

18ACC

a) Table of Contents, in Checkcheet order:

1.	THE OPTIMUM 25-HOUR INTENSIVE, ANATOMY OF PROBLEMS, TRAINING ATHLETES	1
2.	QUESTION AND ANSWER PERIOD	17
3.	WHAT IS SCIENTOLOGY	22
4.	CCH RELATED TO ARC	36
5.	THEORY AND DEFINITION OF AUDITING	53
6.	WHAT SCIENTOLOGY IS ADDRESSED TO	67
7.	THE FIVE CATEGORIES	81
8.	CONTROL	95
9.	THE STABILITY OF SCIENTOLOGY	108
10.	AUDITING STYLES	122
11.	THE MIND: ITS STRUCTURE IN RELATION TO THETAN AND MEST	137
12.	DEATH.....	153
13.	SURPRISE THE ANATOMY OF SLEEP	170
14.	THINNIES	185
15.	ABILITY - LAUGHTER	199
16.	FACTORS BEHIND THE HANDLING OF IQ	215
17.	THE SCALE OF WITHHOLD	230
18.	CCH	244
19.	CONFRONTING	260
20.	INSTRUCTING A COURSE	274
21.	THE FUTURE OF SCIENTOLOGY.....	290

b) Table of Contents, in chronological order:

1.	57-07-15	QUESTION AND ANSWER PERIOD	17
2.	57-07-15	WHAT IS SCIENTOLOGY	22
3.	57-07-16	CCH RELATED TO ARC	36
4.	57-07-17	THEORY AND DEFINITION OF AUDITING	53
5.	57-07-18	WHAT SCIENTOLOGY IS ADDRESSED TO	67
6.	57-07-19	THE FIVE CATEGORIES	81
7.	57-07-22	CONTROL	95
8.	57-07-23	THE STABILITY OF SCIENTOLOGY	108
9.	57-07-24	AUDITING STYLES	122
10.	57-07-26	THE MIND: ITS STRUCTURE IN RELATION TO THETAN AND MEST	137
11.	57-07-30	DEATH.....	153
12.	57-07-31	SURPRISE THE ANATOMY OF SLEEP	170
13.	57-08-01	THINNIES	185
14.	57-08-02	ABILITY - LAUGHTER.....	199
15.	57-08-05	FACTORS BEHIND THE HANDLING OF IQ.....	215
16.	57-08-06	THE SCALE OF WITHHOLD	230
17.	57-08-07	CCH	244
18.	57-08-08	CONFRONTING	260
19.	57-08-09	INSTRUCTING A COURSE.....	274
20.	57-08-16	THE FUTURE OF SCIENTOLOGY.....	290
21.	57-08-26	THE OPTIMUM 25-HOUR INTENSIVE, ANATOMY OF PROBLEMS, TRAINING ATHLETES	1

c) Table of Contents, in alphabetical order:

1. ABILITY - LAUGHTER	199
2. AUDITING STYLES	122
3. CCH RELATED TO ARC	36
4. CCH	244
5. CONFRONTING	260
6. CONTROL	95
7. DEATH.....	153
8. FACTORS BEHIND THE HANDLING OF IQ.....	215
9. INSTRUCTING A COURSE.....	274
10. QUESTION AND ANSWER PERIOD	17
11. SURPRISE THE ANATOMY OF SLEEP	170
12. THE FIVE CATEGORIES	81
13. THE FUTURE OF SCIENTOLOGY.....	290
14. THE MIND: ITS STRUCTURE IN RELATION TO THETAN AND MEST	137
15. THE OPTIMUM 25-HOUR INTENSIVE, ANATOMY OF PROBLEMS, TRAINING ATHLETES	1
16. THE SCALE OF WITHHOLD	230
17. THE STABILITY OF SCIENTOLOGY	108
18. THEORY AND DEFINITION OF AUDITING	53
19. THINNIES	185
20. WHAT IS SCIENTOLOGY	22
21. WHAT SCIENTOLOGY IS ADDRESSED TO	67

The Optimum 25-Hour Intensive, Anatomy of Problems, Training Athletes

A lecture given on 29 July 1957

Audience: Hi! Hello!

