained a stable state and you would have improved his condition. Run in that fashion it is an end-all process, but not run really in the fashion which you yourself intend to run it with Procedure 30.

It is quite a process: simply Opening Procedure by Duplication, simply running this on a preclear, just as I've scheduled it there. We ran it five sessions on a preclear, the first session two hours long, the remaining sessions an hour long. We would attain more with the GE and the preclear than with many other processes, and we certainly would have put the preclear into excellent communication.

Now, that would be a way to run it. And if you were going to run nothing but that – if you were going to handle a psycho, for instance, you would run nothing but that over that length of time. But this is the way you would run it. It isn't the kind of a process which you would do today and then say, "This preclear is now in good condition and will remain in good condition forevermore." He won't. It would be a process which you would run over a period of two or three weeks, giving overall auditing time during those two or three weeks, maybe six or seven hours, maybe a couple of hours worth of it the first crack and then an hour per session on the remaining sessions. And you would have yourself a stable result.

But let's look now at how it is combined in Procedure 30. It is in Procedure 30 to get the preclear out of his incipient explosion so that it won't get in your hair as an auditor. And just consider Opening Procedure by Duplication – although it in itself is *very* therapeutic – just consider Opening Procedure by Duplication as something by which you, the auditor, are going to monitor the preclear so that he really will be able to do what you say.

Now, if a case were to find it consistently difficult to communicate with you, if a case were consistently seeing everything black, if the case consistently was occluded and consistently twisted your orders and so forth, you would simply *have to* – you would have no other *choice* but to sit down and grind with Opening Procedure by Duplication on to this case until he was actually out of the woods on it.

Now, why do you say any lapsed time is necessary between sessions? Well, actually, it isn't. I'm talking now about a professional practice. This is how you would schedule these things optimally. You would make just a little less progress by doing it a couple hours a day for two or three days. You would invest maybe 30 percent more auditing time because the case hadn't had a chance to settle out, but you would get there just in two or three days, couple, three hours a day. I mean, the time period is not really necessary in there. But you can *save* some time for yourself in a professional practice by scheduling it over a period of three, four weeks, you see, and letting the fellow settle out.

This gets him matched back against his environment and saves you time in the long run. He goes back into his environment; he gets restimulated. Then he comes back for an auditing session and you do things to him and he blows that. And he goes into the environment again, and you actually, day by day, are getting another type of environment which you're running out of the preclear. It would be an end-all process if you did this. It would be an answer in itself – just Opening Procedure by Duplication. That's all you'd do with the preclear.

It's a *fantastic* process in the way it will blow a case. Now, not hanging any liabilities on anybody, but listen, if a case explodes or blows under this, get this: there is *no other process* known in Scientology which will break loose a covert communication line which is twisting a process.

If a case blows, that means the case had a tendency to twist a process, you see, because he can't duplicate entirely. And so he was sliding out of your hands as an auditor. As long as he can slide out of your hands as an auditor, he then will alter a process every time that process gets him into going which is too rough for him. And he's got to go through that rough going. And you won't be able to drive him through with a concept.

So you have Opening Procedure by Duplication standing there as the only thing known at this time which will push a case all the way through into a good communication and an ability to duplicate your auditing techniques.

If you just did this for a little while with a case, you would still get an improved communication line. If you did it for many, many hours with a case on consecutive days or consecutive weeks, you would get a total improvement in communication on the part of the case. This is a certainty.

But where your case blows, gets upset or excited, you can look at this fact: that you must have invested – if you audited this case by other processes earlier – a great deal of time trying to get the case to (quote) "break through the sound barrier." Case didn't.

Now, why does it require a little violence? One of the things that happens is the individual knows that he mustn't display any violence, and this technique brings him up to a point where he displays it, and he finds out nothing happened to him. So, in itself he has been per-

mitted, you should realize, to act in a rather reactive fashion without the world caving in on him. This in itself gives him a tremendous confidence.

Did you ever see somebody that got mad and then found out nobody objected and then was cocky evermore?

It's an interesting thing. I met a dog one time. He was a good friend of another dog I knew. He had been pummeled around by his master about barking and so forth. And one day he went into a complete screaming rage. He was away from home, and he went into just this horrible rage at another dog, and he barked and growled.

And he had put to rout a slightly larger dog (this had really nothing to do with this). But he snapped and snarled, and after the other dog had gone away, he snapped and snarled at the picket fence and the lilac bushes and the porches and the people on the walk and so forth. And he was just having a fine time snap-pin' and snarlin', believe me.

These two guys standing on the street there, they took a look at him and they laughed and they said, "He's really feeling his dog biscuits, isn't he?" And they were sort of pleased with him, because he was such a ferocious-looking dog all of a sudden.

And this dog looked this environment over and he decided he *could* get mad. He was never the same dog – never was. Before that time he had walked with his tail never any higher (this is tone scale on the dog) – never any higher than horizontal, and after that he sort of tickled the back of his head with it.

Here's part, then, of Opening Procedure and any such process where your preclear actually can get mad. If you demonstrate to him that he mustn't get mad at you, and mustn't get mad at your presence, you'll depress him. What you do, you see, is just let him go on getting mad, let him go on getting into any state he wants to get into and keep on putting him through the process. Frees him up in all directions.

But Opening Procedure by Duplication is used in Procedure 30 to put the case into the best possible condition that you could get him in, in order to go on auditing him. Saves you an *enormous* amount of time. Now, the amount of time saved in this is probably in terms of scores of hours, if not hundreds.

Now, if you have a case that is hanging up, it may very well go right on hanging up unless you get as violent as Opening Procedure by Duplication. And if the case is hanging up to any degree, why, your remedy, of course, is Opening Procedure by Duplication.

It has its own role; it is in itself its own therapy. But what you're trying to do as an auditor is blast him through places where he would hang up, and which it might take you *years* to get him through entirely.

So it isn't just a passing thought, this process; it seems to contain in it all those elements which go to make a case stable, and therefore is quite important to the auditor. But if an auditor works this without expecting violence, if he works this without expecting that he's going to have an awful time every few preclears, why, he's even more of an optimist than I am, which is impossible.

The Importance Of Two-Way Comm During Opening Procedure By Duplication

A lecture given on 3 December 1954

Let's examine, for a change, the cause end of this communication line; you all too often will examine only the effect end of the line. You see? Because there's where interest gets centered.

Let's examine that cause end of the line and let's discover something of tremendous interest about it. That cause, if it desires to get anything like an ARC effect at the effect point, must take into consideration that the effect point is often quite incapable of mocking itself up as cause. Let's take a look at that. See?

Here's cause, distance, effect. Now, to get a perfect duplication, it's necessary that effect mock itself up in some fashion or another, you see, in order to get into duplication of this cause over here, in order to receive the communication at all.

Give you an example of that. You're an American, you're over in France. A Frenchman comes up and he says, "*Blabalizam-zum-zeeblum-blum-comment?*"

And you say, "Huh!" You weren't an effect at all, really. Not the kind of effect he intended: he wanted you to put your baggage on the van or something. And you sure get a kind of an "only one" feeling when you wander around doing this a lot. And people come up, they don't speak English, they don't speak deaf and dumb, they don't speak Boy Scout semaphore – nothing! You know? They come up and they throw a lot of verbalization in your face which is supposed to mean something. You don't comprehend it.

Furthermore, you are acutely aware of the fact that their customs – the ways of doing things – are probably unfathomably strange.

For instance, to go into a very interesting point as far as France is concerned: You are an American; your idea of plumbing and a French idea of plumbing are two entirely different things – entirely different things.

The whole problem of trying to walk into a civilization is actually the problem of being able to mock yourself up. You don't willingly mock yourself up as a Frenchman; you don't willingly mock yourself as part and parcel of all these strange and outrageous customs – such

as plumbing. You don't mock yourself up in many ways, and therefore you remain to a very marked degree out of communication. This would only be natural, wouldn't it? Here's somebody with a tremendous difference of custom, and so forth, and you don't know about this.

All right. Now, you can understand this quite easily on the effect point, but how about the cause point? Does the cause point ever have to mock itself up in any way? You've said it. Much more so than the effect point, because the effect-point mock-up is being assisted by cause, but the cause-point mock-up is *not* being assisted. And it's this fact that it's not being assisted which causes people to think they need help, and so forth. You know? They get used to being over here on the effect side and they get over here on the cause side, and they say, "Where's all the help?"

So they invent an analyzer and a computer and a reactive bank and all kinds of things in order to be over here on the cause point. Because the cause point has to mock itself up just like the effect point, or subordinate effect points – which are not really capable of any great change, which are not capable of mocking themselves up – will never be communicated to unless cause mocks himself up. Get the idea?

So in order to deliver effect, cause has to be able to mock himself up on a much higher self-determinism than effect, because effect is assisted in the mock-up by cause. See?

When the Frenchman, being cause, walks up to you and says, "*Garble-garble-yop-yop*. That will be eighteen thousand francs" or "That's... you see, you had breakfast... mm... *comment*, rah-da and parsley and a blonde. Let's see now, that's eighty-two thousand dollars; that's twenty francs" – you just don't comprehend this at all.

But you're sure assisted, aren't you? He is asking you to mock yourself up as a complete fool (because he obviously is one). But he is assisting this. You see? You have a model.

Farmer Brown comes in and he says, "Well, *rah-rah-rah!*," in a clear-cut, college Kansas accent, and you're assisted to the effect that all you have to do is copy what he did. You see? (See how that is? That's just real cute.) But you, in talking to him, without seeing him, would be completely – completely – adrift unless you looked at him first and then became the effect of his first communication, which is his appearance. You saw, although they weren't addressed to you, his appearance and mannerisms. You made yourself the effect of appearance and mannerisms and then you talk to him. And you say, "*Raff-hrawf-hrawf-hramf*," however they talk in Kansas.

Now, there is the crux of the matter. How are you going to walk in as an original cause? And then mock yourself up in such a way that you'll be understood? Huh! That's a bigger problem, isn't it? A problem which requires imagination, the ability to change, vary and particularly – and let's put our thumb on this one – the ability to be. The ability to be. That's what it requires – much more so than at effect. The ability to be at the point of cause is necessary for a good communication. You have to be able to be. In other words, you have to be able to mock yourself up.

Now, if you instantly, addressed by this Frenchman, were to mock yourself up as a French official – were you able to do this, you see – and so forth, we would find out that it was all on the house. See? Actually, something could come out of an interchange of this char-

acter. You all of a sudden say, "Garble-garble-comment" and so forth. And "What are you doing without your identification papers?" or something of the sort.

And he would say, "Oh-h-h, huh. *Out, out, merci*. Thank you very much. No checkie. *Adios*," or whatever they would say in French. You get the idea?

You'd have to mock yourself as something he recognized as cause. But what kind of a second sight would this take? What does this effect recognize as cause? All you have to do, then, is of course mock yourself as what this effect point normally recognizes as cause, and of course you're on the cause end of the line on a seniority level, which is a different thing slightly here.

The ability to be. The ability to be.

It is, therefore, the cause end of the line which you should examine, because that's where you're trying to put the preclear. You are not really trying to put the preclear at the effect end of the line. Now, if you understand that real thoroughly, you'll see what we mean by the increase of self-determinism. We mean we're increasing this preclear's ability to be at the cause end of the line.

When you first get him in auditing, you came in the auditing room, and he says, "*He-he-he-he*," why, you recognize that he is not quite at the cause end of the line. In fact, he's probably not at the effect end either. He's probably halfway between the two points, being a communication particle.

They get that way, by the way; they drift away from the cause end and they get on the line itself and they are a particle on the line. A lot of people walking down the street, if you walked out and wrote an address on their chest and put a stamp on their forehead and put them into a mailbox, they'd be the happiest people you ever saw in your life. They're a communication particle; they are a message, they don't even just *have* a message, they *are* one.

The exhausted messenger throwing himself off of his horse and dying at the king's feet as he announces the defeat, of course, is being his message. That isn't any reason why anybody should kill horses or messengers just to tell some king that he lost a couple of chunks of real estate. But they used to do it all the time. You see? In other words, these people could very easily be communication particles. And it's not cause and effect at all.

Now, actually, the decline is simply this: from able cause to fixed cause, and then they start riding out on the line; from an effect which can receive, to an effect which has to receive, to an effect which won't receive, see (desire, enforce, inhibit), and then they drift out on the line. See? So you'd get – eventually somebody would get hung up avoiding all causes, avoiding being cause, avoiding anything else which was cause.

You get the Indians going around and saying, "Well, the reason the buffalo haven't come back is because of the dogs; we'll have to kill all the dogs." See, they avoid the cause. They can't look at a white man anymore, and a Winchester 1876 repeating rifle. They just completely lost cause.

Next thing you know, why, everybody is subscribing to the ghost dancers. The ghost dancers were people who had shirts. And they were just common, ordinary agency shirts.

They said on them, "Made in Worcester, Massachusetts." And they'd take these shirts, and they'd bless them, you know, and draw magic symbols on them. These shirts, of course, would stop a bullet – observably would stop a bullet. And these people went out and made communication particles of themselves by charging U.S. troops unarmed.

You get the idea, though? See? I mean, they eventually drift out on the line. Whatever they do, they finally get on the line as a particle or a symbol. They go from cause into the state of symbol, they go from effect into the state of no symbol, but they get on the line. They slide around. They get mass, meaning, mobility.

Now, there is nothing real bad about this, but let's restore this preclear's ability. When you walk into the room and you are fairly nicely dressed, you know your business and so forth, this fellow is incapable – he is absolutely incapable – of addressing you physically or verbally in any acceptable line. See? He just is not going to address you in some acceptable line that makes an easy communication. It's because he can't change; he's fixed.

The fact that you were there, that the warden of a prison walked in, that the soda jerk down at the corner walked in, that the president of the United States walked in would find him in the same fixed state of address. You see? Wouldn't make any difference who approached him to talk to him, we would find him fixed. See, he can't change this.

Well, if he can't change, he is expecting all the time that he's going to be the effect, isn't he? So we see this preclear sitting there, "Well, go on and audit, I will be an effect." "I'm the effect. I'm the effect. Nothing happening. I'm the effect." Get the idea? That's why they sit there: they can't change; they're unwilling to be cause. So it's up to you to get them so they are at least conscious that they are moving something, that they are not being moved. That's why you get them around touching walls, and so on.

But the essence of this, you see, is contained in duplication. This person cannot duplicate you as he comes in; therefore, he can't talk with you. But that's true of him in all of life. He recognizes his inability to duplicate life, and he recognizes that he can't get on a two-way communication, because he would have to take a glance at life, like we did at Farmer Brown: mock yourself up somewhat as life and then communicate to it in such a way that it then was assisted in its receipt. It will receive your messages if it recognizes that you are communication source. See? It will receive your messages if it recognizes you as a communication source.

How does it do that? Well, you have to be like *it*. In other words, you have to assist its duplication.

Now, this does not mean that an auditor has to get down on the floor and grovel and duplicate all of the weird and bizarre things that a psychotic would. You see? Because, actually, all you're duplicating there is a circuit. But certainly an auditor could be called upon to duplicate any average motion that the psychotic made, any average action that he took. Psychotic folds his hands; auditor folds his hands. Perfectly easy. He sees, then, a physical gesture being duplicated.

Well, all right. What's the common denominator as we go down this line here? What's the common denominator? Common denominator on this inability is duplication of all this

communication difficulty. It'd be the inability to duplicate. So much so that reality could be called and rephrased and redefined as the degree of duplication. Reality equals degree of duplication. Affinity is actually the distance and the particle size – ARC. And communication, of course, is cause, distance, effect.

The degree of duplication is what makes reality. You are as real to those around you as they can receive you. That's a fascinating thing.

You know, did you ever get some kind of an inkling around your family that they weren't quite receiving what you were talking about?

Well, that's because they fixed in their minds a long time ago the fact that they weren't duplicating you: You were little, see? You were different in size. This all by itself would be sufficient to make a family incapable of receiving a child's or a person's data, information.

All right, let's look at that. Grandpop is a fairly successful manufacturer, and this grandson he has – he's seen this grandson ever since he was about so tall; he's been running around while Grandpop was in his middle years, and so on. And the kid goes off and studies promotion, sales promotion, with all the verve of youth and so forth, and a good background and a good inheritance on this whole line – and boy, he could give Grandpop cards and spades on the subject, you see, of promotion.

He moves into Grandpop's sphere of activity, puts a suggestion, memo, on Grandpop's desk – he's working in the place now. Do you think it ever gets read? "Ha-Ha! That's just from Jimmy." You know?

Guy goes out and starts to work for another company, and it starts outselling the whole field; wipes out Grandpop. See, "he didn't know what he was talking about."

But Grandpop has already conceived the idea, you see, that the smallness is not a duplication. And *that* being the primary idea connected with this individual, then he knows that all he can receive, really, from this individual is "*Gaga*" and "*Ga-gah* and give me a sucker." See, you know, and "Gimme a nickel." Something on this order would be his basic communication line with this child. So afterwards, he could not then take the child's communication line different and seriously. But the child changes; grows up.

The main impatience that you ever had with parents or anybody like that around you, is their basic idea, as far as you're concerned, is that you were small. And you come around later, and parents are getting on in years and they're ailing and you say, "Why don't you do..." and you give them some sensible suggestion – you're going to help them out or something like that. Or "Why don't we do so-and-so," and you find out that almost anything you suggest is unacceptable, because they know they can't duplicate your size. Because they know, if they know anything, that you're about a foot tall or two feet tall or something like that – wherever they are stuck on the track as far as you are concerned.

Well, Mama very often gets stuck on the track at birth, see, with the child-first view of the child and so forth. And after that the child just doesn't ever have a sensible solution.

But the child is better adapted to the modern environment than Mama is.

Saw a wonderful example of this: I saw a little girl whose advice was actually invaluable. This kid was very alert, very bright, really could look. And this little girl practically ran her mother's life for her, and her mother had no suspicion of this at all – no slightest suspicion of this. But the little girl was also bright enough to be a covert communicator, as far as Mama was concerned, and she would give Mama acceptable communications. The suggestions which she gave Mama always came from Mrs. Brown. (This is going to be a great shock some day when Mama discovers there is no Mrs. Brown that lives four doors down the street, you see?) The kid was utilizing another mock-up in order to do all the communication and advice and what they did about life and had for breakfast and so forth. Kid always had to attribute to some other source, you see, in order to get a communication through. But this kid was running Mama's life. There was no doubt about it whatsoever.

All right. An auditor sits there working, having a good auditing session, or something of the sort. He may be under the delusion that the preclear is getting better. It may really be a delusion, you see, that the preclear is getting more and more acceptable to society, and it may be that the preclear is getting simply much more like the auditor. You get how this would be?

Well, the entire field of psychoanalysis is built upon that. If we could just make the patient like the analyst, why, then we would be all set. They have to swap valences or go through some magic rite, as I was taught early, in order to accomplish this.

Well, that's not the goal of the auditor. The goal of the auditor is to return a little more self-determinism to this individual.

Well, how many dozen ways could you run duplication? How many dozen ways could you run it?

You could run it the basic way: highly stylized, very pure technique, and simply run it like that. That is the most effective of all the processes we know on duplication. Book and Bottle, they call it in Great Britain. You walk from one to the other and back and forth.

An auditor sometimes fails with this process, though. Why? Because he doesn't keep up a two-way communication. He doesn't keep up a communication. He lets the preclear go on to an automatic endurance run, without actually finding out what the preclear really feels, really expresses, what it's all about, what the sensations are.

This doesn't mean that the auditor even vaguely varies his auditing commands. The auditing commands are always the same; they are given in the exact order they are given on your command sheet; no difference at all except this: *Let the preclear talk to you!* Get that as a difference?

If you can't get him at the cause point of a communication line, you're failing. So we make the preclear talk. How do we do this?

We give the exact commands, we use the exact commands. This is one thing I have really got to teach you: to keep continually two-way communication while you're running *any* process, without actually varying the process or coming an *inch* off the process, right there, see?

You throw in on the communication line what is known as "dunnage," the stuff you put in to keep the cargo safe in a ship.

And this guy goes over, you know, woodenly, picks up the book. You say, "Look at it." You say, "What's it look like?"

"Book..."

Na-a-a-a-h-o-u! Something wrong with this boy's communication.

There is nothing at all wrong. You see, you have got to get those commands in there just exactly in the order that they are: you've got to get him from the book to the bottle; to the book, to the bottle; to the book, to the bottle, just exactly.

Well, he says, "Book."

"Are you sure that's a book?"

"Hm. Well, yes. Yes, I am." You've busted him out of his automatic. By failing to demand to be answered, by failing to insist that the action be knowingly accomplished and by failing to listen when the preclear – he's picked up the book for the 565th time and all of a sudden the whole room goes purple and he says, "My God!"

And you say "What is its weight?" Cut your throat. You've just cut the preclear's throat.

See, he says, "Oh, my God!"

And you say, "What's the matter?" Sometimes they won't even tell you. "What's the matter?" you say.

"The room! It's purple!"

"What is?"

"The room. It's all purple! Everything's purple!"

And you say, "Is that so? Well, how is it now?"

"(sigh) Purple."

"Well, okay. Okay. How do you feel?"

"Oh, not so bad, I don't feel bad about it. It's okay."

"All right. Well, what color is that book?"

"Oh, yes, it's a – it's a purple book, ha-ha."

Now, you *see* something happens to him; for God's sakes find out what it is. You see that he is really going through it like an automaton; for heaven's sakes, shake him out of it. By doing what?

He has told you for the fifty-fifth time "It's cool." Find out that the process works better this way. This is the only thing I am telling you. You see, don't vary your sequences of the process or the commands at all. But you're not above putting some two-way communication in there, see – getting him to say something, so on.

All of a sudden, you could make him describe the thing. He says, "Cool."

And you say, "What do you mean by cool?"

"Well, cool. That's what I mean by cool."

"Oh, come on, come on, come on. What do you mean by cool?"

"Well, as a matter of fact it's not cool, it's hot!" For fifty-five times, you see, automatically he was saying, "Cool, cool, cool." Get the idea? He wasn't feeling it anymore. He was still running a time fifty-five times ago.

Now, if you don't make them communicate, if you don't make them describe, if you don't shake them up and if you don't listen to them, it all goes on an automaticity, and it just goes on and on and on. And I swear, if you ran it on a total automaticity, if you really get him to run it on an automaticity and went on running on it, I bet you could run it for 250 hours with no change in the preclear except he'd get tired legs. Get the difference there?

Now, the key of this whole thing is *each moment must be a new moment. Each moment must be a new moment; each action must be a new action.* And gradually he peels apart these actions so they are different actions, so each moment is new. And that is the primary manifestation of Opening Procedure by Duplication – the newness of each moment.

So when he says – he just gets repetitive; he gets repetitive – you get suspicious. You say, "What color is that book?" That's the command you gave right exactly at that point, you understand? "What color is that book?" "What color *is* that book?"

"Oh, it's purple."

You say, "Is that the only color on it? Describe it."

"Well, there's some green on the back, and some gold over on this side, yeah, and some black under the flap. Hey, what do you know? All these colors."

All right. You could ask him "Describe it" anytime.

I have even gone this far with Opening Procedure by Duplication: "You keep saying it's a book. Will you please describe it as an object." New frame of reference, see?

"Oh, it's a book, and..."

"I won't let you describe it anymore as a book." See? Just like that. "Describe it."

"Well, I don't know what you're gettin' at, but it's a... Well, it's a...it's a... it's a rectangular... it's a rectangular object made out of paper. Cloth. It's cloth on the outside of it. I never noticed that before. You know, books have cloth on the outside of them." And he's back into an interest in the process. Get him going through it again.

Only don't take ever a mechanical answer! Don't ever vary the process, you understand. Interlard it. That's not varying the process. Interlard the process with communication. Discover *what* that book seems to him now. *What* that bottle seems to him now. *What is* the weight of it? "Oh, come on now, what *is* the weight?"

But I've seen boys run it, by the way, with two typewriters or something, you know? It's incorrect, they have to be two dissimilar objects. They would go up and pick up a great

big typewriter, you know, as part one of the objects-back and forth picking up this typewriter. My God. Preclear would die. Preclear got a lot stronger.

You could even get that on automatic. But the second these responses become monotonous, you know that your preclear has simply settled down to being an effect. And you are trying to get your preclear to be cause, so let's make him originate communications to you concerning the object. That doesn't mean that each new communication has got to be new and original, but it does have to tell you that he *is* experiencing that instant and not some other instant. See?

Opening Procedure by Duplication pulls apart all the moments on the time track. See, it pulls them apart because of the duplication. Unless each moment is a new moment, then you don't have that occurring. See, if he goes over –"Book." "Bottle." "Book." "Bottle." "Book." "Bottle." Boo.

"It's a book."

"What is a book?"

"Well, it's a... It's a word."

"Well, is that an object you've got in your hands?"

"Well, yes, come to think about it, it's not a word I got in my hand." See, you know?

Very different realizations come through to a preclear. You've got to learn how to throw "dunnage" into auditing – extra comments, new demands, insistences. You've got to know that your preclear can talk, and he must talk, and he must describe what is happening to him. And when something happens he is supposed to call it to your attention, and you are supposed, then, to pay some attention to it.

That doesn't mean that you go off the process, but for heaven's sakes let him tell you about it. Do you know that preclear after preclear has been just about ready to exteriorize with full perception and has realized this with a... You know that they will exteriorize on Beingness Processing or on Opening Procedure by Duplication? They will! And he is just about ready to exteriorize, and he wants to tell the auditor about this fact, that he's just about to *do* this, and the auditor gives him the next auditing command. See? Isn't interested. And the moment the auditor is not interested – bang!

I've seen guys who have just gone dead in their heads through not being permitted to communicate by the auditor. The auditor is not there to suppress communication on the part of the preclear.

Remember that an obsessive outflow is not a communication. You have to know that. But actual communication on the part of the preclear must not be suppressed by the auditor. See?

So there is the trick. And the real place it shows up is in Opening Procedure by Duplication, because you *do* have to keep to the *exact process*, see? He does have to go repetitively through these exact motions. But you have to make sure that he is experiencing these things, one to the other. And you do that by talking.

You try it out and you'll see what I mean, and all of a sudden you'll find Opening Procedure by Duplication working for you much more speedily than it ever has before, and it will work fast.

And don't let me *ever catch anybody* here looking out the window when a preclear has an enormous piece of news to impart. He's got something to impart: Don't let me find the auditor looking out the window auditing on a sort of a crank basis saying, "Yeah. Well, go over to the book. Now, touch that wall" or something of the sort, without letting a preclear do it. Because the preclear gets a tone drop as a result of this, which is *zooooommmmm!* It'll actually stick him in his head; it will do all kinds of things. I have seen it turn off perception.

One time a preclear, somehow or other he had made up some kind of a system way back in the past someplace, that every body he had was categorized, and during auditing he all of a sudden was sitting there and he found himself looking at about a thousand bodies of one kind and another, all of which were in proper niches. And this is the strangest thing he had ever seen in his life. And it was in full color, and the man did not ordinarily have *any visio* at all. And he was looking straight at this terrific category of past bodies in facsimile form. And he was very startled and he wanted to tell the auditor about this, tried to, and the auditor simply gave him the next auditing command. And this preclear quit, just like that. And his visio went off, he went into apathy and so forth. I know, because I got the case immediately afterwards. And my God, did I have to work to get that damned tone drop out of there. And I finally did get it out by spotting spots where the man had been audited or treated. The thing was sitting on top of a tonsillectomy.

Various things happen. You see, the universe represses communication. The only thing that you can do *wrong* in this universe, according to this universe – but actually the only thing you can do right – is communicate. See?

And as a little boy, he was trying to tell the doctor that he was about to throw up while the doctor was taking out his tonsils. And the doctor just went in then and really started to take out his tonsils. "*Yah-yah-yah-yah-y...!*" But there were a thousand locks like this immediately underlying one of these – he starts to communicate, somebody stops him, just like that, see. And it just – zoom!

I could just plain show you how to do this, teach you how to do this. We'll make sure you spend some time on it. Opening Procedure by Duplication, letting the preclear talk, demanding the thing really be described, keeping it out of the machine category, making each moment new and fresh in that Opening Procedure by Duplication, and never varying its auditing commands. You see, you can say other things than the auditing commands, but that doesn't give you any license to vary the auditing commands. You can say new and different things, but you can't say a new and different auditing command. See? So auditing commands are all the same, but you just make sure that a communication is going on at the same time.

The auditor is not being run, you know? That's what most auditors forget. They sit there and kind of go into the apathy of going through the monotony of these steps, and they go out of communication.

Two-way communication must be interwoven with all auditing. And when an auditor is really taught to stay on the process and yet two-way communicate, boy can he audit and does he get results – wham!

Okay.

Granting Beingness

A lecture given on 1 June 1954

That lives which is validated. A body is dependent upon granted beingness. It is dependent upon granted beingness. It itself does not grant very much beingness.

Now, a thetan after a while could also become dependent upon granted beingness. And let's tie this back in to license to survive, approval, applause, all these other factors that we have struck from time to time, and we see that that individual who objects to the granting of beingness by other individuals, of course, is immediately going to deny his body the right to be. A horrible little backlash. If the body is dependent – this body, this mock-up that he picked up is dependent – upon endowment from the environment, and the thetan objects to endowment from the environment, we then see that the body is being denied the very substance on which it lives.

Here is eating; here's applause. People get below the level of accepting applause, by the way – accepting praise, accepting applause, applause – people get way below this level. At that time, why, they could only be appreciated if they were paid in money, or appreciated if they were fed. They would recognize this as appreciation, but would not appreciate praise or applause. And when you would give them praise, you would upset them. Above this level, a concert pianist might very well feel, after a good, solid round of applause, like he'd just had a full meal. He would feel very good. He would have a glow about him. He's been granted beingness.

Well, maybe he as a thetan hasn't been granted beingness, but certainly his mock-up's been granted beingness, see. And this demonstrates itself very peculiarly.

Now, you understand, in that, it can be measured in the physical universe. You understand now that we are not talking about a philosophic concept. I hope we're being very clear on this. We're not talking, in granting of beingness, about a philosophic concept; we are talking about a totally mechanical, measurable concept.

The experiment which backs this up is this beep-meter experiment: You've got this beep meter and you have somebody hold it to his cheek, and then you go off someplace and you turn on the beep meter. By doing what?

By looking at him and connecting the guy with the electrode. Over a distance with a beam from you to him? No, just by seeing that there is a connection between the body and the electrode, and at that moment you'll get a beep, and the meter up to that time has been completely silent.

This is the granting of beingness, and it is a measure of the ability of an individual to endow. And this is in direct coordination with the ability of an individual to heal, and this has

a lot of other indexes that go right along with it. But we're talking together now not so much as therapists or philosophers or a "Gee whiz, I hope" sort of a thing. What we are talking to and talking about is a very mechanical arrangement, such as we would discuss electric lights, or something like that. I mean this field of granting of beingness is of that order of certainty. It is as certain as that.

Now, when you get into running this you could then conceive, as I told you, the complexities of it could very well weigh down the entire case. In other words, you could make this so complex that a case would simply get lost in these interchanges, because these interchanges are very complex. It isn't just in eating or in sex or in other things that we get this interchange. We get it all through existence. Everywhere we have a third dynamic, we have beingness being granted to some degree. And so we of course have a terrifically complex system.

And you could draw this society, if you had that much patience, for any given moment on its complete current hookup on the granting of beingness. You could, if you had that much patience and you looked far enough and so forth. You could get who was granting beingness to what and where and so on, and you'd just take it all. And it would just be like wiring graphs.

Curious, very curious, but certainly not as curious as electricity. Get that: This is not as curious as electricity. Electricity is studied from this assumption: The first postulate one must make to study electricity, it says right in the electrical textbook, is that nobody knows anything about electricity.

Well, we're not starting with that postulate. We can see very clearly that this occurs, much as we see an electrical current occurs, and as we exteriorize and so forth and begin to know ourselves a little better, we can see it actually happening and we can do it. In other words, there is no beingness, we can create beingness. And beingness can come into existence simply by our own postulate that it can come into existence. So we know the genus of the thing. The genus of the thing is a postulate. This postulate goes into an agreed-upon communication system, and results immediately take place. And we can consider it from this angle, and we'll be very successful in processing.

Now, you could use a tremendously complex process to process this. Oh, man. You could use some kind of a Straightwire process, for instance. I don't say that you should, but I say you *could* use such a Straightwire process that would run something like this: "Now name three people that you wouldn't mind granting some beingness." "Now name three people that you wouldn't care if they refused to grant beingness to you." "Now, name three people it wouldn't matter if you denied beingness to." "Name three people you wouldn't mind granting beingness to." "Name three people, now, you wouldn't mind taking beingness away from." "Name three people you wouldn't mind if they took a beingness away from you." And we could go on down the line, and if we got this with certainty each time, why, we could do ourselves quite a job here.

The only trouble with that process on the granting of beingness, is it doesn't possess sufficient certainty to be processed. That's all that's wrong with it. Otherwise, it's a fine process.

There's a little rule of thumb here: A process which will not obtain certainty, with the one exception of Havingness... Anybody can pull in havingness; he's certain there's something coming in. He does have a certainty of that. He may not be certain what it is or certain whether it has form, but there's where certainty belongs in the Remedy of Havingness. You're absolutely *certain* it's there, and so forth. You challenge him like this, why, he might not be, but there is something coming in and he does get certain of it.

Actually, the Remedy of Havingness is the thetan's operation in granting beingness to the body. He grants energy masses to the body by mocking up things and pulling them in on the body, which is in essence granting beingness to the body. And so the body will eventually get well as you continue this process.

All right. The common denominator of processes which determines their workability is, do they bring about a condition of certainty on the part of a preclear? If a process does not bring about or cannot be worked with certainty, then you haven't got any business using it on the preclear as an auditor.

What processes should you work on a preclear? Those processes which can be performed by the preclear with certainty. Certainty, knowingness, recognition, so forth – all the same breed.

So, that tells you then that you could work somebody for a hundred hours without paying any attention to this whole thing of certainty. The preclear would possibly like to call it reality, he'd like to call it a lot of things, but you could work a hundred hours on this preclear and get no advance on his case – I mean, just practically *no* advance on his case. You see why you could do that? The little factor there of certainty. You didn't get him anything he could do with certainty, which is to say, you never increased his knowingness. Never forget, that's our target. We have a synonym for knowingness: certainty.

All right. In selecting processes to work on a preclear, or any kind of procedures, you have to keep this in mind, and you have to keep it in mind very solidly. And when you don't keep it in mind you go awry.

Some of the people in Scientology who have been trained over a long period of time now (one or two of them along the line haven't done too well) may have learned one thing – because that one thing has been pounded on and pounded on and pounded on – and that is you must attain a certainty on the part of the preclear on the process being done. And when those people have learned that, they have learned a tremendous thing. That is a big thing. That, omitted, makes processing unworkable, and that, included, makes processing workable.

And here we are right there on this business of certainty, which we say is knowingness. Does he know that he knows this now? Does he know that that is the case? Is he certain that's the case? The same type of words. You see, we're not processing words, so we can use any kind of words that will convey our meaning to the preclear. Our only difficulty is, just exactly what do *we* mean by these words? Well, what we mean by this word *certainty*: Is he sure? Is he certain? Is he positive? Does he know? Is it real to him? See? It's all those things under this heading of certainty.

All right. Then it follows that if this granting of beingness could be worked by a Straightwire with a great deal of certainty on the part of the preclear, hurrah, fine, wonderful. Work it. Only you won't find that's a bulk of your preclears. You could throw it in just to find out, and if it worked that way, why, wonderful, boy, would you – you'd be going right out along the line. Your preclear already would have a pretty good certainty, though, wouldn't he? And he'd be pretty high toned. He'd probably be a thetan exterior to begin with. And so your Straightwire: "Who wouldn't you mind granting beingness to?" "Who wouldn't you mind taking beingness away from?" "Who wouldn't you mind somebody giving beingness to?" "Whom wouldn't you mind receiving some of your being-ness?" "... receiving your mother's beingness?" I mean, we could just go into the most tremendous category here of Straightwire questions, which if they could be answered with certainty, would certainly resolve beingness in all directions.

But *you* as an auditor are up against this: Certainty and knowingness are not a dichotomy, they have no comparative line. It says in the Logics and Axioms there that a datum must be evaluated by a datum of similar magnitude. And when we have the problem of certainty staring us in the face, we don't have data of similar magnitude to compare it with. Certainty *is* certainty, and it's an unfortunate fact that it doesn't have another certainty with which to compare it. See that?

Now, there could be two kinds of certainty, and you could try to get out of it this way. I have tried. You could say there's subjective certainty and objective certainty. And you could compare the subjective certainty to the objective certainty, and you would have something like that. And you start to run this in on a preclear and, by the way, he practically goes through the roof or dives down a manhole.

By the way, awareness is a viewpoint of dimension of alertness, of alive-ness, of this and that, and could be included in this package of being certain. "Are you aware that your mother has granted some beingness to something?" You could ask them, see, "Are you aware?" "Are you certain?" "Do you know?" "Does that seem real to you that she could grant some beingness to it?" Any one of these questions would produce the same thing.

Now, we don't have a dichotomy here, merely because he is under this suppression: If his subjective reality equalled his objective reality, he wouldn't know where the hell present time was. Present time is established by this fact: "What's the realest thing you can contact?" And if that's an engram, he's got high certainty on the engram, God help him. I mean, he's got high certainty on the en-gram and no certainty on the wall, you're looking at a psychotic, see? This engram is really real to him. In an auditing session this can take place: the en-gram is tremendously real to him, and of course the environment at that moment is not real to him at all. But you could have people walking up and down the streets all the time where this is taking place: The alligator that's following along wearing the alarm clocks and snapping at the fellow's heels (shades of Peter Pan) is a certain thing, but the sidewalk is not.

And that is this difficulty: Subjective and objective reality are then a gradient scale of certainty, and we again do not have a dichotomy. Present time is where the greatest certainty is at that moment. That would be the time the fellow had. This is no reason he couldn't be in

five times simultaneously and be certain of all of them, but he'd certainly have to be able to differentiate like mad in order to pull off that trick.

There are a lot of people, by the way, who think they can only see or concentrate on one thing at a time. Curious thing. Fellow showed up (Burke was telling me) at the Freudian Foundation who knew absolutely well that everybody could only contact one thing at a time. And the auditing command was "Hold the two back corners of the room." And the fellow knew this was impossible because you could only hold one, of course. And Burke solved this and he began to do himself a fairly good job of processing afterwards. Burke solved it by asking him to be aware of his right ear and his left ear and his right ear and his left ear, and then asked him "Now, well, do you know you have two ears?" And the fellow of course was certain of both ears simultaneously, so naturally he could know two things at once. And this solved it. He could grab ahold of the two back anchor points of the room.