Thank you very much.

Well, tonight we start a brand-new series of tapes. Brand-new series of lectures based on Q and A.

Rightly or wrongly, Scientologists to some slight degree, to people who are interested in Scientology but aren't, yet, have the reputation of not answering questions. To some slight degree. And I'm going to show you here in the next couple of weeks that I can answer questions at great length. Therefore, this is the first of these question and answer things. And maybe I'll get tired after this – after a couple of days and we'll do something else. Anyway, this is lecture number eleven, 18th ACC, July 29, 1957. The beginning of a series of questions and answers on the subject of Scientology.

And I think that you probably haven't thought of any questions yet to amount to anything. There's hardly enough here to bother with yet, but these will come up. I'd very much appreciate questions in class. I don't partic – – I mean, about your class activities. I don't particularly appreciate questions asked so that other people will be informed, and which you already know the answer of. Now, I'm going to sit down here at least for part of this lecture and look over some of these questions. And any question that can't be asked in a paragraph... Now, here's a good question: "What would be the optimum one-week intensive to give on a case where one week of CCH 1 and 2 would just begin to crack it?"

Well, I can answer this by saying that CCH 1 and 2 would be what would be used.

Male voice: I see.

Now, this unfortunately contains the answer to the question. Don't you see? Well, "What would be the optimum one-week intensive?" is a very good question. And I think that you would like to hear the answer to that. Right?

Audience: Yes.

All right. The best intensive – the best thing to do with an intensive here today – by which we mean a twenty-five-hour, straight-at-it series of processes-would probably be the

first of the CCH, which is CCH 0, followed by a good test pass here of CCH 1, CCH 2, CCH 3, CCH 4, CCH 1. That brings us to the end of the first day. Providing the auditor can't duplicate. Now, it would actually bring us about ten or twelve hours deep.

And I would then, depending on the type of case it was, continue from that point either on up the control line or I would simply crack the case wide open on all of its refusals to communicate, improve the communication, turn the fellow loose in my area and tell him to talk about Scientology to people. That's what I'd do. That's what I'd do. Now, what somebody else would do would be something else.

Now, people who don't like people communicating and things like that, they could go on and run this sort of a process: they could say, "Recall birth. Thank you. Recall conception. Thank you. Recall a past life, with great reality. Oh, you can't do that, eh? Well, thank you." And get them introverted. You see? So that they couldn't then communicate and say what a bad session it was.

Now, a lot of people who would go out anyway and say what a terrible session it was, of course should be handled that way. Raise their IQ, not their communication, you see? If they're going to be very critical of it, of course it's best to just sit on their heads for twenty-five hours and skip the rest of it.

Answering your question very directly: I'd run CCH 0 at the beginning of every session in the intensive. There's a difference between beginning of session and beginning of intensive. And I would run CCH 0 at the beginning of every session in the intensive. Keep that nice and flat, keep that from going out from under. I would run CCH 1, the presenting the paw – the hand process until I was fairly – he was fairly willing that he'd reach to me. And then I would run enough Tone 40 8-C, let him find the auditing room and – so that he wouldn't kick up any fuss that way particularly. I wouldn't make any endurance test out of it, however. And then I'd run some Hand Space Mimicry so he'd get some reality on the auditor very well; and then probably some Book Mimicry to get him to duplicate.

But if he was doing extremely well, was developing little comm lags of one kind or another, I would just go ahead and audit straight out from my assurance that he had found the auditor, the auditing room, was willing to reach. You see, that's what those first steps establish. They're not really an endurance contest; they work. You know? I mean, they can be worked in this direction.

But how can you get the most case gain and how can you get the case into the greatest level of communication, if that is your goal? How can you shed the most psychosomatics and so forth? The indicated course by the CCH processes, actually at this level of CCH 4, is not as direct as you would be willing to think. After all, you're auditors who know something about your business, don't you see? And there are things that you can just do with cases. You just decide to do something with a case and then you do it with the case. You see? And you push the case around on any course possible.

Now, you'd need to know this, however: how sure were you that you could control his body and his attention? And if you were sure that you could control his body – you know, he

did CCH 1, Hand Presentation and he did CCH 2, Tone 40 8-C, he did these pretty well, he had some good reality on Hand Space Mimicry – you would have a fair guarantee that you had a good body control. Right? And there to some degree you could direct his attention.

Well, if you were going to go any further with the case on CCH, you would simply go up the ladder, don't you see? But that isn't necessarily the exact thing to do. This is a sort of a shotgun sort of thing that would get all the cases. But it's not necessarily true that you would take off there at 4 with 4. You could go this route very easily: instead of CCH 4, Book Mimicry, you could go into this department: Locational Processing. Just a training process. In this particular case though, you'd be training his attention. Well, why would you graduate from CCH 3 to training? A training process of one kind or another? You'd just be making sure that you could keep his attention directed.

Now, Locational might itself – run ninety hours – might or might not flat-ten a case. We don't care. But we know what it would do. We know that it would place the preclear's attention under control. And knowing that it would place his attention under control, we then could run a thinkingness process on the preclear, providing we would come back and take his attention under control adequately again and again and again. So if you were going to follow some sort of a thinkingness pattern with this preclear, it would be really up to you what you ran on him; but for sure you would have to include in this process two other processes. I don't care whether it's Rising Scale Processing you were doing, you were running Black and White or dichotomies or any-thing else, there's two things you'd have to include in it. And one is CCH 0 at the start of every session. And the other is Training 10 (I think it is) to direct the attention here, there and every place. Is that right? All right.

Now, why? Well, when you run a thinkingness process on a preclear with lots of significance in it, he runs into things which makes him obsessively come off of it and he is changing all the time and he's liable to run into something that makes him difficult to follow your thinkingness command. Well, if you come off of that and give him something on the order of, "Notice that wall. Notice the ceiling. Notice the floor," and make him turn his head in that particular direction, you have taken again control of his attention, don't you see? So you'd hardly call it a process because it has no end goal in itself; it's just keeping the preclear in line. And this is one way of handling the preclear's attention. Do you follow me?

So you couldn't omit – and this is scraping down the lowest thing – you just could not omit out of an intensive CCH 0 and some form or version of Locational Processing. These two things would have to be in there pitching.

All right. Training Zero is there because an individual gets into problems in the middle of an intensive, as well as at the beginning. It's all – be very well if all the present time problems occurred on Sunday and you were going to start the preclear going on Monday. It would be very nice if they would always arrange this, but very often these present time problems occur on Wednesday or even Thursday. And I have spoken to preclears about this reprovably and I have said, "In the following week I don't want you to have any present time problems of any character," but it hasn't done any good. Probably because I didn't put a canceller in ahead of it or something.

But here is the point here, that a preclear gets into restimulation and telephones George. And George says, "Yeooow yeahhh yeahhh yeahh yeahh." Preclear got into restimulation and decided George was a perfect heel and called up George and said so. Or decided – preclear decided she didn't know how Mama had possibly put up with it all those years and wrote Mama so, and the answer doesn't come till Friday. You got the idea? In other words, the preclear in restimulation made trouble for himself. And very often while he's coming through these things he's more liable to make trouble for himself than ordinarily. So you can expect present time problems to occur during an intensive. And if you expect anything else, you're just trying to postulate out of existence the behavior of man. And I'm sure that you ... I'm sure that you could do this, given a little spit, but I haven't been able to so far. Anyway, what – I'm doing very well on it, though.