Well, to some degree or other this scarcity of concentration, which is a scarcity of attention, is in itself the dwindling scale of the condensation of attention. As the individual's attention becomes scarce, he begins to get masses of attention which he mocks up. That's machinery. He starts setting up machinery, because he knows he can't keep attention on this many objects. Therefore, he sets up something to covertly get attention from him while he's doing something else. And that is a machine. A machine is a covert mechanism by which to put attention on more things than the preclear feels he can comfortably put attention on. And so we get machinery and automaticity coming into view with the dwindling spiral, scarcity of attention. Scarcity of attention.

Well, attention and beingness are not quite the same thing. You see, you could have a bored attention, an inactive attention, a vague attention. See? You don't ever have a vague granting of beingness. It's not a vague thing. I mean, a person is either – well, of course he'd say, "Well, I'd just as soon the police of New York City would live, I'd just as soon, I..." This is an apathy. It really isn't a bored attention. It's granting of beingness in apathy. So attention and the granting of beingness just don't quite come a par, because granting of beingness has a different consideration to it.

Please note: At this point in the lecture, a gap exists in the original recordings. We now rejoin the class where the lecture resumes.

An auditor went out of here with his right foot pestering him. It was moving when it wasn't moving. He could sit still and he knew his right foot was moving, but if he looked down at it, it was planted very solidly on the floor.

What had happened here? This individual was carrying around a considerable amount of granted beingness in his body, see, he's carrying around a big mass. He might, you might say, have two bodies. One is his physical-universe body. See that? There's his physical-universe body. And with this body he has another body, and this other body is a mass of granted beingness or stolen beingness or something of the sort. But this body could be coincident with his physical-universe body, and he as a thetan could be in contact with his granted-beingness body, not his physical-universe body. He wouldn't have any sensitivity of being able to touch his forehead, but he could touch a ridge which was sitting somewhere where the forehead was.

There you get your occluded case. He's packed in tight. There you get your person who, when he exteriorizes, exteriorizes as a body. That body is made out of granted beingnesses. He wouldn't have that body unless he objected to other people granting beingness. He's just as mobile as he doesn't have one, by the way. His mobility is reduced to that degree where he's packing around objected-to beingness.

How mobile is a thetan? How able is he to exteriorize? He's as able as he doesn't have large energy masses held in suspension – standing electronic ridges, in other words, massed around him as a thetan. And that's how mobile he is. The more he gets of these, the less mobility he has – the less he's able to be certain too, the less he's able to fix himself in space and so forth.

Now, these beingnesses will talk to him, and we get voices. These beingnesses will dictate him questions and answers, and we get machinery and the whole stimulus-response activity of the mind and body. Now, there's where this thing goes.

All right. If that's the case, then we certainly ought to tackle this thing and tackle it at that level of certainty which we have. In Issue 1 of Procedure 30, we have this process used: "Give me somebody you feel it will be safe to have grant some life, some beingness, to things." They select somebody out. They get the least objectionable character, sometimes. Sometimes they get somebody – they're perfectly free to get this person. And now you ask them what they're willing to have this person grant some beingness to. And you fish around and find out if they're doing this with certainty. Are they absolutely certain that they're willing to have this person grant this beingness?

Now, you follow through with your questions: "Something else that you would be willing to have this person grant some beingness to" and "Something else you would be willing to have this person grant some beingness to" and "Something else," each time ascertaining if this is certain, you see, until you've got enormous areas.

Now, does the preclear do this in mock-ups? Does he get pictures, does he do it in masses, does he do it in geographical areas? Well, the funny part of it is, yes he does, but that isn't what you want him to do. The less mass in the process, why, the better the process works.

When you first start working with your preclear, you're right into the middle of all these tremendous masses of granted beingness. And of course, he starts doing this thing with all kinds of masses of this and masses of that and recalls of this and facsimiles of that. And he has a picnic for himself in terms of when he puts up Father – perfectly safe to have Father grant some beingness. You say, "Well, what could he grant some beingness to?" Well, he thinks for a long time and finally finds out it would be all right if Father granted some beingness to the bowl of his own pipe. He gets Papa, he gets the pipe – not in the geographical area where Papa used to load pipes; it'll be someplace else, probably very close to him.

Well, you just ignore that to a marked degree, according to Procedure 30, Issue 1, anyway. Just ignore it to a marked degree. And you'll discover that the individual will gradually drop away from doing this. If you were to question him what was going on, simultaneously, he would find that there are energy ridges moving, there are these standing electronic waves moving. This so-called electronic gel, which I have talked about in other lectures and

so forth, would be shifting quite markedly, shifting very markedly. A lot of interesting things occur in terms of phenomena – a lot of phenomena occurs, in fact. You're not terribly interested in the phenomena, and you're not really interested in anything but, is the preclear absolutely certain he would be willing to have that person he has named grant beingness to?

Well now, if you just don't find any person of any kind whatsoever, you'd better hit it on some kind of a gradient scale. And you could hit it on a gradient scale like this: mest universe. All right, "What thing would it be safe to have grant some beingness?" And of course, you're on to the problem of orientation point at a late inversion. And above that will be a person, and above that will be another orientation point.

Now, how far do you go with this, and is this the only process you have to run? Well, yes, by *theory* this is the only process you have to run. And in actual processing, it's the only one which is going to produce a lot of result.

But in practice, throw in some dunnage, because it will get very monotonous on the preclear. You can vary it this way, because you don't want him spotting, particularly, what you're up to. You say, "Well, what wouldn't you mind granting beingness to Papa?" you know? "Are you absolutely certain of that? It's all right for the bowl of the pipe, now, to grant some beingness to Papa?" Okay.

That's not run as a dichotomy, see, but just thrown in. He seems to be hung up for a moment, he's on a little lag, he seems to be nonplused or confused. Let's give him a win. He's always willing to have something grant beingness to one of these people. He's always willing to, but it so happens these things don't grant beingness to. That's a reverse flow. So it's not processing in the direction of truth, so you use this sparingly. But he'd be perfectly willing, for instance, to have a sawed-off shotgun grant beingness to the sheriff. Oh, he'd be real sure of that, see? I mean, you get these queer ones coming up, they're reversals and inversions. So if they come up, so handle them.

I mean, just throw that one in. Throw any kind of a process in. If you think you have to shift off to another person, this is probably what's happened: You haven't picked up the key personnel. You might sort through five, six, eight people before you finally had one that was really rolling on this case, where he was really getting some idea of certainty.

I say that: You *should* be able to pick it up the first shot, but I can't guarantee that you will pick it up the first shot, you see? We're just assuming rather unreasonably that there is only one case – one person – who hung this person up on the track with granted beingness. And we're assuming unreasonably that the first one that you got a response from on the pre-clear would be the right one, see? We're making two assumptions here: (1) that the preclear will give you the right one first, and (2) that your preclear in all cases is staying right in the groove with you as an auditor in terms of imparting information. We are assuming these things, and it's not really the thing to assume.

So let's handle it loose, let's be effective, huh? I mean, we know what we're trying to do. We know somebody has granted this person, possibly when he was quite young... Young, though, you see – this is *age* we're talking about now. We're talking about a span of years but we're also talking about masses of energy, and so when we say "quite young" or "past," this becomes a meaningless thing. We just delete energy out of it, we don't have a past, see?

Somebody granted this person an awful lot of masses of energy which he's sure packing around one way or the other and which are hindering him in performing his proper functions. And in view of that, why, we've got a solution for him. Now, it may be that as this is audited out along the line, an auditor will find very routinely that he will have to handle a number of people and a number of geographical areas before his preclear feels real good about the whole thing.

If that's the case, all right, we handle it that way. But in Procedure 30 we're handling the granting of beingness in this direction, and this is the *goal* of that section of 30: To make the preclear happy to have other people – beings – grant beingness to the society at large and to himself. And when he's *totally* willing to have this happen, you will have a saint on your hands, and who knows, he may even have a halo back of his head, because it's quite an unlimited process. But that's our goal.

Now, how we arrive at that goal, I give you one choice of auditing commands. There may be many.

Viewpoint Straightwire

A lecture given on

3 May 1954

And this is a lecture on viewpoint Straightwire, a process which is very simple, very easy to use and has continuous advances.

This process is not mixed with other processes; it's not part of any Standard Operating Procedure; it's not part of anything that you would do ordinarily; it doesn't particularly apply to one case level or another case level. It is an independent process which in itself is very simple to administer. It can be, I suppose, self-audited, but I wouldn't advise it offhand.

The formula of this process is: all those definitions and Axioms, arrangements and scales of Scientology should be used in such a way as to bring about a greater tolerance of such viewpoints on the part of the preclear. That's a formula. That means that any scale there is – any arrangement of fundamentals in thinkingness, beingness – could be so given in a Straightwire that it would bring about a higher state of tolerance on the part of the preclear.

To make this more intelligible, you should understand what a great many preclears are doing and why an auditor occasionally has trouble with one preclear more than another preclear. A great many preclears are being processed solely and entirely because they are unable to bring themselves to tolerate an enormous number of viewpoints, and being unable to tolerate these viewpoints they desire processing so that they can fall away from them and not have to observe them. And the auditor is auditing somebody who is in full retreat, and Scientology is being used to aid and abet the retreat. By taking the charge off of an engram, the auditor at once gives the preclear something in the way of a change of viewpoint, in that he erases something so the preclear doesn't have to view it anymore.

Well, as you can see, this is a weak direction – he erases something so the preclear doesn't have to view it. In other words, what the auditor is doing is to some degree holding in question the ability of the preclear to tolerate viewpoints.

Time itself may very well be *caused* by an intolerance of past viewpoints. A person doesn't want viewpoints in the past, and so at a uniform rate he abandons past viewpoints. And when he no longer is following this uniform rate but is abandoning them faster than the uniform rate, he starts to jam in terms of time and becomes obsessed about time, becomes very hectic, begins to rush time, push hard against the events of the day, feels that he doesn't have enough time to accomplish everything he's supposed to accomplish. And this falls off on a very rapid curve to a point where an individual will simply sit around idle, fully cognizant

of the fact that he doesn't have enough time to do anything and so doesn't do anything, but knows he should be doing something but can't do anything because he doesn't have enough time.

This is idiocy itself, but is the state in which you find a great many preclears. Time is a single arbitrary which entered into life, is well worth investigating on the part of an auditor.

Now, an unwillingness to tolerate viewpoints will cause a jam in time. The fewer viewpoints which an individual will tolerate, the greater his occlusion and the worse his general state of beingness is. As I said, an auditor can remedy this in various ways. He can erase locks and engrams, and by erasing them make it possible for the individual to tolerate the view he finds in his own bank. Or, an individual can be so processed, as in exteriorization, that he can be caused to go around and *look* at various things and find they're not so bad.

Now let's just take the mean between these two and realize that a person who doesn't exteriorize is a person who does not want an exteriorized viewpoint: he does not feel he can tolerate an exteriorized viewpoint. He may have many reasons for this, but one of the main reasons he will give, of course, is that somebody may steal his body and so forth. In other words, here you have a tremendously valuable viewpoint which he's liable to lose if he exteriorizes.

But, viewpoints then must be scarce, viewpoints are obviously too valuable to be used, and this comes about by viewpoints becoming intolerable.

Let's take somebody standing watching his family being butchered by soldiers or something of the sort – Indians or other wild people. And he would go along afterwards so intolerant of this viewpoint that he would fixate on it. It's the fact that he refuses to tolerate the viewpoint which makes him fixate on it.

Now, the reason for this lies in the various agree-disagree scales in the Doctorate lectures: the fact that if you want anything in this universe, you can't have it: if you don't want it, you're going to get it. This is an inversion, and when this inversion comes about, an individual finds himself overwhelmed each time on whatever his own determinism is. If he starts to desire something, he will find out immediately that he can't have it. Actually, he himself will take steps to make sure that he can't have it.

The point is that you have an inversion: when he wants something to flow in, it flows out; when he wants something to flow out, it flows in.

Now, there's nothing more pathetic than watching a psychotic try to give up any material object. I processed a psychotic just on this basis: trying to make them give me or give up or throw away one possession, such as an old Kleenex or almost anything – just try to make them give it up. No, no, they just won't do it. The material object is there, they clutch it to them, and I swear that if you handed them an adder, wide-mouthed and fully-fanged, they would clutch it to their bosom. Anything that comes in, they immediately seize, and that's that.

Now, you as an auditor are trying to make somebody give up something. In essence, you give up a compulsive viewpoint. Well, every time you ask them to give up something, they're liable to hold it closer.

Now, there are many processes – there are a great many processes. There's all the Standard Operating Procedures, and oddly enough in good hands they all work. There's Universe Processing; there's Advanced Course Procedure; there's Creative Processing, on and on and on and on; the tremendous, *tremendous* amount of technique which can be applied with good sense to a preclear.

There's enormous numbers of Straightwire. There's old-time Straightwire, the most basic Straightwire there is, which by the way is better than Freudian analysis. It's a marked advance on Freudian analysis, the first Straightwire we ever had, which... We notice that the preclear is afraid of cats, so we say, „All right. Now, let's recall a time when you were afraid of cats.“ „Now, let's recall somebody who was afraid of cats.“ „Now, let's find a time when somebody said you were like this person.“ That was, to some degree, its formula.

Just Straightwire, and you sprung apart these valences very gently. However, it required a great deal of good sense on the part of an auditor. An auditor now and then would become a Straightwire expert and by just asking such searching questions and causing the individual to recall certain things, he would bring about a great deal of relief on the case.

Why did the relief take place? The individual has been going along in the full belief that he could not tolerate a certain viewpoint. And the auditor has come along and demonstrated to him that the viewpoint was in the past and therefore is tolerable. There's, in essence, the fundamentals of such Straightwire. You get *key-outs* on this type of Straightwire.

Well, there's that process which is: get the individual in present time so he isn't looking at the past. That's a goal of a great many processes. Another one is: wipe out the past so he won't have to look at it or experience it.

We have in viewpoint Straightwire a very, very new type of thinking in this. This is a new type of thinking. This is not to be confused with what we have been doing for the... lo, these many years. It hasn't any connection with it. You should think of this as something entirely different, because it has an entirely different goal than any process you've ever done on a preclear.

It takes the benefit of exteriorization and reduces it to Straightwire. We get an individual to race around the universe and look at things, observe things, experience things. That's Grand Tour and that sort of drill, and reduces it right down to Straightwire which is done interiorized or exteriorized. One simply goes on the basis that the preclear is in the state he is in, because he is not tolerating many viewpoints. And the entire goal of the process is to bring him to a point where he will tolerate viewpoints. That's all there is to the process. The key wording of the process is, „... you wouldn't mind.“

All right, let's give an example of this. Why do I announce this as something important, something new, something that is very useful to you and so forth? That's because, as I told you a few days ago in a lecture, there are many varieties of viewpoint. If we were to take knowingness and squash it, we would find we were first getting into space, which would be perception. We have to „perceive to know.“ Now, if we condense that, we find out that we have to get „emote to know.“ The person has to emote. We squash perception and we get into „emotion to know.“ Now, if we squash down and condense even further emotion, we get effort: and if we condense effort even further, we get thinkingness: and if we condense and

package thinkingness, we get symbols (as an example of this, what is a word but a package of thought): and if we were to condense symbols, we would get actually the wider definition of a *symbol* – we would get animals.

It's very strange, when you think about it. You're probably thinking about it in terms of a viewpoint of a body, if you don't see that clearly. But the definition of a *symbol* is a mass with meaning which is mobile. And that is a symbol. And of course that is an animal, too. An animal has certain form which gives him certain meaning, and he is mobile.

And if you see that thinkingness condenses, then, into form, you will understand art, just in so many words – a very simple thing. You have thinkingness condensing into symbols, in other words, ideas are condensing into actually solid objects. And when these are mobile, we have these symbols, and when these symbols are observed, they are found to line themselves up with other symbols and take and associate-associate with one and another and take things from one another – and you get eating.

That's a big band we're covering in there. That's the whole business from „I have an idea about a form, in this space and matter, and I'm going to get it all together, and I'm going to make this mass together.“ Well, the second we've done that, something has *been* created. Now, don't expect that thing which has been created to create anything, because it won't. So, it is a thing which isn't creating and therefore must subsist on an interchange of energy, and we get eating.

Now we take eating and condense it down – that is to say, let's make food scarce and let's make it very hard to get – and we got a condensation, you might say, which completely escapes time itself. And you go outside of time and get sex – that is to say, the outside of present time and you get future time, which is sex.

An individual goes right straight off the time track between eating and sex, and there's nothing will float on a time track like a sexual engram. They just float all over the time track; they don't nail down at all; they're very mobile. Believe me.

And the individual, in eating, starts to slide out of present time by this token alone – and most people are terribly worried how are they going to eat tomorrow. And when they reduce this down to the *reductio ad gastronomy*, you get to a point where 'I can't solve the problem of eating tomorrow, so, therefore, I'd better just leave it all up to somebody else and slide in on the genetic protoplasm line and go up the line a little bit and get a form and be another form.' That's the best way to solve eating, is just to live tomorrow. And maybe tomorrow there will be more food.

This is by the way, such a thoroughly easy thing to perceive that a simple test will demonstrate this. Now, let's take a look at those countries of the world which breed faster and harder than other countries of the world. And we find India and China. And we find that these two countries have the greatest food scarcity. Now, we could say, „Well look, they have the greatest food scarcity because they keep breeding people and that eats up all their food.“ No, no, it's the other way to: They eat up all their food and so they breed like mad.

And this can be tested with an animal. If you starve an animal, an animal will procreate faster. If you were, for instance, to give any family of *Homo sapiens* a carbohydrate diet,

with a very, very low protein diet... And by the way, this would be, you'd say, terribly un-conducive to the production of, well, estrogen, androgen. It's true, it would be very unproductive to it, but if you give them a high carbohydrate and very low protein diet, the next thing you know, they'll start to get very anxious about breeding. You're telling them in essence, right where they can understand it – in their stomachs – that they are unable to obtain enough food today and so must eat tomorrow, Therefore, you get countries of the Western hemisphere, which are very heavily starch-dieted, and you'll find out that these countries are the most anxious about breeding and about tomorrow. 'Why, no reason to stand around and prove this for hours – it's just the Know to Sex Scale and you get condensed knowingness. „I don't know how I'm going to get along today, so therefore I'd better breed like mad and appear tomorrow and maybe I'll know then“ is about the last ditch.

Well, if you notice this, death must come in this band above sex. And the person presupposes his own death, to indulge in the protoplasm line. See that? And so we get people like Schopenhauer and *The Will and The Idea* and so forth, closely associating sex and death. And we get certain animals and insects and so on, which so closely associate sex and death that they accomplish death when they accomplish sex.

People always – particularly fear merchants who come along – they always like to tell you about the black widow spider. I don't know why the black widow spider is such an attractive beast to some people, but it's apparently so. I notice that it exists mainly in California – Southern California. Lots of black widows down there. And most California girls, if you get into any kind of a discussion on the second dynamic at all, will sooner or later inform you that the female black widow spider eats its mate after consummation of the sexual act. I don't know why this is, but well, it's probably Californians. Anyway, the main thing is here is, actually, when you go down this scale – although it doesn't belong on the scale – you'll find death just before sex. In other words, it goes: Know, Look, Emote, Effort, Think, Symbol, Eat, Death, Sex. See, only Death doesn't belong there. But just shows you where this mechanism comes in.

Now, beingness might also be on this scale somewhere. Beingness might be on this scale, and if it were, you would have a tendency to look for it up toward the top. But the truth of the matter is it's all up and down the scale. And there is no beingness like that beingness at Symbols. And you'll find most of the human race having been made into a form, that is, a mass which is mobile, has meaning – a mass with meaning which is mobile (that's a body, that's a word in a dictionary, that's a flag flying above a building, it can be moved around and so forth). You'll find out that they indulge very, very heavily in *being* symbols.