Here's always a thought with this. The pattern of CCH is as follows: you control the body so that you can control attention; you then control attention so that you can control thinkingness. If you're going to run a thinkingness process with significance in it at all, it is at least necessary that you continue to control attention. Do you see? You can't void controlling attention, no matter what you do. If you're going to start running thinkingness – he's just sitting there and about the highest, hottest thinkingness process you can run on a pre-clear is this: "Think a thought. Thank you. Think a thought. Thank you. Think a thought. Thank you." And you just could carry it off almost at that basis and he'd be replying whether he would or no. It is a control of thinking-ness process, which is quite an amazing process all by itself.

Now, you went that far, you could probably do it all right. The funny part of it is, it wouldn't run on me. I mean, it wouldn't run as an automaticity because I found out something the other day that's very incredible. I could sit there for about a half an hour without thinking a thought. Found it very, very easy to do. I was feeling very stupid and I said: "Well, I wonder how long I can sit here without thinking." I sat there about a half an hour and at the end of that time I wasn't even thinking about what I was supposed to be thinking about and I wasn't even thinking about not thinking, you know? And picked up the postulate at the beginning of the half hour and washed that out and looked at the clock and got up.

It is possible for you, if you're at all in control of thinkingness, not to obey the command "Think a thought." Somebody says, "Think a thought," you can say ... "Think a thought. Think a thought." Just as I was doing this right now I wasn't thinking a single thought. All right. Not even the thought to be provocative. All right.

So, we have thinkingness – actually, oddly enough, only in upper-level cases can you get a blank. You may think that's peculiar, but people at lower levels never have blanks. It's just one long consecutive whir.

The psychologist, for instance, said in all of his textbooks, just shortly after the Chaldeans, he said in his textbooks, "Thought is an associative process whereby all subsequent thoughts depend on an earlier thought." In other words, he knocked out of existence and notised prime thought. You see?

Well, one can always think a prime thought and go on from there or just stop that and think another thought. It's quite an amazing ability here centers around thinkingness. So that if

you're handling thinkingness, you're running up against – and the only people you get into any trouble with, by the way, are the people who can't stop thinking – you'll get a thinkingness out of control. And now you control this thinkingness and you may be able to do it for a half an hour or forty-five minutes very happily (and I'm talking about somebody who's real low-toned now) and all of a sudden you're no longer in control of the thinkingness. They're not thinking the thought that you told them to think at all. And so they are out of session. Now, understand that, please. They're out of session when they're not thinking the thought because they're not obeying the auditing command. And they act like they're out of session, too. And after a while they blow. So CCH 0 and a direction of attention process such as Locational – "Notice the ceiling. Notice the floor" – is absolutely necessary.

Now, you could tell anybody to think anything you wanted to tell him to think as an auditing command. And you understand that Trio is in itself a thinkingness thing. You consider it a Havingness Process, but he has to think the thought, "Yes, I can have that," and be answered up with some sort of a conviction that he can have it and have a basic agreement going there one way or the other inside himself. Do you understand that? CCH isn't just a process like SLP 7 or SOP 8 or something like that where you did one step, flattened it, did another step, flattened it and did another step. These are indicated processes for various levels. That's a bit different than a scale of processes which you must always climb.

Now, you take this direction of attention process, there is a pattern behind it. First you direct attention to the environment, then body plus the environment, alternately, and then run into some sort of a duplicative process on the body and the environment. And that seems to be – well, it is the best order of procedure there. So if you start directing his attention to the room and the body and so on and you're going to make a process out of it, you're not running Locational Processing. You're doing something else, you see? It's not a process. But this process, "Notice the ceiling. Notice the floor," and so on, is the simplest of the direction of attention processes.

The other day I tried to better this process. And I tried several ways to better it and finally hit on an auditing command which worked fine until it was run on somebody else and they had a question about it. And I got – the thing was run on me and I just practically blew the session. It can't be done. A variation on this like, "Touch that table. Touch the floor," and so forth. This actually can't be done the moment that an individual is no longer very closely associated with the body. It's all dependent on the earliest auditing command, isn't it? You say, "In this session we are now going to employ your body and we're going to have you touch things with your body. Is that all right with you?" Well, we might as well just halt in that moment of time because anytime the preclear changes in any way the auditing command goes by the boards; and after that he himself can touch that ceiling, touch that floor, and the auditor never notices and insists he use his hands to do it. But he hasn't been told to use his hand to do it. Don't you see? But, "Notice the ceiling. Notice the floor," and so on is a very fine process and does directly control attention and is a control factor.

Now, let's look at Havingness. Havingness says, "Look around here and tell me something you could have." The optimum running version on that, by the way, is the original Trio

form, which is: "Look around here and tell me something you could have. Look around here and tell me something you would permit to remain. Tell me something with which you could dispense," or "that you could dispense with." That was the original Trio, the three questions. And they're run in a group. That is to say, a few of them are run and a few questions on one of them, a few questions on another and a few questions on the third. All right. That's permissive, isn't it? It doesn't direct his attention, does it? And he'll fly out of control with it. Some day, some hour of the intensive, the preclear was not finding things he could have. Don't you see? He was doing something else.

So that CCH 0 and Locational I would then use, whatever else I was using in the thinkingness or significance line of processing.

First I'd get – I'd follow this pattern, rather than follow processes: I would get his body under control; then his body and his attention under control; and then I would tell him what to think and show him he could think it and get him to change his mind to a point where he could behave in a more optimum fashion.

And that's the way I'd go about an intensive. And that is the optimum intensive.

Okay. Somebody here wants to know what the anatomy of a problem is. Seems to be a very interesting question.

You have to – the anatomy of a problem would consist, first, of an inspection of the CDEI Scale. All difficulties are entered through curiosity.

Curiosity killed the cat. Scientology brought it back.

Now, a problem actually is at the "C" part of the CDEI Scale as a very high-toned manifestation. The individual who could have a problem would be a person in not too bad condition. The person who is a problem is something else. That person doesn't have problems, he is them.

The problem is intention-counter-intention. We answer the question, "What is an intention?" by saying it is an intention (since a lot of you are taking this up right now, tomorrow, and I wouldn't bust your class up).

The next question that was on my desk here was, "What is an intention?" and you'll just have to beat that out tomorrow. But the whole idea of a problem is that it's something versus a something, with a doubtful outcome. Now, it can be more than one thing versus more than one thing, but we – the irreducible minimum of factors in a problem happens to be two. Except the problem of the "only one," where the only problem is that there is only one. Problems based on scarcity, however, if you will look at it, are based simply because there's an absence of another. So problems start with the base number of two and can go anywhere else.

Now, you say, "Well, it's like a war – there's one side fighting the other side and the outcome is doubtful." All right. That's fine. That is a problem. Then any war is a problem. But to say that only two sides can fight a war is foolish indeed. To say that it would be two versus one or three versus six and that it would always have this complexion would be very foolish. There is a such thing as a three-cornered war. There was such a duel fought once: Mid-

shipman Easy, the great triangular duel – if any of you ever read Marryat's masterpiece on that. They fought a triangular duel; everybody got in his shot and so forth.

There actually was a three-way war going on one time, right here in the United States. One of the sillier wars. It happened down in the Gadsden Purchase. And the Gadsden Purchase was purchased sort of over the dead bodies of the defeated Mexicans and so on and they didn't particularly like to sell this. But we had Mexican troops fighting American patrols and Apaches; and we had Apaches fighting Mexican troops and American patrols; and we had Americans fighting Apaches and the Mexican troops. And boy, if you don't think that was a problem! There you had a three-cornered war going on; a real one. Didn't last very long but it was awfully confusing. The doubt of outcome is a problem.