Well, you'll find people around being sexual objects too. So that this scale sort of interlocks on beingness. A fellow could *be* some effort and actually we don't find beingness up at the top of the scale at all, we find it down there pretty low on the scale. So when an individual has gotten to a point where he has to be something, he's practically out the bottom.

Now, that controverts to some slight degree something I said many, many weeks ago on this. But if you remember many weeks ago, I said beingness didn't belong on this scale. Beingness is an activity or a condition and you might as well throw it onto the scale. So I just threw it onto the scale and didn't discuss it further. Further discussion examination would

have to put beingness at least at Symbols. A person becomes things at that level. So if you find a preclear madly being his name, where is he?

All right. Now let's look this thing over even further and find out that there's – I told you the other day – some different kinds of viewpoints. Well, there's something you might call a „know point“ – *k-n-o-w* point. That would be senior to a viewpoint, wouldn't it? An individual wouldn't have any dependency on space or mass or anything else, he'd simply know where he was.

Now, there'd be a viewpoint, which is a perception point, which would consist of look and smell and talk and hear, and all sorts of things could be thrown in under this category of viewpoint. But ordinarily we simply mean at that level of the scale, looking. But you can throw all the rest of the perceptions in at that level of the scale.

Now, we go down a little bit, and we would get something called an „emotion point.“ It would be that point from which a person emotes and at which he is emoted.

And then there would be something else called an „effort point.“ And the „effort point“ would be that area from which a person exerted effort and that area into which a person received effort.

And we'd go down a little bit more than that and we'd find we had a „thinking point.“ And there, of course, we get figure-figure-figure. The person is thinking there, not looking.

And we go down a little bit further than this, and we get into – from a „thinking point,“ – we just get a „symbol point.“ And there, really, properly, we get words.

And below that we get an „eating point,“ and below that we get a „sex point.“

If you considered each one of these below Know as an effort to make space, a great deal of human behavior would make sense to you.

Let's take an individual trying to make space with words. He's simply trying to make space with words. Words don't make good space, and so an individual who tries to make space with words sooner or later gets in bad condition.

Now, let's look at another one, much lower than that, and a person who's trying to make space with eating – of course that's inverted, isn't it?

And then there's the person who is trying to make space with sex. And boy, that's really inverted. That goes both ways from the middle.

Of course, part of the eating scale... the lowest part of the eating scale is excreta and urine. And people will try to make space with that. Dogs are always trying to make space, for instance, that way.

Now, then there are people who try to make space with effort. This is the use of force. This is Genghis Khan riding out and slaughtering a bunch of people – he's trying to make space. You notice the space had to exist before he could ride out anyplace.

And we go up a little higher, and maybe you've known somebody who tried to make space with emotion.

And we go up a little higher and we get the way you *do* make space, which is by looking. Actually you make space by knowing. If you just knew there was some space, there would be some space. That would be about all there was to that, so it's so simple.

Now, that's an effective way to go about it. And looking is another effective way to go about it.

And when we get down to emotion, boy, that's getting real ineffective. People who try to make space with emotion don't get very far. And that's literally, actually, figuratively, any other way you want to look at it, they just don't get very far. You can't make much space with emotion. It's too condensed and it kicks back and so forth.

And then there's the individual who makes space by working hard or by pushing hard or by exerting force. In other words, there's quite a little bit of band there, you see, to the effort band. And you'll find out they don't get very far either, but they get less far than people who try to make space with emotion.

And now, we get into the thinking band. And people who try to make space with thinking, boy, that is about the awfulest activity anybody could engage in, is trying to make space with thinking.

And of course we get down to making space with symbols. This is a nation trying to fly its flag all over the world and so forth. And, it doesn't make much space.

Then we of course go into eating. And an individual by offering things to be eaten, such as a cattleman – you know, he offers things to be eaten – he's making space with cattle. And a fat man, of course, is trying to make space with food, so on.

Now, when we get down into sex, of course, if an individual could breed fast enough and far enough and that sort of thing, why, he'd wind up with all kinds of space, he thinks. And of course he winds up with no space. This is the most condensed activity you can get into sex. If you want to see somebody's bank all short-circuited and jammed, it's certainly short-circuited and jammed on sex. But remember, we're looking at a gradient scale that runs from Sex right straight on up through to Know. And anybody comes along and tells you sex is the only aberration there is, laugh at him. Say, „Yes, that was how we entered the problem. We found out that people were loopy on the subject of sex, so then we examined the problem. And having examined the problem for many, many years, discovered that sex was part of a gradient scale of human experience, which is an activity of trying to make space.

And people try to make space in various ways. And when they get down too low, why, on the sexual scale, they're abandoning life. When they get into sex they're abandoning present time life and trying to get some future going on the track, and that throws them all around the place. Because sex is really a cave-in. It's the effort to have an experience externally. You know, pull an experience in.

Well, if you look at this band up and down, you'll see that it inverts here or there. So, it gives you the doggonedest, most enormous number of Straightwire questions, when codified correctly, that you'd ever want to ask anybody. The basic questions would reduce this thing, first from just the standpoint of viewpoint of the whole scale.

And there's where you'll catch your preclear most ably. You just take viewpoint of the scale: viewpoint of sex, you see and viewpoint of effort and so forth. And you would ask a question like this: You'd say, „All right, let's give me some effort you wouldn't mind observing,“ „... type of effort you wouldn't mind observing,“ „... a type of sex you wouldn't mind observing,“ sexual activity you wouldn't mind looking at,“ and so on and so on and so on and so on. You know, „... some eating you wouldn't mind watching,“ „... some emotion you wouldn't mind observing“ – just as quiet and mild as that.

Now, the systematic questions, as you go into the line, would run like this: „Now, give me something you wouldn't mind knowing,“ „... something you wouldn't mind looking at,“ „... an emotion which you wouldn't mind observing,“ „... some effort which you wouldn't mind observing,“ now „... some thinking which you wouldn't mind observing,“ and now „...some symbols which you wouldn't mind seeing,“ and „... some eating which you wouldn't mind inspecting,“ and „... some sex you wouldn't mind looking at.“

Well, that's the simplest way to phrase these questions. But as we go on from there, of course, these questions can get much more complicated, because we simply interweave every single part of Scientology and get the individual to pick out some kind of a viewpoint by gradient scale which he wouldn't mind observing or wouldn't mind experiencing.

Now, as we go on a little further from this, we find out „... some effort you wouldn't mind engaging in,“ „... some effort you wouldn't mind having leveled against you,“ „... some thinking you wouldn't mind doing,“ „... some things you wouldn't mind thinking about,“ (better question) „... some things about you, you wouldn't mind people thinking,“ and so forth. In other words, you throw him into the centers of those viewpoints. As what? First as cause and then as effect. Which is, of course, then obeying the entire communication chain – C to E being the definition of *communication*: cause, distance, effect.

So, „Give me some people you wouldn't mind looking at you.“ And you'll finally get him down to „Give me some things, now, you wouldn't mind eating,“ and „... some things you wouldn't mind being eaten by.“ You see, cause to effect. Let's get the action involved in it.

But how complicated would you have to be with this Straightwire? Well, you wouldn't have to be very complicated. You can actually take the first lineup which I gave you, and just play that over and over and over and over and over, and you'll clear up the fellow's bank and turn on his sonic and visio. That's not an idle promise, for I've been working with this process. And at first, when I was using the process, it was so complicated that I rather despaired of an auditor using it, since it took into consideration the many considerations of the preclear. And finally just broke it down to a point of where it no longer took into consideration any of the considerations of the preclear, and so it became a simple enough process to put out and a process which could be used to advantage.

Now, you go over and over and over this, and the whole object of it would be to bring the preclear into a higher tolerance of viewpoints and, of course, this will eventually fish him out into having some space. You accomplish all the goals there are just by that highly permissive quiet approach.

Now, if you don't think this will turn on some somatics, you're quite mistaken. If you don't think it won't turn on some aberrations, you're also mistaken. It's liable to turn on some very, very vicious ones. Because your preclear will immediately determine that you are asking him these questions in order to beat him into apathy, and his first acceptance of any viewpoints will be an apathetic acceptance. He will suddenly conceive that you're just asking him, „All right, I'll give up and abandon all the fight every place. And all right, so I will look at my mother. All right, I don't mind looking at my mother. I don't mind looking at my mother punishing me.“ You're pushing him right straight through the tone band.

Now, an auditor using this process shouldn't kick the bottom out from the preclear. And if he tries to press the preclear too hard and push him around too hard, he'll really produce this apathetic reaction. You're inviting the preclear to look at things which he ordinarily would find intolerable. And you're just going in there a little deeper and a little further and a little further and a little further, and you're just inviting him to do this and to do that and to look at this and do that.

And your goal is... Without directing his attention toward any specific thing (that's the one thing you leave alone with this process – don't direct his attention to anything specific; let him pick up what he picks up, good, bad or indifferent), why, you will find him eventually looking a red-hot electronic or an atom bomb in the teeth and saying, „Yep. Yeah, viewpoint of my town being wiped out by an atom bomb. Yep. Yep. Yeah, yeah, that's pretty bad, to be radioactively burned that bad. Yeah. I guess I could experience that.“

You just search a little further, occasionally, and ask him, „Well, how would you like to experience such a thing?“

And he'll say, „Oh, no-no-no.“

Now, you'll find out that he will run into one which isn't on this scale – a viewpoint of aberration. People try to make space with aberration. And he will run into this sooner or later and tend to fixate on people who have made a lot of space with aberration. Particularly if this fellow is an auditor, he's liable to fixate on aberration and look constantly and continually for aberration rather than to realize that 99 percent of living consists of nonaberrated conduct. It's the fact that a culture gets stuck on the remaining *one* percent which invites a person to plumb only into that one percent. But if he does, he's overlooking the bulk of living.

Just because *you* were part of a culture which had a taboo against touching banyan trees, would be no reason for you then to exclusively process the touching of banyan trees. Do you see that? If you went into the Mugwumps in Lower Catatonia, you wouldn't find very many customs which made good sense to you. So you would consider all these customs as aberrated customs, and you would be very likely prone to process out these strange, weird and fantastic customs. And these would demand your interest to such a degree that you would overlook the fact that even the Mugwumps are doing a lot of things which are a lot of fun, and which they enjoy doing, and so forth.

In other words, if an auditor looks at aberration only as a part of conduct, he is not really clearing up the life of the individual at all. You want to get his attention off of aberration rather than to get it on it.

But people make space with aberrations. And an auditor tends to fixate on such people because those people evidently *can* make space, and certainly *have* made space *in the past* when there was no remedy for their aberration. They said, „Boy, is it safe to be aberrated! There’s no cure for it.“

Now, you’ve done a terrible thing. You’ve come along and told the fellow that he isn’t safe being aberrated anymore, you’re going to cure him. Of course, his primary impulse, if he really realized what he was doing, would be to knock you off. You’re spoiling his game entirely.

All right, as we go over this Straightwire, we find out that many other items could be added into it. An auditor could use the ARC triangle. „Who could you like?“ „What wouldn’t you mind agreeing with?“ „What could you agree with right here?“ „What could disagree with you?“ Just that. And you would get the reality and the affinity sides of the communication triangle.

Now, you could get fancier than that. You could get up to a point of „Who wouldn’t you mind hating you?“ „Who wouldn’t you mind hating?“ Because hate and so forth is usually a nonacceptable viewpoint.

But as soon as you start going out terribly wide with this and including all the other elements that you can think of and so on, it gives *you* quite a repertoire. But you had better not get too complicated because it’ll stop producing results for you out there in about the third or fourth echelon. So you stick along with the ARC triangle, the Know to Sex Scale and primary principles such as duplication. „What wouldn’t you mind duplicating?“ „Let’s look around and find something you wouldn’t mind duplicating at the moment.“ And stick close to home, in other words, with such things as the dynamics.

Now, let’s take this whole thing and run it against the dynamics. And we discover that we have a... In any one of the Know to Sex Scale, we have eight dynamics at every level. We have the effort of sex and the effort of God at the Effort band. You see, the complexities of life are made up from the fact that you have eight dynamics at each level of the Know to Sex Scale. See, there’s knowing about sex, there’s knowing about spirits, there’s knowing about... This is all in the knowingness band. It doesn’t necessarily... know about these things doesn’t take you into the dip on further condensation – you simply know about these things, that’s all. Perfectly at liberty to know about anything you want to know about. There isn’t anything damaging about knowing.

And then we go into Look, and of course you can look at anything on the eight dynamics – so you’ve got eight dynamics there at Look. But remember that Look includes lots of perceptions, other perceptions, even though sound dives down to Symbols, see? Sound, hearing, the transfer communication of symbols goes way on down the bottom of the band there. Nevertheless, actually, it belongs in the field of perception which is at Look. See? Hear. Look, hear – these things go together.

The hardest thing there is to turn on in a case – lookingness turns on long before sonic, and sonic is the hardest thing there is to turn on in a case – because an individual will turn it off. So, we mustn’t neglect in this Straightwire process such things as sound. All right, „What wouldn’t you mind listening to?“ „What sound wouldn’t you mind making?“ „What sound

would it be all right for you to make?“ so forth. „What sound would it be all right for you to hear right now?“ And you pursue that course of questioning for a while, and you will find an individual’s ears will hurt and pop and snap and various things will occur, and sonic is liable to turn on.

But of course, if you haven’t hit the rest of the band, his sonic won’t turn on. You see, you’ve got a lot of things there he’s afraid of looking at and afraid of hearing. He’s also afraid of other people hearing things. ‘What would it be all right for other people to hear?’ So we could spread this all out onto a bracket, couldn’t we? We, in other words, play this thing almost any way. There’s almost an infinity of questions here.

We get emotion – of course, there’s an emotional level from the first to the eighth dynamic. And quite in addition to that, there are about eight very, very specific emotions. So we’ve got eight dynamics for each emotional scale. Look how this plots out for Straightwire questions.

And we’ve got effort for all eight dynamics, and we’ve got all kinds and types of effort. We have the force-ideas of force. We have electronic, we have mechanical effort – you know, there’s lots of them.

And the same way about thinking. There’s all kinds of thinking. There’s mathematical thinking, there’s intuitive thinking and there’s spontaneous thinking and telepathic thinking, and you could get very complicated if you want to.

Well, the funny part of it is, is that’s what your preclear’s brain is going to do the second you start asking him simple questions. See, he’ll start racking around all over the place. And what you’re looking at here is, if you plot these eight dynamics at every level on the Know to Sex Scale and then plot the eight dynamics on each corner of the ARC triangle, and if you were actually to arrange the Know to Sex Scale as a triangular column (you know, Know to Sex at each corner of the column, and that triangle, bottom or top, were the ARC triangle), you see there – did you get that picture?

Let’s take ARC at the bottom – pretty condensed – and we take it and apply it to sex, see? And then we have agreement and disagreement about sex. And then we have – over on another corner, why, we have liking and other emotional reactions toward sex. And then we have at the other corner sexual communication. So that at each point there we could take the Know to Sex Scale totally in communication, Know to Sex Scale totally as it comes down the line in terms of affinity and the Know to Sex Scale totally in the form of reality, which is agreement. And we would have the nicest-looking column there you ever wanted to see. It’s the ARC triangle gone solid on us, and we plot it in chunks on the Know to Sex Scale vertically. See, we just got a stack of triangles – a vertical stack of triangles – and they’re all lying there flat. You see that?

Well, by the time we’ve pushed this around and drawn it around a few times and worked it around, we find out that, my golly, we’re working with a jigsaw puzzle now which can be plotted almost in any direction that comes up with practically the same answers. And it interweaves and interlocks. And these interweaves and interlocks and interrelationships are the basics of the complications known as life and human behavior and animal behavior and

any other kind of behavior. (Going to write a book sometime on behavior along all of the eight dynamics.)

It gets very interesting when you get to the eighth dynamic, you have God behavior. Then you have to, of course, take into account all kinds of things, such as what is the acceptance level of God, and so forth. It gets very amusing after a while when you start plotting out behavior, but you could get awfully complicated in this line. You could sit down and you could write ten fifteen-million-word books without any trouble whatsoever, tracing out numerous examples and so forth.

Well, it's so easy to get complicated, that why don't you leave that up to your pre-clear? And why don't you stay with these great simplicities, such as the corners of the triangle and the Know to Sex Scale. And you find out he's studiously avoiding the third dynamic, why, you take note of it sooner or later and ask him, well, what's something about groups he could agree with or he wouldn't mind experiencing; what kind of a group would he mind experiencing – something like that.

Just steer him a little bit, because he can get complicated enough. And your whole goal is a very simple goal. That's to give this individual some tolerance of viewpoints. Try to make him tolerate viewpoints, wider and wider, more and more of them, and he will start changing his mind. And that is the first thing that processing ought to do, is change a pre-clear's mind – process doesn't change a pre-clear's mind, it isn't any good at all.

And that's one thing this process does, with rapidity! You say, „Now, let's... Some kind of effort you wouldn't mind looking at.“

„Oh, effort. Oh-ah-oooh. Ohh, effort. Um... effort? What do you mean by effort?“

„Oh, well, you know, just effort. Putting... Somebody putting out some energy and so forth.“

„Woo-oo, let's see.“ You get this kind of a reaction; you're liable to get a long communication lag. And then all of a sudden the individual happily thinks, „Ha! A dancer. I wouldn't mind watching a dancer. That's right, I wouldn't mind watching a dancer.“ Yeah, he's real certain now, he just wouldn't mind that at all.

He has suddenly realized that effort was part of art. You've made him change his mind about effort, to that degree that now he recognizes that effort is an essential part of existence, not something you would ignore all the time.

The next thing you know, he will say, well, he wouldn't mind his mother doing housework – wouldn't mind watching his mother doing housework. And he'll think about all the complaining that he listened to when he was a little kid and he all of a sudden reevaluates this whole thing: „It served her right! Yeah, anybody that unhappy about something or other ought to close terminals with it.“

Then he realizes that he himself has kept areas, even if they were only a *summer camp* and so forth, certainly clean and burnished bright – and maybe a compartment on a ship when he was in the service or something like that – he's kept that all duded up, and he's worked hard at this sort of thing and he begins to wonder a little bit just what the devil his mother was

talking about. It was a small house, there was only a couple of kids, there wasn't too much work to do and all he ever heard about was how hard she worked. And now he's scratching his head wondering how this could come about.

Well, he's liable to hit one of these tracks of association and want to soliloquize for the next eight hours. You are not interested in consideration, you are interested in looking at and that's all you're interested in – you're interested in looking at. You want him to tolerate viewpoints. You don't give a damn for his opinion about a viewpoint. Because every time he starts to give you a bunch of considerations and stretch it all out and explain to you this and explain to you that, without suddenly damming his communication line but by expertly detouring him, get him to look at something else. Because there's... You don't want him in the think band. You just landed him in the thinkingness band. Instead of looking, now he's perfectly willing to think. And do you know, that he could probably go on thinking for the next 76 trillion years without getting anyplace with it. And that's a solemn and horrible fact, that thinkingness doesn't happen to wind up in solutions.

Thinkingness is based upon the fact that a person doesn't know, so he has to think about it. The solution depends upon the fact of his postulating that he does know, and then he knows. You see, in order to do thinking, you have to assume that you have to go through some kind of a process in order to arrive at an answer.

Now, there's another horrible thing that happens about preclears, is, you see, they have to have assumed an inability – assumed that they had an inability – before they have it.