Now basically, a confusion is not a problem. That is not a good definition of a problem. A confusion is not a good definition of a problem. In the first place, a confusion isn't a problem. A confusion is simply a disorder. It is when a problem ceases to be solvable that it becomes a confusion. When you get a problem falling apart and bewildering everybody thereafter, like some places in this universe – there's the dark horse head in Orion, which is one of the more interesting stellar phenomena visible from Earth; there's a horse's head up there, coal black and no light ever comes through it. Of what is it composed? You'd say immediately, maybe, parts of your bank, but... I dare say the thing was set up at one time or another on a problem basis. It was some-body versus somebody. Then the war disappeared and the confusion remained. Follow that carefully.

Any confusion that is in a preclear's bank at this moment was at one time or another a problem which was in the realm of handling capability. One time or another somebody could handle the thing. But when the war ceased, when there was no longer another terminal, when there was no longer this thing with two terminals fighting and so forth, the weapons and other bric-a-brac used in that conflict tend to drift around.

Somebody is busy plowing in France and the end of his plowshare goes into the nose of a shell that was dead when it landed, but suddenly goes whumph! and bits of farmer and plowshare go spattering around the Picardy horizons. All right. That's no part of his game, you see? He's busy trying to plant a field and it's quite unexpected. It doesn't have anything to do with the problem at hand – is will the crops grow and will the government leave me three kernels of wheat per bushel, or two? It doesn't have to do with any of these problems and therefore it creates confusion. Now, the funny part of it is, is when this happens to him – I'm telling you about this guy with malice aforethought because it explains a lot about your pcs – this guy, when it goes off, goes booooo! He's liable to have something blow up under him like this; and if he lives through it, you'll find a very confused man. Why is he so confused? He wasn't playing that game and there was no problem.

Now, soldiers were in trenches on that field. And by the way, if you've never been over there I invite you to drive through the parts of France where the US has spent so many millions of dollars and so many troops and so forth. You'll laugh yourself silly. I mean, it's one of these horrible, gruesome jokes. You could lose the whole country in the northern part of the panhandle of Texas and never find it again. How you could get all these men in there

without them sleeping on top of each other, I don't know! It just isn't ground to fight in or that much to fight over. It's – has to do with – I told you when I came back from Europe a couple of years ago I finally figured out what it was all about. The Germans came down – they got short of cows in Germany and got restless and they tried to go down and raid the French cows. And the French objected and more and more people were brought in on the thing and finally, why, these cattle rustlers got driv' off. That's happened a lot of times. Anyway, it's not something that anybody would take seriously. That's for sure. And yet the number of lives that have been lost in it...

Well, all right. The soldier could be there in the trench and a shell could land alongside of him and go boom! You know? And he'd say, "Thuuuuuh, that was close, you know?" And so on. Well, he's part of that game, see? That's part of the expected activity, he's been given to believe. Of course, he isn't any better off for it, you understand. But it's at least in a problem condition.

Now, when problems deteriorate they become confusions. Do you see that? And now you go in to solve the US government. Total confusion! Why? It's a degeneration of all the problems that were never disposed of or solved for a hundred and – three-quarters of a century.

And they generate all this confusion and then they're all going which ways and then nobody ever knows what the solutions – or what problems the solutions apply to, don't you see? "Let's see. What problem does this solution apply to?" See? Well, you run across a perfectly orderly solution like "all soldiers while on guard shall not put potatoes on the ends of their bayonets," or something, you know? And what problem did this solve? Well, nobody knows, so that sort of thing becomes army regulations, you see? Totally composed of potatoes not on the ends of bayonets. The navy has still retained some idea of it. They say somebody sometime or another has run into those difficulties and the composite of all these difficulties is in US naval regulations. And that's true. Total composite of difficulties. Only trouble is, they took it from the Queen's regulations and nobody knew what that problem was.

Now, you start unconfusing this thing, how would you go about unconfusing it? You'd actually simply start addressing out-of-present-time problems. You get the idea? I mean, you would start resolving problems that had existed once but which only demonstrate themselves now as debris. Do you understand that? Hm?

Very possibly the basis of this universe is a problem. It probably existed to fight some other universe or something at one time or another. And then they lost all contact, maybe, with the other universe or it disappeared or something of the sort and after this, why, you have the Milky Way and other things. And astronomers cast up vast opinions about the whole thing. It's like finding a deck of cards out in the street. There's been an awful fight and two gunmen shot each other down over eight aces in the deck or some such thing. And they've been carted away, the blood's been mopped up but nobody picked up the cards. And you come along – astronomer comes along and he looks at this deck of cards lying in the street and he makes some terrific theory out of this. He says, "This proves the existence of nymphs. This shows us conclusively that the interrelationship between alpha and beta particles is the square

root of bull." See, he doesn't connect this phenomenon of a deck of cards or any such phenomena with the actual problem or conflict which caused them to exist.

Now, we're not trying to say that all things begin with a problem. But if there's any trouble anyplace, there was something to cause some curiosity to bring about a desire so that the desire could be enforced, so that it could then be inhibited. The CDEI Scale. And the problem is usually what is offered as bait, one way or the other.

Problem is a very, very interesting thing. But its anatomy is two or more intentions opposed. Opposed intentions. That's all there is to a problem. The anatomy of a problem is that it follows down the CDEI Scale. After it's ceased to be a fight, then somebody had to have a fight, don't you see? They haven't got a fight but they had to have a fight. Well, that ensues at the end of a fight. You know, he's got to have a fight, but he hasn't got a fight anymore, so you get "D." He can't tell you why. Then you've got to have have. All these little kids running around with cowboy pistols don't know it, but they're still trying to shoot Black Buck back in Nebraska. Those kids that are real serious about it have lost – have had the misfortune of killing an opponent. It was a big problem how they were going to shoot off Black Buck, you know? And they finally snuck up on him one night and stove a shiv in him. And "Black Buck," they said, "was causing problems." But you notice there was no problem until they came along and opposed Black Buck.

That's why police and criminals cause a vast problem. These two, counter-opposed, cause the problem. If the cops weren't there, you probably wouldn't have any crime to amount to anything. If the criminals weren't there, you probably wouldn't have any cops. That's understandable. Everybody realizes that. But they never look at the other side of this problem because they're not supposed to. This problem's supposed to continue in existence forever. If you didn't have any police, there probably would be very few criminals. Broken-down space opera mechanics scattered around Earth here are the debris of an old cops-and-robbers game which has now disappeared. That's just debris, don't you see?

All the preclear objects to is the debris which he is now holding, which was once a significant part of a problem. He's got solutions that no longer apply to any existing problem. So he thinks he has to do something with them and as you audit him he tries to find places to fit these solutions in. Or he realizes that these solutions no longer fit anyplace, so he's trying to knock them out. And all of it is for want of problems, want of game, want of contention, want of randomness and so on.

When we say "problem," then, we're actually saying part of a whole structure which would have to do with opponents, which would have to do with spectator sports, which would have to do with calculating machines and so on. There's nobody unhappier than somebody with a tremendously wonderful calculator that has nothing to which to address itself. See? Just sits there and gathers rot. That's a silly thing to have happen. It'd be like launching somebody with a 180 IQ into a land or civilization of monkeys. He goes around trying to show the monkeys how smart he is. There's no opponent. No opponent at all. Matter of fact, the monkeys probably think they're much smarter than he is!

So this whole vista of the problem should actually be viewed with intention-counter-intention. And you could have mystery or curiosity in either or any of the intentions. Curiosity about the outcome and curiosity about the actual problem.