Now look how this blocks processing. They have to assume that they can't do so and so in order to have it remedied. And you leave them parked there – I've gone into this several times, we didn't have a process which easily remedied it – but an individual has to assume he's sick before he can make up his mind to get well. The reason he's sick, basically, is in the postulate band. He's had to make a postulate that he's sick before he can make up his mind to get well.

Now, if your preclear has had to make up his mind that he's aberrated before he can get sane, he's still riding on the postulate that he's aberrated. But he's still better off having made the postulate that he's aberrated so that he can get over his aberrations, than to coast along gibbering like an idiot *for* years and years telling everybody how sane he is. You see, he'd be crossed up there in universes – something of the sort.

Well, what does this do... this process do for universes? We have the three kinds of universes: the other fellow's universe, the preclear's universe and the physical universe. And what does it do for these universes?

Well, any universe is essentially existent in the space created by lookingness. See, any universe exists from the center of lookingness. So that if we speak of Mama's universe, it's the point from which Mama is looking – see, if we think of Mama's universe.

Now, we could take a terrific number of factors here that would complicate this universe, such as what does Mama say? What are her postulates, and so forth? And we get the space with the postulates. You see that? First she has to have some space, one way or the other, and then she has to put some postulates in there to have a universe. The basic definition

of a complete universe would be some space which is tenanted by postulates. Postulates, of course, might wind up in forms of various kinds, might wind up in various conditions.

Now, you can ask yourself some day, why is it you see this MEST universe so well? And if you look around, you will discover that there are many people around who are so thoroughly interiorized into Mama's universe or somebody else's universe that they actually see Mama's engrams. And you don't have to go very far to investigate this. You take a preclear who is very badly interiorized into some other person's universe than his own, they will see that other person's pictures and not their own. Now, get that.

The fact that Mama made a postulate produced a visibility. Mama said, „There are snakes,“ and this individual then very easily gets pictures of snakes. But he himself can say, in trying to put up mock-ups. „There are flagpoles,“ and he doesn't get a mock-up of a flagpole. Curious, huh?

If Mama had said there are flagpoles, he would be able to see flagpoles. You see that? He must be running on somebody else's postulates than his own. So the manifestation of super-, super-, supervisibility, which is not the individual's super-, super-, supervisibility – you know, the individual, doesn't... when he puts up a mock-up he doesn't get this much visibility on it. You know, he has terrific visibility on mock-ups somebody else has put up, you know, like Mama's statements and so forth. You are looking at a condition there of living in somebody else's created space.

Now, what would you think of somebody who could look out here and see a factory chimney with great ease and yet couldn't mock one up of his own? You would suspect him of being in another universe, wouldn't you? Well, whose universe is he in? He's in the physical universe, that's the universe he's in. Its postulates are so strong and impressed upon him so strongly, that its reality is much greater than his *own* reality. Therefore we used to talk about – and in the book 8 – 8008, talk about – agreement with the physical universe. You can agree with it or disagree with it, but as long as its postulates outweigh your own postulates, you're going to have difficulty.

Now, there's a lot of complexity here that we needn't even look at. And that complexity, however, that we do need to look at – the part of it we do need to look at – is this: Look, an individual is in the physical universe and then he's reinteriorized, you might say, into somebody else's universe, such as Mama's. And Mama's pictures are very bright to him, but his own mockups don't exist. Oh, boy.

Now, the common denominator of universes declares for him that the physical universe is right there, you know? There is the physical universe. There it is. But he is not even in it. He has been in it and has to some degree... Well, you see, he was in his own universe, and then he got into the physical universe, and now he went into his last wife's universe and his mother's universe and he's in those universes. Well man, there's no telling what kind of a mock-up this individual is liable to get, if he gets any at all. Everything is kind of other-determined. If he gets any pictures, they're probably in a nightmare. He's running on somebody's declared statement that he resists all the time, and he goes to sleep and his resistance cuts down; the next thing you know he's in a full-armed play about something or other.

Well, when your individual is departed from the physical universe into Mama's universe, and so forth, on down the line, you've got this kind of a backtrack to walk with your preclear. He's got to get out of his mama's universe and *into* the physical universe.

Now, the only way he ever gets into a universe is by refusing to tolerate its viewpoints. If he refuses to look, he pins himself in the universe with his own energy and turns off the visio. There's two necessary steps here. He interiorizes by resisting – he goes into the universe by resisting the universe. A viewpoint he doesn't *want* is the one he gets. You see that? Because he's the only person really capable of putting out energy. So he has granted an other-determinism and, having granted this other-determinism, it backfires on him.

Now, let's look at this physical universe out here and discover that an individual has as much perception in it and of it as he will tolerate its viewpoints. And you're not going to get anybody out of Mama's universe, really, or out of the physical universe, until they can tolerate a viewpoint or an effort point or a sex point of any part of the whole darn universe. And when they will tolerate any point in it – any view, any effort – either as cause or as effect, they are then capable of withdrawing from that universe. Until they can tolerate all the various viewpoints of that universe, they can't withdraw from it.

So your preclear is going to think at first that you're just pushing him into apathy, because you're asking him to tolerate things. And he knows that if he tolerates those viewpoints, it'll finish him. And that's the funny part of it: It is only by refusing to tolerate them that he gets finished.

So, the course and direction of this processing is to bring about the greatest possible tolerance for the greatest possible number of viewpoints.

Okay.

Remedy Of Havingness And Spotting Spots In Space

A lecture given on 6 July 1954

We're going to talk this morning about the Spotting Spots in Space and the Remedy of Havingness as a process.

This is a total process. It has many ramifications. It's, you might say, a family of processes.

Now, there are many such families of processes. And, actually, it belongs to the family that we would call 8-C of Opening Procedure – the Opening Procedure family. Spotting Spots and Remediating Havingness belongs to an Opening Procedure family.

It is actually a low order of Change of Space. So it belongs to another family. It belongs to a duplication family, since Change of Space is actually a dramatization of the formula of communication. That's just *exactly* what Change of Space is. You just dramatize the formula with the preclear exteriorized.

You have him be at one point and then be at another point, and be at the first point and be at the second point. Now, that first point is the source of something, usually, and so he, by being the cause and being the effect and finding out there is a vast distance between them, becomes rather relaxed about the whole thing.

But Spotting Spots and Remediating Havingness, could then be said to be cousins to two families: it's cousins to Change of Space and it's cousin to Opening Procedure.

Now, the reason why we relate it to Opening Procedure (that's a blood relationship) is because that is the way you're going to produce the most effect with it – as though it were Opening Procedure.

The first contest is to get the preclear to find a spot in space. That's the first contest. The preclear will go around and he will find large spots, two, three feet in diameter; he'll go around and find only spots which come out so far from the walls; he can't find a spot independent of the room itself; his spots have energy in them, they have masses, they have color, they have size. In other words, he has a lot of trouble. If he does locate a spot, it's liable to be suspended four or five feet above the floor on something that looks like a microphone stand.

It's quite fascinating, the various manifestations which occur. But all of them are completely useless. You want to get the preclear over them as fast as possible, and you get him over them simply by having him spot some more spots in space. That's all.

Space where? In the space of the room. And you have these spots in such a wise that he has to go over and put his finger on them. Now, when you have him capable of spotting two or three spots, you've generally shot his having-ness to ribbons. So you have to remedy havingness right away. If he starts to get queasy, sick, upset, disturbed in any way, remedy his havingness. There is nothing more destructive to havingness than spotting some spots in space.

You understand this is a precision proposition. You want him to spot a spot in space and then be able to spot it again. Actually, that spot is only a location; it doesn't have mass. And you want him to be able to put his finger on it and take his finger off of it, and put his other hand's finger on it and take it off, and move his body into it and move his body out of it, and so forth. This is a location.

And you get him really cognizant of the fact that this is a location, and the more certain he becomes of these locations, why, the better off he is. The next thing you know, he's able to tolerate space. And you do this, as I said, by remedying havingness.

Now, supposing you had an individual who had an enormous struggle in spotting some spots in space, and the first spots he spotted were fairly large. Well, you just kept on nagging him until he finally got actually a location in space. He started to get sort of upset, you know? Remedy of Havingness had not been done yet, and he feels rather queasy about the whole thing. And then you say, "All right. Mock up something that's acceptable to you, and pull it in."

And he says, "What mock-up?"

And you say, "Well, you know, I mean just put something out there – a dead body."

"What dead body?"

"What are you looking at?"

"Nothing."

"What are you actually looking at?"

An interesting contest will come in at this point – getting him to tell you what he is looking at. What he is looking at is usually blackness. And he won't tell you he's looking at blackness. This is nothing as far as he's concerned, but he's looking at blackness.

And to get him to finally tell you what he actually is looking at is your first contest. "What are you looking at?"

Well, it doesn't do you very much good, [with] an individual who can't get any fac-similes, mock-ups, anything of the sort whatsoever, to tell him to mock up something and pull it in, because he's going to have a hard time.

But supposing you could get a vague or indistinct image out there. Is that good enough? Yes, sir, that's good enough. That's good enough. Have him mock up several of them and pull them in on the body, and go on spotting spots in space.

But supposing he couldn't get any? None. Then enters upon the scene this interesting single Straightwire question: The agreement between the mest universe and the preclear gets

down to a point where the preclear agrees entirely that two things cannot occupy the same space.

And after that he is not able to pull anything in, which is the biggest trap you have. Because the way a preclear makes something disappear – makes it vanish utterly – is to pull it *all the way in*.

And if he can't pull anything all the way in, it continues to persist. So how would you fix up a preclear – how would you fix up a being – so that he got packed in energy masses? You would fix him up and get him to agree to the fact that two things could not occupy the same space. And after that he couldn't destroy any energy mass that was around him.

Ha-ha! Machiavellian, huh?

Well, Count Alfred Korzybski devoted a book called *Science and Sanity* – there are some other books on this subject, too, general semantics. There's a guy by the name of Hayakawa, who writes even wilder colloquial English than I do, but whose originality is notable in its absence. And there are others who have written on this subject, but it goes back to Korzybski. And that is this: "It is utterly impossible for two things to occupy the same space. "And if this book has any message, it says "Differentiate amongst your words and statements and thoughts," and "Two things can't occupy the same space." You darn near sum-mate general semantics when you say those two things.

Now, there's a terrific amount to this, you understand. He examined the mechanics of this, but he examined them in complete agreement with the physical universe. And two things can't occupy the same space. And you'll get somebody who has studied general semantics, and you've got a picnic on your hands in the Remedy of Havingness. You won't realize it or recognize it, but you have.

Yes, sir! He can't pull anything in! Can't remedy havingness and, therefore, can't destroy energy. Why can't he? Well, two things can't occupy the same space, so if he mocked up a car out there to pull it in and remedy his own mass, so forth, he of course couldn't do this because he's already occupying the spot where the car would come into, see? So, therefore, he couldn't remedy his havingness.

The mock-up would disappear just before it got to him. And that underlying agreement, back of that, is two things cannot occupy the same space.

This is, of course, an utter falsity. This is not true. It happens to be a condition, which, when imposed, resulted in this physical universe. That law is what keeps the parts and parcels and spaces and planets of this universe apart. It is an *enforced differentiation* in this universe which makes space for this universe. That is the law which keeps the space stretched in this universe.

So, of course, Korzybski would get all involved with differentiation-differentiation on the basis of the mest universe holding itself apart. Well, that isn't differentiation. So as a result, why, you'll have trouble with anybody who's been in general semantics. You will notice this mock-up disappearing just before it got to him. In other words, he isn't remedying havingness.

Now, how do you know he isn't remedying havingness? Because he stays sick, of course. That's all. You got him spotting some spots in space and this didn't make him feel good; this made him feel kind of frantic and this made him feel kind of upset and this made him feel sick at his stomach. These are common manifestations. And then you said, "Well, mock up an acceptable mock-up to you."

And he says, "All right."

And you say, "Well, you got a dead body there, or what? What have you got there?"

And he says, "Well, I don't know. I got a wrecked car."

And you say, "Well, okay, pull that wrecked car into your body. Now pull another one into your body. Now pull another one into your body, and pull another one into your body." And you say, "How do you feel?"

"Well, I just feel just as – as frantic as I did," and so on.

He isn't pulling anything into his body. See, that's the answer. It's disappearing before it gets to him. It's dissipating. And other things are occurring there so that his havingness isn't being remedied.

By the way, if he could adequately remedy his havingness, there's a total process on this. You just simply have the fellow mock up things and pull them into his body. And the more massive the better, until you get planets and stars and black suns and all kinds of things being pulled into his body. And you'll start something called an avalanche after a while. And, boy, the planets start coming in with a roar. And it's quite an interesting phenomena. I've seen one run for three, four days. They'll blow up every facsimile that gets in their road. They'll blow up the entire energy-behavior pattern of the preclear, if you keep up remedying havingness. It's an interesting process.

No doubt about this as a process. It's a sort of a heavy-handed, clubfooted process.

If you could get him to remedy havingness, he'd straighten himself out simply by remedying havingness.

But if remedying havingness doesn't straighten him out, it is because he has agreed to this single agreement, which doesn't happen to be true, that two things cannot occupy the same space. He's agreed to that so thoroughly that he can't remedy his havingness.

The reason I'm stressing this is so that you'll remember why you ask this question, and that this is *the* question, and there isn't any other question. And that question is simply this: "What wouldn't you mind having occupy the same space as you're occupying?"

Well, he's got to change his mind immediately – that two things can occupy the same space – in order to fulfill this condition. And without explaining to him why he had to change his mind, you made him change his mind. Sometimes it takes them five minutes, sometimes it takes them five hours.

But the roughest case I know of at this time had to be pounded for (I was told last night) two hours before he could finally accept something in his own space – that is to say,

until he could get something that he wasn't unwilling to have occupy the same space as himself.

And this question was asked this case over and over and over. Now, this case had never been able to remedy havingness, never been able to get mock-ups, never been able to do this, never been able to do that. So, well, he remedied his havingness and he got into fine fettle and feeling very good indeed. Changed his case.

Well, it sure would. If an individual had been asked to spot spots in space rather continuously and continually, that would make him sick and he'd get feeling worse and then he couldn't remedy his havingness, you see? So processing was horrible to behold.

On the mock-up on the body and the mock-up on themselves, it depends to a large degree on whether you're exercising the preclear as a body or the preclear as a thetan. That's all it depends on. If you're doing a lot of Change of Space, you remedy the havingness on the thetan, which is the pc.

You just remedy the thetan's havingness. Have him put up eight anchor points and pull them in on himself, and eight more and pull them in on himself, and eight more and pull them in on himself.

And when his body gets upset and restive, why, we simply have him pull it in on it – when the body gets upset on that.

If he really pulls it all the way in, it'll disappear. That is how you make things disappear. All space is an illusion. Therefore, if you pull in all anchor points, of course there's no space.

So what happened to the anchor points? Well, they didn't exist in the first place. So if you completely close terminals with the anchor points, they'll vanish.

And actually, recognition simply depends upon occupying the same space *with*. That's why Beingness Processing works.

Now let's look at this factor of recognition and knowingness, and so forth, in terms of beingness and facsimiles and so forth, and we simply get it this way: Is he willing to occupy the same space as it? And if he is, it'll blow, and if he isn't, it won't.

So we get a case who can't remedy his havingness being unable to destroy a concept, a lock, a secondary, an engram. If he can't remedy havingness, he can't occupy the same space with; if he can't occupy the same space with, he naturally conceives that it's making space, so therefore it has validity and it won't pull all the way in.

Now, this process is very elementary, but it could be hashed up most gloriously. This could be hashed up gloriously, by overrunning the preclear on spotting spots in space until he was good, groggy, upset and quite ill, and then expecting him to work in some fashion or another.

Well, you've driven him down tone scale to a point of where he could hardly hold on to anything long enough to do anything about it, you know? And having driven him down tone scale, why, you're now going to remedy his havingness and do the rest of this?

No, you do this early. You remedy his havingness long before he needs to have it remedied. You don't wait for signs. You could make them appear if you wanted to, but you just do this as a routine process. And whenever you spot a spot in space, you remedy havingness, that's all.

The process we're interested in is this one. The process we're interested in is spotting the spots in space. We're not really interested in remedying havingness, because this is only dramatizing his dependency on it. So we're just giving priority to the important thing here. And the priority is the spot in space. That's what's important; the Remedy of Havingness is incidental.

How come his havingness chews up? Ah, there must be something awfully wrong with the way this fellow is handling energy for his havingness to chew up, simply by trying to remedy it.

All right, what do we do? What do we do here, specifically? We ask him what could occupy the same space as he's occupying. If we had any doubt about this – and here's where we get the answer to your question about that – we would take up this problem before we fooled around with any spots in space. We would look at this fellow and there he is, gaunt and emaciated or bloated or something – something strange with his physiology. We would say, "Hm, this guy has a little bit of trouble with havingness."

You know, he's a banker or something. We could tell professionally: He's a commissar or a banker or a general. There's something wrong with this guy's havingness, otherwise he wouldn't be where he is. That's obvious. He has to have in some other fashion than simply having. You know, he needs a system, like becoming a general. That's a method of having, you see? You go to West Point and don't talk back, and graduate and don't talk back, and get into a War Department post and don't talk back, and coast along the line and don't talk back, and then you have to, of course, get more suppressed about how famous you've got to be. And the next thing you know, why, you will start to accumulate troops to remedy your havingness. That's right. And you got a U.S. general. Don't do anything with them, just accumulate them. You'd be amazed that that's what they do.

Now, here – it's not just a snide remark on generals or anything else. You can look at somebody and tell whether or not he's having a lot of trouble with havingness. If he's having trouble with havingness, then it might be very wise for you to just sail right in on that basis. Let's fix it up *quick* before we render him liable to anything. That'd be a good idea. All right.

Well, what's important about this process is spotting spots in space. What do we do with all these spots in space? We just spot them, that's what. Oh, I know, but what do you do with them after you spot them? Well, you spot them. Well, after you've spotted them, then what do you do with all these spots in space? Well, you spot some more of them, that's what you do.

Don't look for any deeper significance in the technique than that, except this: The pre-clear is sitting on three kingpin significances. And (1) is that he's there but he's got to leave; (2) is that he's there and fixed there forever, being fixed against his will; and (3) is that it was there in that spot but now it is gone. Three considerations, there, that are very aberrative on the track.

Well, you can run these with this process: You spot a spot in the room and have him move his body into the spot – move the spot into his body, rather, and have him stand there.

And you tell him, "Now," you say, "now get the idea that you can't remain there." "All right, find another spot." "Okay, now move out of the spot you're in and move this next spot into your body." "You got that? All right, now get the idea that you can't stay there."

You just do this in sequence: "Just get the idea of that." You know, he's in the spot, now get the idea of that.

And you are making him dramatize the basic formula of self-determinism – location of objects in space. And you make him locate objects in space one after the other, he'll get well.

Well, put this consideration on to it: that he can't stay there and have him move to the next spot. And put the consideration on to that and have him move to the next spot. You just spot the spot and have him move to it. But you give him the consideration he can't stay there.

Now we get the other one: We have him move onto a spot and then get the idea that he's fixed there and can't move. And then we have him change his mind – not just break or disobey his postulate – we have him change his mind and pick out a new spot and move into it and get the idea he's got to stay there forever.

And then have him change his mind about staying there forever, and get a new spot and move it into his body. Get the idea he's going to stay there forever.

You'd be surprised at the agony and weariness and tiredness which this one turns on.

All right. There's the next level. And the next level is, you have him spot the spot and get the idea that something very precious has just left there that he will never see again. And you have him do this, just walk around and spot these spots, and get the idea each one has just been vacated.

There is the manifestation of the fellow trying to fill in the spots with energy. There's the mechanism that he's undergoing. And it has a tendency to blow these.

Now, there are three conditions. There are probably others, but those are very, very important conditions. Why? What is the manifestation of facsimile? The manifestation of facsimile is not being able to remain in the spot, having to get out, and, cussedly, taking along a picture of it so that one can say he's still there.

That's the rationale behind the facsimile. The facsimile is the solution to the problem of not being able to stay there. That's the solution to the problem.

Now, what is this thing called unreality? Unreality is that activity the preclear has engaged upon whenever he was forced to stay in a place where he did not want to be. His answer to this was to make it all unreal, so that he wouldn't really know he was there.

He's trying to be self-determined anyhow, and the way he's being self-determined is to make it all unreal. He didn't want to be there. See that?

And now he can say, "Although I am forced to stay here in prison, stone walls do not a birdcage make," you know. "It's all unreal." That's why they put psychotics in cells.

Oh, that remark didn't quite add up to a solution? Well, I'm – that's as reasonable as anything else in psychiatry. That's a subject that has to do with nuttiness; don't expect it to be reasonable.

All right. He'll make things unreal, then, if forced to stay in the same space; he'll dim down his perception on things. That merely says he's unwilling to be there.

All right. Now what's this thing called occlusion? Occlusion comes about as a consequence of loss. Something precious has disappeared from the object, and if the preclear could still see, he'd notice it'd be gone and this would be more than he could bear. So the best thing to do is to cover it all up with blackness, and that'd be that.

That'd be a good solution, wouldn't it? Let's just hide the whole thing, let's just hide the problem, and then let's just abandon the whole idea, and then, you see, we can still pretend that it's still there.

This is the basis of "it's too good to lose," too. You know, people will get to a point of where you give them something very, very valuable, they will not wear it, use it, or anything else. They promptly hide it. Well, that's because they know, if they know anything, that they lose things like this.

I know I gave a very dear old lady – my grandmother – a present one day; she had a watch there that was a shame and very disreputable, and I gave her this watch. And she kept on wearing this old, disreputable watch, you know, that she'd been wearing, instead of this nice, new watch. And I, one day, was going around looking for something. I opened up a drawer and here, hidden at the bottom of the drawer, was this brand-new, very nice – rather indestructible, by the way – but a good watch, you see? And there it was at the bottom of the drawer. She wouldn't wear it.

And I asked her why she wasn't wearing it, and she said, "Oh, that's much too nice to use." And so I began to wonder about this a little bit, and I one day just glanced through some of her things there. And you know, she had more things that were too nice to use! You talk about the amount of abundance in commodity which was present: it was tremendous. She couldn't use it though; it was all too nice.

Well, people do this on another wise. When they've lost something they turn everything black. They just hide it. See, they hide the fact that they've lost it.

Also, this is no-responsibility and other factors, and so on. Occlusion adds up to too many considerations. Actually, the basic occlusion is mystery. Unpredictability: "It's gone and I didn't predict it would 'went.'" And so it's all black.

Well, you're making the preclear predict that something is going to go and then disappear. So there's these methods of handling spots in space, and these are the main considerations.

Now, don't for a moment believe, now, that there are eighty-five other considerations that can be added into that type of processing. There aren't. There aren't. The basic Prelogic on which this is based is a very precise thing. And it says *theta locates things in time and*

space, and creates time and space and things to locate in them. That's a Prelogic; that's what theta does. Self-determinism is one's ability to locate things in time and space.

And so this directly processes self-determinism. So it doesn't go out in all directions. It's right there, it's on those three considerations: The consideration of loss, consideration of "I got to stay here, so I'll make it all unreal," and the consideration of "Well, I can't have that place anymore, so I'll carry a picture of it."

Most of your preclears that you'll get a hold of, whether they know it or not, are walking around with a childhood home over their heads. You know? They can't have that spot anymore – the orientation place – so they think to see at all, they better carry it around with them.

Now, Spotting Spots and Remedy of Havingness, between the two of them, the more important is spotting the spot. And the consequence of spotting the spot is having to remedy the havingness.

But why does he have to remedy havingness? Well, that's because he can't create energy. There are obviously lots of methods – one way or another – which would get somebody out of creating energy. But just had one here: After something had been discovered which the preclear was perfectly willing to have occupy his same space, the next thought was, "Well, let's see now, if there's that, that's energy. I think I'll make up a machine of some kind or another to remedy my havingness," and mocked up a generator. And then it went on to a power station and then on to suns.

In other words, the preclear went right on and remedied *all* of his consideration that he was dependent on anything else of any kind whatsoever for energy, and he started producing it himself. So that is the end product of Remedy of Havingness.

Well, that was a very good procedure, which is you just change the consideration on it all the way on up. I mean, it's obviously a terrific procedure.

You don't go on remedying havingness forever. Why don't you remedy the condition that makes you remedy havingness? Get them out of the idea entirely – there's an indicated process, then.

Well, this'll turn on mock-ups and everything else: "What wouldn't you mind occupying the same space?"

There are a lot of tricky processes that we could go into. There's no necessity to do so whatsoever.

Now you've got an idea of what this type of process is, Spotting Spots and Remedying Havingness?

Okay.

Description Processing

A lecture given on 28 July 1954

This happens to be the most important subject that you will cover in auditing. It's not the most important subject in the universe, but it's the most important subject in auditing.

And that is Step 1: Two-way Communication. And this is the relatively advanced procedure of conducting two-way communication.

And someone who would have no concept of the four conditions of existence would not be able to run this process. Therefore, this would not come at the very early part of the course – although Step 1 comes at the early part of the course. This requires (two-way communication) every iron you can throw into the fire. It requires all of your knowledge of Scientology and its theory in order to conduct an adequate two-way communication with a preclear. Because if you conduct an adequate two-way communication with the preclear, you can, just by that and with no further processing, make him entirely well; make him a Theta Clear in *relatively* short time. Now, that's an interesting thing, isn't it?

So this must be an important process I'm talking to you about.

This process, however, requires all of the knowingness you have of Scientology in order to conduct it. It is done by a *clever* auditor. It is not a process which is done by a fellow who is going to sit down, as his furthest effort of cognition as far as his preclear is concerned, and read off a series of commands to him. It requires a continuous communication with the preclear – a *two-way* communication with the preclear.

It requires that you establish it and that you maintain it and that you conduct it in such a fashion that the elements which compose the preclear's difficulty are vanished.

Now, just by carrying on a two-way communication with the preclear, you can cause *any* difficulty he is having, such as nonexteriorization, such as a failure to take responsibility in other dynamics, and so on – whatever his difficulty – you can conduct a two-way communication in such a way as to make those difficulties vanish.

Now, I say to you this very advisedly, but I say to you that you will have just as much good fortune with this process as you are willing to be a clever auditor and to follow the exact rules of this.

Now, this is the primary difficulty with this process, two-way communication, is that, apparently, it is entirely permissive. It apparently can wander into any field, topic, subject; it apparently could address anything, and therefore and thereby, an individual who is not cognizant of its very, *very* precise fundamentals would go immediately astray. He would go as far

astray as men have gone as far astray with this as a process. It's a process which you can easily get entangled about; it's a process which you can be argued with about.

The Roman Catholic church *fully* believes that it practices this. And if you were to conduct a session in the presence of a few bishops and a hatful of cardinals, this person would say, "Yes, that's exactly what we have been doing for thousands of years. So, therefore, we have discovered Scientology and it was actually down there in the catacombs all the time, and we just now have decided to give it to the world, because we've been doing this for years." Oh, no, they haven't been doing it for years! They've been making an instinctive gesture, like the cat washing its face, and that's all they've been doing.

A two-way communication could be a very broad field, but it has a particular precision area where you as an auditor can concentrate. If you know the exact mechanics of what you are doing, it becomes the best process you ever used in your life – used cleverly. If you don't know its mechanics and you don't use it cleverly, it becomes the gummiest, most misunderstood, nonadvancing sort of a process you ever ran into. So, again, here's a process that requires judgment, but it's very easy to do.

This part of two-way communication which we are discussing could be given a name all of its own, and we would call that name "Description Processing." It could be given this name, and so on, but it's liable to get entirely lost if we always refer to it by this name, "Description Processing."

In the first place, "Description Processing" would not be the entire descriptive name of this process. It would have to be "Description Right Now Processing." You'd have to call it that. But we had better call it a process known as two-way communication, which is just exactly what it is labeled in Intensive Procedure. And you're learning about it at this distance in the course because it uses every single thing that you know about Scientology.

And the main thing that it uses is this factor: If you establish the as-isness – if you establish the as-isness – of your preclear's condition to his satisfaction, it will vanish.

And you don't establish its as-isness by tracing its consequences, by tracing its basics, by tracing its significances, by discovering what lies under the thing that lies under the thing that lies under the back of beyond the other side of – let's change it all, change it all, change it all, change it all, change it all.

Because what will happen? The process will persist, won't it? This is a tricky one, then. It is a process which actually and *overtly* processes and *achieves* alter-isness by using nothing but as-isness.

You can get a change of case with the preclear, very simply, solely by taking his case as it is right now. Right now, we want *right now*, no place else. We want to know how it is right now.

The *key* question of this process can be codified; the process is not sloppy, it's not all over the place, it's highly precise. And the key question: "Well, how does it *seem* to you?"

You could just go on asking this question, "Well, how does that seem to you?" and "How does that seem to you?" "And how does it seem to you now?" "And how does that seem

to you?" "And how does it seem to you?" "And how does it seem to you?" "And how do you feel now?" "Now, how is that?" "How does the room look to you now? I mean, actually." "How does it actually seem to you right now?" "Now, what manifestation is going on now?" "Now, how is it?" "Well, how do you feel about that?" "Well, you don't know about that. Well, can you get that – how you don't know about that?" "Well, do you like it or dislike it?" "Well, it seems like you dislike it. Well, all right, now how does it seem to you?"

And the funny part of it is you get change, change, change, change, change, change, change, at a mad rate. By doing what? Asking for nothing but as-iness. What is the condition as it is right this instant?

Now, you see that if you were a very, very clever practitioner, wouldn't it be very, very interesting? All you would have to do is take this basic question, "How does it seem to you?" and couch it in a thousand different guises, always, always pointing straight at this one: that we want this individual to discuss *exactly how it is*. We want to *know* about it; we want to know *how* it is and we don't want any romance, we don't want any embroidery, we don't want any alteration so as to get our sympathy, we don't want any super pressure on us, so that we will do something. All we want to know is how it is.

You don't think that takes a clever auditor? Believe me, that does. Your preclear will sit there and he will say, "Oh, my mother is so terrible, she beat me and so on and so on and so on. And I associate this with the time when my little sister... And my little sister read a book on sex and that associates with it. And I see a piano over there and sa... ssa... sssuh."

And you'll say, "Now, have you ever been psychoanalyzed?"

"Well yes, as a matter of fact."

"How does it seem to you now?"

We've gotten that one out of the road. See that?

Now, that's quite an interesting thing, quite a fascinating thing to watch a preclear come into cognition – not recognition, because he probably never knew it before. You see, recognition would be "I knew it but I forgot it."

Conditions exist through him, around him, above him, below him – considerations exist of which he has no *cognition*. These have come into beingness without any understanding whatsoever on his part. He's never *seen* them before, and yet they're right there.

And so what we're interested in is *cognition*, looking at it, and we want the as-iness of any and every condition which this fellow has.

"How does it seem to you?" "Now, exactly how does that seem?" "Oh, you want him to repeat it again, huh?" Well, now let's look that over again. Now, you say you have this feeling like there's a tight band around your throat. Well, how is it now?"

"Oh, it's unfeeling. There's no feeling in that area."

"Well, is that the same as it was? Now, how is it? Well, is that the way it generally is?" (You know, you've got to throw the dunnage in to keep up the communication line.) "Well – oh, you say it's rather sharp pains in the vicinity of your throat. Well now, is it

like that often? Well now, how are these pains? Do they go around to the back of your neck? Oh, the whole back of your head's numb? Well, how is that? How does that seem? Is it numb right down to your hair roots? Well, you don't know? Well, how does it seem not knowing about it? Well, that's fine. That's fine. Well do you like that? I mean, is it good to have the back of your head completely missing that way? No, you don't like that? Well now, let's take your throat again. You say you've had this condition for some time. All right now, do you get a sort of a continuousness about that throat?"(Get that other as-isness in there. I mean, does it go on and on?)"Oh, you've got it checked. Well, just how are you checking it there? Just *how* are you checking it, hmm?"

And your preclear, the first thing you know, is saying, "Well, there's nothing wrong with my throat, back of my head is perfectly alive."

If he doesn't know the formula of what you're doing, and he doesn't track with it at all, and he doesn't know any Scientology – if he does know Scientology, by the way, it works like mad; he can't prevent it from working. If he doesn't know anything about this at all, you will not just appear to be a priest, you will appear to be a very, very magical sort of priest indeed. You will already become a priest the first time that you all of a sudden have turned pain running live all over his body. I mean, you're somebody there – you're possibly a witch or something. Lord knows what you are, but you have ceased at that moment to be entirely human as far as he's concerned.

Now, I have run this process on preclears who were intensely resistive to auditors, who knew nothing could happen, who generally finished up sessions saying nothing happened. And I've received the most amazing sort of a result. The person knew something had happened – cognition had occurred. And it had occurred with considerable action. The person *knew* this very, very well, in other words. He knew this *extremely* well – that something had happened.

You can't run this on anybody without changing his condition. It's impossible to do so. Even if you ran it poorly, you'd change his condition.

Now, the basic laws which underlie this – you want to know how it is right now, *with this thrown in occasionally* (now, if you throw this in often, I'll beat you – so help me – because this will backtrack him): You throw in *where* and *when* once in a while – *once in a while*. Let's not stick him back on the time track; just throw it in once in a while – well recognizing that if he spots this thing even vaguely in the time and place where it started, you're liable to get a whole chain of them blowing. But we're not really interested in that, because where and what is present time?

Time is not just beginningless and endless – it would seem so – but time is a continuing postulate. It's a postulate which continues to postulate. *All* time is now. What we call the future, which is entirely hypothetical, is what will be. That's not an as-is, is it?

You could have an as-isness about the future, such as "I am worried about the future," but you don't have a future in that preclear. All right. You might have a future if you did enough for him to completely change his life and he was a millionaire and gave you the Roman Catholic church or something to reward you. But as far as *the past* is concerned, it has no more validity than the future. All that exists of the past is what is in the present. And if it's not

in the present, so what? You say," Well, it might come into the present." No it won't. No it won't, not if you've got the present straightened out.

If you have a continuous state of beingness in this present, which is rising and getting better and his cognition is better and better and better, you're turning on his knowingness. And if you turn on his knowingness in the present, his knowingness about the past will increase markedly.

I have had a preclear start out with a statement that "I am a body, I know I am a body, I have heard about this Scientology and I have heard that it pretends that it can do something and people get out of their head. The actual truth of the matter is, that I've heard about this too, that the people who actually exteriorize are really crazy. I read in a psychiatric textbook once upon a time, that people occasionally had the delusion that they were not in their bodies, and that psychiatry used electric shock to move them into their bodies" – which would be more or less the practice of a bunch of monkeys hanging from their tails that shouldn't be fooling around with such things as the spirit.

You think I'm being very cruel on psychiatry? Listen, psychiatry and psychoanalysis, in the last fifty years, have sat in auditing chairs – which is to say practitioner chairs (they could have been auditors, but they weren't) – for I'd say several million, if not several billion, hours, and they didn't notice this? Ha!

Well, they were starting out on the basic premise that man is mud, is mud, is mud, is mud, is mud, and he's a body, and there's nothing you can do about it anyway. And going at it from this angle they weren't liable to find out much of anything but the fact that there does happen to be some mud around.

The as-isness of a preclear was what was in the road of materialistic approaches to the field of healing. And that's what's in the road of the medical doctor and anybody else who shouldn't be in the field. Now, I don't infer that a medical doctor is out of order in practicing on broken bones, obstetrics and things like that. That's definitely mechanical structure and so forth. But when it comes over to his doing something about the mind, he has to deal with the spirit, because there isn't any mind. That was the thing they never learned about, you see? They didn't find out that what they were studying didn't exist. A lump of computing machine made out of neurons and psychotrons or something. This they were studying. Well, they could have studied it forever. And they never found out anything about it, because it has no as-isness.

In other words, you could go on describing it forever and of course it'd continue to exist because it's an alter-isness.

Well, don't you make the same mistake with a symptom. Don't you *dare*, if you're using this Description Processing, make the same mistake with a symptom and consider that this symptom consists of some structural difficulty which has the deep significance of the causation point in the thisa, the thata – in other words, alter-isness, alter-isness, alter-isness – because all you'll do is perpetuate the symptom. Don't make that mistake. What you want to do is quite something else.

You want to know *how* it seems *right now*. How it is? Its as-ness. You want to know *where* the dark area seems to be. You don't even want to turn it white. You know, you don't want any action on the part of this preclear. He's so *fixed* on the idea to [of] being an observer, let's let him *observe*. And there's a white area.

And he says, "I don't know. The back of the leg is kind of white and the front of the leg is kind of dark. And there seems to be a shooting pain that's going up through the leg."

"Well, does it seem to continue? Well, how does it seem when you...? Is there any effort there on your part to shut it off? Or anything like that? Well, is the pain bigger than you are?"(Dunnage, you see?)"Are you bigger than the pain or the pain bigger than you? Just how is this?"

"Oh, the pain seems real big."

"Well, how are you estimating that?"

Keep him looking at it, keep him looking at it. Don't *fixate* him on it. You just want him to describe it and describe it and describe it, and then to communicate and communicate and communicate. And we don't care if we waste a little time. We don't care if we waste some time with this. So what? He goes off into some wild excursion.

And he says, "Well, it seems to me like, I don't know, I can't quite look at the room when that pain is on. I try to look at the room. I wonder why that is. I wonder why that is. I've had a lot of speculation as to why this is."

You can let him talk for a minute. Let him talk. It's just burning time.

But, remember you're preserving a two-way communication. And throughout this process you're preserving a two-way communication and that is its keynote and that's why it continues to work so easily. Your preclear does not seem to be under duress at any time.

Believe me, is he interested in his symptoms! And you simply use that overtly to get him to describe them as they are. But this requires a certain sensitivity on the part of an auditor – a certain sensitivity, believe me. He's got to know when the preclear starts weaving the fancy tales.

Now, how is he going to know this? The condition does not alter. That's an interesting one, isn't it? The *condition* doesn't alter. He's describing how horrible it is to have his head in a continual migraine. He goes on and describes this and he describes it and he describes it, and he describes it for three, four minutes, and there's *no* change at all. And he describes it for a couple more minutes and there's *no* change at all.

Don't shoot him. Just ask him how his feet seem to him. Get him *off* the subject by pulling his attention off that part of his anatomy, because you hit a lying machine. And if you'll just get his attention off of it, why, maybe you'll get some straight answers.

Now here's where you learn about people. But in what framework are you learning about people? You're going on the very, very basic material of the four conditions of existence. And you will see him run this cycle over and over and over as he does Description Processing.

People become so fantastically patterned, they are so predictable when they start this sort of thing, that they become very easy to process. But as far as it being restimulative is concerned, it isn't, because you're not trying to change the preclear. You're trying to find out how he is. You can do this for hours.

Cognition will turn on, on the part of a preclear that he's actually had a migraine headache for years and he didn't even *know* it, except all of a sudden it turned on and then *stopped*. You know, I mean, it was on and then it stopped.

All of a sudden, he says, "Wait a minute. What's happened to this pain? I didn't ever know I had a pain here?"

See? That sort of thing has happened in this type of processing. Well, all right.

Description Right Now Processing – two-way communication – Step 1. That's how you get them into communication, how you keep them into communication, and *why* you keep them into communication along this particular line.

Now, you could perform 8-C Opening Procedure by just simply maintaining a two-way communication. "How does this room seem to you?"

"Oh, I don't know."

"How does that wall look? Oh, you don't know. How does it seem to you not to know? What are you not-knowing with there?" Anything.

You're trying to get the exact condition at that moment which he is observing. And of course, it'll just go flick, flick, flick, flick, change, change, change, change, change. You're *undoing* all the change he has put into it. But it undoes with great rapidity.

So there *is* some hope after all.

Group Processing

A lecture given on 28 July 1954

I want to talk to you now about group auditing.

A group auditor is one who stands in front, sits in front of, or relays by some voice-canning system to a group (and a group consists of two or more people), and audits them so as to improve their condition of beingness as thetans. That's a full, complete definition of a group auditor.

If he's standing there to improve their condition, he will of course do his group auditing well. If he's simply auditing, he might do something too, because mechanics will carry forward a great distance. But if he really wants to make people well, cheerful, better, put them up into an operative band, change their condition, make the able more able and so forth, he recognizes as he audits a group that he's auditing a number of preclears, and he's auditing them collectively and individually all at one time. And a good group auditor recognizes that this is not unlike driving one of these twenty-mule teams. It's a trick.

So, some people are good group auditors. They recognize it and they don't flinch and they can do it. And some stand up in front of the room and give auditing commands, but you'd hardly call them a group auditor.

Now, what are the conditions under which group auditing is best done?

1. The atmosphere should be quiet.
2. The methods of ingress into the group-auditing room, such as doors, windows, chimneys and so forth, should be to some degree policed so that we don't get people walking into the session.

So this would include, under a subhead, the fact that people don't come late to a group auditing session. Those people don't *come* to a group auditing session. You understand that?

I mean, there's no such thing as coming late to a group auditing session. A group auditor who knows his business simply follows that as a rule. He doesn't let people come late. They just don't come. When they get there, they will find the next group auditing session is next Thursday (which fact it might announce on the door or something of the sort). He impresses this upon his people and upon his group, that people mustn't come stumbling in fifteen or twenty minutes after the group auditing starts, fall over a couple of chairs, fall over a couple of preclears, drop a couple of ashtrays, step on a couple of ashtrays and then drop their pocketbook, upset the chair, nudge the fellow in front of him so they can say "Excuse me," and in other words, interrupt the session.

Do you know what can happen by reason of that? You might have somebody sitting there in the back of the room where these people came in and sat down, who was just at that moment getting into something that was pretty darn hard to handle, and he was having to wrestle it with [by] himself. You were there helping him as a group auditor, true, and your next command would have a tendency to straighten this out. But this individual has started to flounder. And all of a sudden somebody comes in and helps him out by falling all over him. This introduces an automaticity into the environment which is not conducive to that case improvement.

So a group auditor is somebody who starts case improvement, and that's not conducive to case improvement. So the group auditor has a code all of his own, which happens to be the Auditor's Code. But the Group Auditor's Code has some more to it. And amongst those things is people don't ever come late to a group auditing session.

Another thing is that he doesn't audit – just to give you a few other little items on this code – with processes which establish long comm lags. He avoids processes which do this on individual preclears. If he knows that a certain process produces a long comm lag on individual preclears here and there, he *certainly* avoids it in auditing a group. He audits primarily with techniques which will discover *every* person in the group alert at the end of an hour's processing. And that certainly doesn't include anything that'll give somebody a twenty-two-hour comm lag.

Now, another one in that same bracket is he must be willing to grant beingness to the group. He isn't a lion tamer sitting up there with a bunch of lions about to pounce upon him. He is somebody who is standing up in front of a group willing to grant beingness to that group. And as he grants beingness to the group, so the group recovers. If he is willing to grant beingness to a group, a great many things immediately fall into line, and these follow.

He gives his commands in a clear, distinct voice. And if he notices that people at some part of the room or another look at him suddenly after he's given the command, or look at him questioningly, he simply repeats the command for the whole group. In other words his mission is to get that command through and registered.

He recognizes and must recognize that the people to whom he is talking in *this* group are not an audience. They are a number of people who are in a greater or lesser degree involved in recognizing, looking at or resolving problems relating to their beingness, and as such, of course, they are slightly out of communication with him. And so he must recognize this, just as he has to in an individual session. He has to give his commands clearly, distinctly and get an answer.

In a group auditing session he doesn't have the answer. He doesn't get that answer that says "Yes, I've got that," "Yes, I've finished that," and so forth. Therefore, he must do all of his auditing on such a basis that it obviates those answers. You see, he says this and he's not going to get a reply from his preclear, and so he must therefore take enormous precautions – actually *very exaggerated* precautions – to make sure that every word he says is clearly registered to the most anaten person in the entire group. They're registered.

He must also be careful to give his commands in such a way as not to give a number of failures to one or more individuals in the group.

For instance, he says, "Now, get a place where you are not. Now just contact that place."

And he shouldn't give another, contradictory command until he's sure that everybody in the group has found at least one place where he is not.

Now, let's take an example of that. He says, "Give me a place where you are not."

And he waits for a moment and several people in the group already have spotted this place with accuracy.

So he says, "Get one place certainly, and then some more."

You see? Now, what he's done is take those five, six, eight people in the group who did not find that one place right now, right away, and he let it be *all right* for them to go on and comm lag on it, you see? And still made it all right for the remainder of the group to go on and find some other places.

Now, one doesn't have to have a stylized patter in order to do this, but that happens to be a very stylized patter – "Get one place, one place for sure, and get that place, now. All right. And when you've got that one place, get some more. Get some more places." You see?

Now, if he's willing to grant beingness to the group, he'll be heard all the way through the group, and if he's not willing to grant beingness to the group, he won't be heard all the way through the group.

Furthermore, if he's not willing to grant beingness to the group, he will find himself willy-nilly shifting processes halfway through. He suddenly decides he'd better run something else. He'd better run something tricky. He'd better run something that's very stunty.

You know, I mean, "Oh, let's see. Now, we were doing all right. We were spotting the walls of the room." And we were doing Group Opening Procedure which, given in the *Group Auditor's Handbook*, is a very precise process. It was figured out as an opening procedure for a group, and he's got that going fairly well, and he's just got that well started and he decides "Well, let's shift off to some Duplication by Attention." "All right. Look at the right wall." "Look at the left wall." "Look at the right wall." "Look at the left wall." "Look at the right wall." "Look at the left wall."

"I don't know. That doesn't seem to be getting very far. Let's see, what really should we do?" "Well, fix your attention very, very solidly on the front wall and just look at it." "Well, that's fine." "Fix your attention on the front wall, now, and look at it." "Now look at it." "Now let's pretend it isn't there. Let's pretend the front wall isn't there, and let's mock up something in its place."

The group by this time is getting sort of restless, you know? What's basically the trouble here? Is it the fact that the man doesn't know what he's doing? Well, it could be, to some slight degree. But why doesn't he know what he's doing? Every single one of those commands and the theory behind it can be found in the publications of the HASI. What's he doing not knowing what he's doing?

Well, I'll tell you what he's doing. He's trying *not* to grant beingness to that group. And there'll be people in that group who are worried about granting beingness to the group and all

these people getting well and improving and becoming thetans and flying around and demonically attacking people and "You shouldn't make everybody free like that, you know?" And these people will step on ashtrays, upset chairs, come late, get up in the middle of the group session and open and close windows, open and close doors. And then we discover, of course, that they don't want to have beingness granted to them. But, particularly, they're worried about the group session going on with this individual granting all that beingness to all these people and improving all these people. And if all these people improved, why, goodness knows what would happen-something horrible would happen, competition would get too high or something of the sort. But something dreadful would occur. That's the computation that's running on when bad auditing commands are used. And don't ever think otherwise.

No, don't say, "Well, he just doesn't know," or something of the sort. Every one of *Homo sapiens*, individualized the way he is to an "only one" complex, and so forth, has some facet of his beingness which is refusing to grant beingness. Every man alive has it to some degree, otherwise he'd never have a game or a contest. There's always the other side. He isn't going to grant any beingness to the Princeton football team – that sort of thing, you know?

And when you exaggerate this consistently and continually, you'll get somebody who doesn't want to have any beingness granted to anybody anywhere. And so, before he does some group auditing, he won't bother to read over the way you do it. You see? And if he does, he'll do something else. And he won't study up his subject, he won't look over his people and he won't audit in such a way as to make them well.

And you'll find, by the way, that his group sessions will not be well attended. A group auditor's group sessions cannot be anything but well attended. And they will be continuously well attended, and they will increase in their attendance to the degree that the individual is willing to grant beingness to people. In other words, do a good job.

Now, that's the long and short of it and that's a very uncompromising statement. And you can tell me there are a lot of things which mitigate this statement, but I'll argue you out of them. The truth of the matter is that it comes down just to this business of granting beingness. He will or he won't.

Now, can that be remedied with him? Yes, when he has a little more freedom. Just the standard auditing sessions which are given in the *Group Auditor's Handbook* will bring him up to a point where he will grant more beingness to people. It will do this.

You could run it just as a straight process, as a group session. "Let's grant some beingness to the front wall and some beingness to the back wall." And so you could do this if you wanted to. But again this is too much significance in the process.

The reason he's not granting beingness is because he himself is enchained and enslaved, and he feels himself attacked to some degree by the environment, and you've got to get him up to a point where he has a little more operating margin in his survival. And if he has a little more survival margin, and so forth, he's willing to let somebody else survive. He begins to treat survival as a commodity.

There's only five quarts of it in the world, and he's darned if anybody's going to get any part of those five quarts, because he knows he needs it all himself. Now, there you can

tell immediately a good auditor and a bad auditor. So there is a case computation at the bottom of group auditing, isn't there? An individual who is afraid of effort is a good mark of that.

Now, people recognize that instinctively, that a fear of effort, an unwillingness to put out energy or effort and so forth, is right there along with "bad off," "won't grant beingness," "got to slow other people down too."

So we have a group auditor who sits down, who puts his feet on a desk and audits a group? Oh, no, we don't. The group won't get well, won't recover, won't do anything. Why?

They'll sit there and run the commands, because they've heard that Scientology is a good thing. But they say, "This guy, this guy doesn't care. He isn't interested." There is no necromancy involved here. We don't have a beam of energy coming out from the group auditor, settling over like a little star over the head of every person. That is not the case in point.

But there's another case in point. There's the simple matter of duplication of a communication. Why do people recognize this rather instinctively, that a person doesn't care and so forth, if he hasn't any energy or effort?

Well, here's this individual; he seems to have some vitality. If he's got some vitality, the communication line has as its source point, vitality. And whatever it's got as its effect point at the beginning, it will at least wind up at the end of it with vitality. If you've ever talked to somebody for a while in a rather bored tone of voice, you have found them after a while getting kind of bored. Well, this is just Q and A.

Have you ever listened to somebody who was very electrifying, a William Jennings Bryan sort of a speaker? I mean, boy, pound and howl and beat and so forth. Look at an audience that has been talked to this way: they're aroused – see, they definitely are aroused. The man didn't say anything logical at all anytime during the time he was talking, and yet just simply the fact that they're duplicating a speaker who seems to have some vitality comes on through to the audience and gives them some vitality. But does it *give* them some vitality or do they simply *duplicate* that vitality? They just duplicate it, that's all.

Now, a group auditor could sit down, you see, and talk to the group. As a matter of fact – and this is a very dangerous point to tell anybody – that actually brings about a little bit better duplication, because the audience is sitting down. But if he is sitting down, for heaven's sakes, think of how much, now, his voice has to do. He can't depend on anything else to do anything for him. Everything he does must be contained in his voice. Everything he *does* must be contained in his voice; everything he *thinks* must be contained in his voice.

"Oh, my goodness," you say, "this then requires an actor."

Yep. If you're not willing to be various things and if you can't be various things at will, you actually haven't even got any business auditing. Why?

Because you're trying to keep things from being. And the first person you're trying to keep from being is you. And if you're trying to keep *you* from being to any marked degree, you will, on a duplication basis, more or less re-stimulate this fact: on the other end of the line you'll keep others from being. You see that?

So a group auditor could sit down. That would make a good physical duplication. But if he does, think of the vitality that has to go into his voice. The audience has got to become even more aware of the command line.

It isn't really absolutely necessary that a group auditor sit down. I mean, this is very far from it. As a matter of fact, the best results I have ever gotten in group auditing session was actually walking up and down in front of an audience and picking them out every now and then – singly, you know? "Did you get that all right?" You know? And so on. And the audience tone just starts up. And then the fact that they're doing drills which are just dynamite, of course will just practically lift them right straight out of their heads.

I think one of the last broad group auditing sessions I did, I got a report on it afterwards. I came away from a mike and was simply talking to the crowd, and I was really trying to do something for the cases, and so forth. I was quite interested because it was getting on down toward the end of a series of group sessions. And I got the report afterwards, and there were more people exteriorized during that particular session than in any other single session.

Well, here I was feeling more alive and I was feeling more interested and I was feeling more urgent about what was going on, and that in itself was communicating, and it was communicating very strongly.

A group auditor who has no wish to have anything happen will be disappointed. If he sits there and reads the commands in a flat, dull, dead voice out of the *Group Auditor's Handbook* to a crowd of people, he will get some results. This we've tested out – tested out. We took the worst group auditor you ever saw or ever heard, and took this group auditor and gave him some commands that were not too well written, and we sent him out to audit somebody. And he goes, "Well, I've got some commands here now. I've got some commands. Uh... let's see, uh... uh... let's see... Uh... Hum... Uh... look at the front of the room. Uh... It says here... Let's see... Uh... Uh... look at the right wall."

This guy still got some results. So what we're doing with processes is fabulous.

And in view of the fact that we have the *Group Auditor's Handbook* and all of these various sessions which go with it... And by the way, the best sessions we have for group auditing are in the *Group Auditor's Handbook*. The results on the part of people will come up just if they're read in that fashion. So the operating margin we have to improve here is the auditor, isn't it?

Now he, then, becomes the variable. So that we could take four separate groups with four separate auditors running the same – let's just say Session One in the *Group Auditor's Handbook* – and we would find that the most animated, most alive, most willing auditor there, who was the most interested in his audience, would produce the highest tone rise on his people, because that's the bonus we're operating on.

And the others, if we just left that factor out, they'd all improve equally. But we do add that factor and we get a *considerable* jump in our people in that group.

So there's something to know about group auditing, isn't there? And the most that you can know about group auditing is this: If you're afraid of a crowd, you won't want to grant beingness to them, because that's why you're afraid of them. You're sure that they're liable to

interrupt you; you're sure they're liable to jump over the seats and attack you or something. If you're in that frame of mind toward a group, you will not be heard clearly through the group. You will have a tendency to change techniques, and your attention hunger will probably cause *you* to drop ashtrays, lose the place and do other things.

Now, what is this thing called – if we're going into this auditor, then – what is this thing called stage fright, and how could a person resolve stage fright?

Well, the crudest way he could resolve it is simply by some kind of mock-up. You know, just do mock-ups on being scared to death and the audience jumping him and so forth. Well, that's a very crude way to do stage fright – very, very crude way to do it.

The best way to cure stage fright is to walk up on a stage before a vast number of people and do your best, and after you've done it a few times you will recognize that this is an as-ness, this condition, and generally everything connected with it, the strain and so forth, will blow. You just recognize clearly that you're under strain when you talk to this audience. You're just under strain. "So? So what? So I'm under strain when I talk to the audience," and you won't be.

All it is, is fear of what you will do, that you might do something unpredicted or something strange might occur. And after you've done it a few times, you discover that no strange things occur, that you get away with it every time, and you become quite accomplished.

Now, there's something else that you could do – there's something else *definitely* that you could do to improve your capabilities as a group auditor. And that's beingness! You could just practice beingness. Yeah, you could be actors and be therapists and be swamis and be this kind of thing and be that kind of thing, and just work on it, on this kind of a gradient scale, until you have got the idea you could be anything. You could have this run on you, you see-processing. And it will cure stage fright too, because a person with stage fright is being somebody who has stage fright. That's all there is to it, you see? It's just an as-is – Q and A.

All right. The whole subject of group auditing then involves itself, today, not so much with a knowledge of technique, but it involves itself with a stage presence on the part of the group auditor and his command over the group itself. If he's willing for the group to get well, they'll get well; if he's interested in whether they get well, they will; if he's interested in having a group, he'll have one.

It's a very odd thing, but the very best auditors we have now have no real difficulty in collecting groups. If they're really good auditors, they have no real difficulty in collecting groups. So I don't know where all the scarcity of groups – where this idea came from unless it came from the same source as bad auditing. You know, the individual who is having a rough time.

Now, you can't have a feeling of embarrassment towards your fellow man actually and walk up to him on the street and say things to him, you know, and ask him to come places or sell him things or anything else. As long as you have an embarrassment toward somebody, or toward men, you'll have difficulty collecting a group or running a group or anything of this sort.

Well, what is this quantity called embarrassment? It is a matter of exhibition. Here we have appearance and disappearance as a dichotomy, you see, and a group auditor is somebody who has to be willing to appear. And if he's been compulsively made to appear many, many times against his will... One of his mother's favorite phrases might have been "*Look* at you. There you are, dirty from head to foot, and I just cleaned you up. *Look* at you. Look at you. Look at – you're appearing, you little swine." Some gentle upbringing of this character will tend to promote embarrassment. But you shouldn't go looking for embarrassment into deep-seated significances.

The embarrassment is, the fellow is there kind of apologizing for his presence and trying to disappear at the same time. That's the as-is-ness of embarrassment, and that's just an as-is-ness. We don't care where it came from, see? He's apologizing.

So, one of the first things you could do is simply, don't apologize for your presence. You might expect people to apologize for theirs, but don't you apologize for yours. You're here and their hard luck, they're there too – or their good luck that they're there. But if a fellow is in real good shape, why, this is the sort of an atmosphere that goes around a group session. He says, "I'm here and you're right there and I'm real glad to see you. And you're sitting there and that's awful unlucky for you if you're sick, because you're going to get well. And you could come in and not run any of the commands at all and sit down and you'll get well, naturally – I mean, that's a matter of course.

"I'm sorry you've got some things to be ashamed of, but you know I haven't got a single one. I can remember back down the track just as far as I can reach and all the women I've ruined and everything else. Well, you're just jealous, because you couldn't have ruined that many women."

And in other words, "Here I am and here we go and everything's fine," and so forth. Just a fairly calm atmosphere rather than an excited, ecstatic atmosphere. But even an excited, ecstatic atmosphere or a swami atmosphere or an Aimee Semple McPherson atmosphere is better than somebody standing there saying, "You know, I'm... I'm... I'm sorry I'm up here visible."

So the best way to get into the groove of group auditing is get your case in good shape just exactly as you would get your case into good shape – just with standard processing. Nothing peculiar, nothing slanted, nothing odd or unusual run on it, just it gets in good shape. You're a little freer, and as you become freer, then you are more competent to let yourself appear.

And the other, that goes right along with that and is not at all dependent on you getting your case in good shape, is the fact that you just go on making public appearances and group auditing people with this postulate: "Everybody's glad to see me. They're very happy to hear me talk, and I'm here and I know at the same time I'm scared to death and that's the as-is-ness of it, so what? But I'm putting on a good show, anyhow." And the next thing you know, why, all of that is gone. All that feeling of strain and tension and everything is gone, and you'll go on and give group sessions.

But you give sessions to people to make them well, not to be somebody standing on a stage running off a set of words.

You have reason, purpose and meaning in what you are doing and consider it a personal affront if somebody in this group did not immediately get entirely well after a couple hours' processing. That's a personal affront, and you treat it as such when they tell you about it. "You mean, you've come to one of my sessions and not gotten well? Humph! Well, I'll let you come to another one, but don't pull this again."

Okay.

Scientology And Living

A lecture given on 4 July 1954

I want to talk to you about the application of Scientology to everyday living.

The best method of applying Scientology to everyday life is the simplest one, which is simply using the ARC triangle with its consequent Chart of Human Evaluation in everyday living. This takes into effect most of the manifestations which you see and which you can evaluate quickly.

This, of course, includes the communication formula. And an understanding of that communication formula would be an understanding of cause, distance, effect, and the fact that people who are at the cause point or source point are very often very reluctant to be cause, and people who are at the effect point are very often very reluctant to be an effect, in both cases, of anything.

And so they will do various things. They move out onto the distance between, and so they become a message. And you'll see people going around with tracts, or something like that, being a message. They're spreading a certain word, something like that, and they get stuck with this; they get stuck very easily with this.

You can go around and take all the wisdom you want to anybody without yourself being a message. Have the message in your hand if you are carrying something around, don't, yourself, *be* the message, see?

The people, as they go between these two points, get closer and closer to arrival. And there's the fellow who doesn't dare arrive, you see? He doesn't dare get to that effect point. And there's the fellow who doesn't dare go any further from that cause point. He'll get further and further, then, from being cause, whereas he will be more and more an effect. And you could get these two points pulled together more and more tightly, until they were not quite the same point.

But that is to say, you get *this* series of manifestations if you do that (just an understanding of this formula is very useful in everyday life – very, very useful in understanding life): You get somebody that, everything he is the cause of, he becomes the effect of. This goes back a long way down the track; the second law of magic could have been said to be, don't be the effect of your own cause.

Well, of course, it is impossible not to be the effect of your own cause. So that in itself is a booby trap. A fellow is a fool if he thinks that he can cause something without becoming one way or the other the effect of it.

He can cause anything he pleases as long as he's willing to be the effect of what he causes. And naturally, if you know of yourself, you're a static, you're a personality, you don't have mass, meaning or mobility as yourself. You are using a body rather than being a body. You naturally are capable of causing almost anything. But supposing you were standing there protecting a body, being a body, hiding in a body, anything you want, and you cause something. You wouldn't like that to happen to the body.

Supposing you pick up a book or something and throw it at somebody and give them a big bruise in the face, something like that. You don't like that. So you begin to resist, you see, being an effect. And you resist being an effect more and more and more and more.

Actually, you're making one body resist being an effect. And after a while, because of the makeup of this universe where anything you resist you get, eventually – anything you resist you become. Now, that's this universe's favorite motto. When you resist something hard enough you become it – in the absence of processing *and* understanding. Let's modify that to that degree. If you understand this, and if processing exists, why, that doesn't occur.

But here we have people going around and they become very, very unwilling to be the cause of anything. You'll find they won't give people orders, because they themselves do not want to be the effect of receiving orders. You see? And they won't give people orders. They'll do all sorts of very remarkable things to avoid upsetting people in their vicinity.

Why? Because they're afraid of being upset. You see? They have learned by experience what we used to call (and still call) the motivator-overt act sequence. You want to know why people get nervous, it is just because when they make the faintest overt act, you see, they get this tremendously exaggerated package of facsimiles saying "No-no-no-no-no-no. No, no. You better not talk to those people hard like that or it'll really cave in on you."

That's fairly normal; that's fairly normal in a society. It's one thing to be polite, because you can be polite. And it's quite another thing to let yourself be walked all over. It's quite another thing to be reactively in apathy, you see? Just *blaahh*, apathy.

Now, that's one manifestation. There's another manifestation which is even more curious, which you will see every once in a while. And that is, anything that happens in the vicinity at all, the person knows he is the cause of it – anything that happened in the vicinity.

Now, it starts out with anything that happened to him, he knew he caused it basically. Well, of course, this happens to be a salient truth. It is true that anything that happened to him, he was basically the cause of. But that's *way* upscale up here, you see? And now he just feels this reactively, that he has become an effect, therefore, he caused it. This automatically must be true.

You've got cause and effect so close together that they short-circuit. If there is an effect, he caused it. And he gets out to the broad environment, till you will find people sitting around in insane asylums worrying like mad for having caused all of World War II, or something, you see? He must have done something because there was World War II – must have been him. You see, he's playing the "only one" very hard, at this point.

All right. Even children will react on this one occasionally. We have an ally die, and the child will walk around worrying, worrying, worrying, wondering what on earth he *did* that

killed his grandmother or his sister or something. He must have done something. He was the effect of it, wasn't he?

See how that is? He must have done something! And we get that as the entering wedge into superstition. "Now, let's see. I'm a victim. So, therefore, I must be guilty of something," and they dream up something on the order of original sin. Something like that. You see, it's all bad, so therefore you must be the effect of it. That's repent, repent. That sort of an attitude toward people is an effort to do that.

Well, actually, an individual only needs to accept the responsibility for his own acts; things will take care of things very nicely. And if he recognizes clearly the effects which he does cause, and if he's perfectly willing to cause effects which he dare be the effect of himself, why, naturally, he can walk through this bramble and brush with great ease, even as a body.

There is, there, a mode of conduct which is available.

Well, I want to call your attention to the Chart of Human Evaluation, which was organized very early in 1951, which has various columns and which gives behavior. Now, that is plotted out mathematically on the basis of ARC: When you raise the affinity of a person, you will raise their reality and raise their communication; when you raise their communication, you will raise their affinity and raise their reality; when you raise their reality of something, you will raise their affinity and raise their communication. Okay?

That whole chart is plotted out there and is a very good chart to use to predict people. It's particularly good for an auditor to use this chart, but it's a chart that can be used in everyday living.

Had an auditor one time who had studied this chart as theory, you see? He just studied the chart as theory, theory, theory. You know, it was interesting, too. You know, interesting. Having studied all this, why, it never occurred to him that it was true or real or anything else. He was perfectly in agreement with it as a mathematical problem.

All right. He went out one day and a thought struck him that it might be applicable to life at large. Is this possibly true? I mean, oh well, of course, people really wouldn't act like that. So he went into a bank and looked around and – just watching people go by, in the bank lobby, and watching the people behind the desk and talking to a couple of people, and so forth – he started putting them on the tone scale.

Well, he did this all one morning. And he came back to school *horrified*. It was absolutely accurate. But what horrified him was not the chart, but that people *acted* like this *all* the time and didn't know what they were doing, and they had no slightest inkling of what was going on here, you see?

The fellow was 1.5ing, acting exactly as a 1.5 should act, reacting across the boards. And he even went so far toward the end of morning to ask one fellow who was 1.5ing – which is why I brought that up – how his arthritis was and how his heart and arthritis were.

And "Ohhh," the fellow says, "it's terrible." See? Hit it right on the head.

He was beginning to be able to diagnose simply by just the attitude this person had toward existence. You know, just an everyday – the way he would pick up a blotter.

Well, this was deadly to this individual. He had all of a sudden walked into a completely predictable world, where all the people were predictable – just as curious as that.

Well, that's pretty good if you could predict everybody.

You want to beware of *this* trap, though, in doing this: the reason *why* they're doing all these things. Let's just *avoid* the reason why they're doing all these things. The reason why they are doing what they are doing is ARC. And the reasons they give are the reasons which justify them against the social pattern in which they live.

You see? That is the totality of it. The reason why.

For instance, a cop acts like he acts because he is a cop. This bank president has to act the way he acts because he is a bank president. His first excuse is his beingness, or position, and his next few excuses down the line are this way and that. And you'll find out he acts like that because...

Well, now these things might have been causative and these are causative things in his life. That's very true that a person put in a position which requires, for instance, a 2.0 is liable to at least dramatize being a 2.0 on that tone scale right across the tone scale.

But this is a curious thing, that he doesn't have to believe it too. See, he could be at 2.0 across the tone scale, but he doesn't have to believe it. It's only when he takes all this seriously that he gets onto this scale.

Remember that it's ARC, then, not reasons why. If you fall into reasons why, you can just figure with the rest of them forever: the reason why he is doing this, the reason why he is doing that and so on.

You just look at this ratio. How much space does the person have on that communication formula? How much space has he got? What's his general affinity toward life at large? And what's his reality? What is he basically in agreement with?

And we look at that and, actually, we see these three corners of the triangle forming a plane. And as his space gets greater, he goes right on up the scale and right on out the top of the scale. And as his space gets less, why, the source point and receipt point of the communication formula come almost together, but it's like walking halfway to Chicago, if every time you walked halfway to Chicago, you, of course, never get to Chicago. The source point and receipt point do not coincide.

They will and can coincide perfectly at the top of the scale, at which moment you have achieved a condition which might be rather poetically stated as a brotherhood with the entire universe. But that's a total affinity, and it is not an enforced or compelled affinity. It never occurs under enforced and compelled affinity. If you've ever noticed, that affinity which is compelled and enforced, and so forth, does not persist. It simply goes downscale.

A free affinity for all of life, then, is quite a different thing.

Now, every once in a while an individual may start worrying about his *sympathy* for life. He realizes that he has some inkling of what ants think about and do. And he could look at them, you know, and he knows this. And knows that cactus has a certain emotion about *it*, too.

And he goes around, and he's liable to start worrying about this and try to pull back, you see, as he's afraid he'd become these things fixedly, you see, if he went into *sympathy* with all these things.

His passport to freedom is his sympathy for all life and its forms. Not compulsive, you see? I mean, just his free sympathy. If he were being forced to feel sympathetic toward young boys, we could be certain he would eventually, if he were a thetan, become a young boy.

Now, there we recognize in this chart that we have a terrific method of prediction, and in ARC in general we have a good scale of prediction. And an individual cognizant of these things *can* predict the activities of those about him.

Now, in view of the fact that these three items – A, R, and C – combined together, are symptomatic of understanding, the degree of understanding which a person has of existence is the same degree as he has *distance possible* in his communication formula. Therefore, we find understanding of existence increasing, increasing, increasing, as he goes upscale, and decreasing, decreasing, decreasing, as he goes down scale.

Now let's add *beingness* into this. And of course, we could add every factor of Scientology into this – but let's add beingness into this, and we'd find out that an individual is at first, in middle scale, completely free to *be* anything.

And then as he goes downscale, he is more *compulsively* being made *to be* something. And he finds himself something, and this makes him unhappy because he feels that it is not by his own choice.

Well, actually, we know by as-ness and the necessity of altering as-ness that he had to appoint an other-determinism to keep something – to go on persisting, you see? And he is more and more avoiding motionlessness, because motionlessness *is* dangerous to him.

Therefore, a consistent and continual *beingness* as something, is something he begins to fear. And when your individual is to a point where he has the *horrible* feeling that if he stood still for a long time in one place, he'd sort of grow roots, you know, or he'd do something peculiar like this – something bad would happen to him. Or if pain turns on, because of – he has to stand still for a while. You would have a condition there where you have compulsive *beingness* jibing with this one – which is the same thing – fear of motionlessness.

And that fear of motionlessness is making him more and more motionless. The more *frantically* this individual goes into motion, the more he becomes a symbol.

Let's look at that. And of course, the more he becomes a symbol the more *mass* he accumulates. And the more *mass* he accumulates, the more *meaning* he accumulates.

And boy, when you get him down around about 0.5 on that tone scale, you talk about reasons! You talk about reasons why. They would be utterly non sequitur but, boy, would they be significant. Mass, meaning and mobility, then, fits in there, beingness fits in there.

Now, to understand life and human beings at large, you should recognize this: that every human being there is, is being – he is a human-being thetan; you know, as a thetan he is being a human being.

Well, that individual would never have become selectively and enforcedly a human being if he had no overt acts against human bodies. So he has enormous numbers of overt acts against human bodies – tremendous numbers of them.

As such, then, he is very, very pressed on the subject of protecting bodies, you know? He mustn't let a body be an effect of anything. He has these tremendous overt acts against bodies, you see, while he was still a thetan, and now he has got to protect the body from such things as himself.

So as he goes down tone scale, whereas he may worship some powerful spirit that'd throw lightning bolts at him, as far as an individual thetan is concerned, to let anybody be three feet back of their head or something like that, it means that a body is liable to be attacked.

You see, thetans attack bodies – he knows. They're bad. And we get an individual down scale like that, exteriorize somebody and he'll pull some kind of a trick like this: "Be three feet back of your head. Are you three feet back of your head? Well, all right. Well, are you sure you are now?" See, that "mustn't have any thetans around here" has hit him, you see?

And he says, right at that moment, he says, "Well, why don't you put your attention on your nose. Let's see if we can't take your nose down a little bit in size" – boom! Terrific change of pace, you see, and it'll just hang a person in that particular incident. We get that kind of a manifestation taking place.

Well, there is something else that is taking place, is something-and-nothingness. A thetan is perfectly at liberty to have all the somethingnesses he wants to and any of the nothingnesses he wants to. He can communicate with somethingnesses with great ease. A thetan is something which is *above* something and nothing. A thetan isn't just nothing, you see?

He is something which can *monitor* somethings and nothingnesses. Well, if this is the case, then, we find that people would be doing one of two things when they get extreme and downscale: they would either be trying to concentrate on all somethings or they would start concentrating on all nothings.

And as a matter of fact as they go downscale they do this alternately. They fall out of all something, something, something, and then they go into a strata where it must be nothing, nothing, nothing; must be something, something, something. And then *must be* nothing, you see? And then *must be* something. And they're going on down this strata.

And you'll find human beings around who are utterly *compelled* to make nothing out of bodies, to make nothing out of cars, manuscripts, any remark which you say, any act which you pull. They have got to make nothing out of it. They have got to stand back there, and it would just kill them if they couldn't ridicule it, you see.

Ridicule is the very lightest method of just slapping you to pieces. You know? You come up with a favorite joke of yours, or something like that, and it has always been funny to

other people around, and all of a sudden this person – "Yes. Well, so on, so on, so on," some snide remark on the subject.

Or you come in and you have just won the track meet, something like that. And boy, you're sure happy there. You got a ribbon there that was about a yard long, and everything is fine. You just won this track meet, and this person says to you, "Do you know, your shoes are muddy, and you have some dirt on your face, too?"

Nothing. See? Nothing. Make nothing there if we possibly can. Well, this is the biggest allowable nothing they can make. And they are being prevented from making nothing of things. In other words, they don't know any mechanisms to unmock things, really – just by effort, energy, you see, and they've got to make nothing out of things with energy. And the harder they try that, the further down they go.

Now, when they've got to make something because they have to make something because they have to have something, and so on, same way. They'll get into the same kind of a category.

You get some psycho, you ask him to put up a couple of anchor points. And he is just as likely to put up solid steel pyramids, you know – something. Just get this as an attitude.

Now, a thetan who is in very good shape could mock up a solid steel pyramid, and if he was in wonderful shape, you could probably see it, too. You see? But down scale he just compulsively has to mock up something, then all of his automaticity has gone into making something. And he is objecting to it. He is objecting to every part of it as he goes down.

Now, to understand people, then, we would have to understand what kind of a cycle is this person on. Is he on a somethingness cycle or a nothingness cycle? Neither one is any worse than the other, but the truth of the matter is that sane people – we categorize that just overtly as above 2.0 on the tone scale – sane people make something and nothings at will. You know, they don't have to. You know, they just do, to get some action in life, and so forth.

They can change their mind. They are not compulsively making somethings and compulsively making nothings continually. In other words, their conduct has a little randomness and difference to it.

Now, as far as sanity is concerned, there is not really such a condition as insanity; there really is no such condition as neurosis. I say that because these are simply two arbitrary words which were thrown into the society, and they were never defined. And the society so variously understands them that you get a couple of kids as sane as anybody standing there calling each other crazy, you see? It is just slang, and so on.

There is an emotion, however, called the *glee* of insanity, which is an *intolerable* thing to a person. And they'll get this turned on, and it will be a very upsetting thing to them. We could say a person in that state – or in such a state in relationship to energy, so that he could not take care of the first dynamic; you know, he can't take care of himself, he can't feed himself properly or take care of his body – let's just call that person insane. Either he has this terrific glee of insanity or he is utterly incompetent in taking care of himself.

And above that level – just to give it definition – let's call him anything else above that level which is irrational, compulsive, obsessive, so on, call it neurotic. Carry anything neurotic right up to 2.0 on the tone scale. And just call this stuff that's low on the tone scale, and so forth, insane if you want to. But again, I tell you it is just an arbitrary thing; it really has no definition.

Now, to understand and predict people at large, it is only necessary for you to know whether they make something or nothing out of things. And then remember, if you please, that their conduct is consistent – that they are *consistent* in their conduct.

Now, they might have a lot of reasons why, they might be very unpredictable, but they have a motive which underlies their conduct just to this degree: something and nothing. This person one way or the other is going to make nothing out of everything around them. See? Or this person, one way or the other, is going to make something out of everything around them.

Now, there are two other categories of human beings. And one is the category, upper scale, where things can be bad or good at will; everything on Know to Sex in the upper scale can be good, you see? But when they are on lower scale, everything on the Know to Sex Scale – which is Mystery, there, to Sex Scale – is bad. And when you get something where everything on the Mystery or the Know to Sex Scale is bad, you have somebody who is inverted – very *badly* inverted.

And when they are consistently and continually "everything is bad, bad, bad, bad, bad, bad" – watch out. They are well below 2.0. They're using some kind of a mechanism: if it's bad, it's bad, it's bad, that's why we have got to make something, you see? Or it's bad, it's bad, it's bad, that's why we have got to make nothing. This is your 1.5. He is actually operating there 100 percent. He can only operate on emergencies.

"We are about to have this tremendous disaster, and therefore in view of the fact that we got this disaster, we have to have this emergency legislation, "and so forth." And therefore we can make something here. We can make this army so as to make nothing" – big compulsive sort of a reaction. You see?

But it's bad. All that reasoning is bad. The only reason we can *do* anything is because something is *bad*. They have lost concept of doing something because it's fun, and there's your last keynote.

Individuals who can *do* things, no matter whether good, bad or indifferent, or outrageous, simply because they are fun – an individual who can freely and with a clear heart do things because they're fun is a very sane person. And he'll be in good shape. And the amount of laughter which a person laughs – which is, by the way, not your harmonics of laughter. Laughter, you see, has a number of harmonics down the line. Rather upper scale laughter: a person, he laughs, he doesn't laugh because he's embarrassed, he doesn't laugh this way and that, he laughs because he thinks something is funny. And if a person laughs fairly often, and is very easy in that laughter, you got a sane man in your hands.

And they just go downscale and laugh less and less and less, or laugh more embarrassedly, or compulsively or obsessively, more and more and more, as we get clear down to the bottom.

Person down at the bottom doesn't laugh at all. He doesn't live, either. He just lies there, a lump of energy, being mass, meaning and *no* mobility. He's not even a symbol anymore.

The truth of that is, you go up and ask him what his name is, he can't tell you.

Now, there, in essence, if you care to study this Chart of Attitudes, and you care to apply this information to life as a whole, you'll find out that you can know human beings. But remember, you shouldn't expect them to know you, if that communication formula is very close together. They won't understand you. But that doesn't prevent you from understanding them.

So remember that a thetan can always handle symbols. Until they are exteriorized and in good shape – or any life form is in good shape and operating as a thetan – it is a symbol.

And symbols don't understand. They run around and act, one way or the other.

Okay.