The only horrible thing that occurs in thinkingness is to have no desire whatsoever to discover what the problem is before you start solving it. I did that one day. I took three or four of my buddies, they were – I was back home on a visit from the Orient and I was trying to make myself personable and trying to say, "Well, here I am, don't you remember me?" sort of thing, you know? They were working on a curb and they had a – in the old days automobile rims were not drop-center. And some of them were very difficult to get tires on and off of. And they had some old heap there or another and they were trying to get this – wrestling with this tire and I went over and said, "Here," I said, "I'll give you a hand." And with great expertness took up a tire iron and snapped the tire back onto the rim very nicely. And I said, "There you are." And they said, "Ohh, we were trying to get it off and we'd almost succeeded ..." I just hadn't bothered to ascertain what the problem was, that's all!

For instance, you'll find many, many cults get into this kind of thing. They go out to do good and then they never find out what's bad; and you find them doing all sorts of weird things.

For instance, there's some peanut-whistle outfit sets up a racket in the United States called the Busy Business Bureau. And this outfit would just love to squash all these forgers and cheats and all that sort of thing, but they run out of ammunition all the time because there just aren't that many people doing bad business. They completely overlooked an interesting fact: the survival value of a bad business or a person who is doing badly is very low. Very low. They get weeded out at a mad rate. Even before the Busy Business Bureau could get a good report on them, see, they're in and gone. Somebody's selling a bunch of shrubs he pulled up in the woods as ten-thousand-dollar fruit trees and he's into the neighborhood and out and gone again long before the Busy Business Bureau hears about it. And this guy manages to survive per-haps for some time, but sooner or later somebody knows the bushes and hits him over the head with an auto wrench and that's the end of that guy and that business. Society has a habit of weeding out the wooden nutmeg sales-men. Well, the Busy Business Bureau has it all figured out that the trouble with business is that it's fraudulent. See, they know the trouble with business: it's all fraudulent and the public has to be protected against fraudulent business. And they have this huge problem mocked up of the public versus these businesses, see?

The public's in there doing business with the businesses and the businesses are doing business with the public. And when they get into trouble with each other, they don't go to the Busy Business Bureau. They chew each other up or they sue somebody and start into this natural selection. Knock somebody out of business and he isn't doing business in that community any-more, don't you see? It's naturally selective as a mechanism. Which leaves the Busy Business Bureau out on a limb because there is no general fight in progress. Consumers are consuming and producers are producing, and it's going on all the time. And out of this terrific agreement, terrific communication level, they try to make a problem and there just isn't one.

Now, if they looked around, they could undoubtedly find something to have as a problem, you know? But they keep doing asinine things. And actually I found out the other day, much to my amazement, that they're in much more trouble than they're out of, all the time. I called up somebody concerning suing the Busy Business Bureau and so forth, and he said, "Well, that would be the 10,761st suit filed this week against the organization." All they do is fight lawsuits.

Now, the ascertainment of a problem or an existing problem or the creation of a problem is necessary for a game of some kind or another, you see? Unless one is established, no game exists. And one is in the funny situation of being out in a vacant lot and he picks up the bat and he swings madly through the air and then he runs to the first base and then he jumps over into the pitcher's box and he throws a ball to first base and goes over to first base and tags himself out. Only he isn't there anymore and it makes him feel foolish. There's no game in the absence of a problem.

Now, that's pretty much the anatomy of a problem. But in view of the fact that a thetan can do with more – you know, he hasn't got enough problems, which is why he's hanging on to what he's got – he doesn't release them easily until you demonstrate to him that he can invent more. And when you show him he can invent more, then he'll let go of a few of the obsessive problems. The trouble with problems is there aren't enough of them. The only thing – reason people protest against war is there isn't enough war going on. If war could go on long enough and everybody could engage in it... See, these big shows that they put on – Warner Brothers and Roosevelt Pictures and so forth put on there in 1941 and so forth, they were actually colossal productions but nobody was any part of them, see? And it didn't make a good problem.

Therefore, Problems of Comparable Magnitude, "dream up more problems," "invent problems," "figure out a problem you could make out of that," and that sort of thing is all very necessary. And injecting mystery into it is necessary too. "Now, can you really get the feeling that there's a problem there?" and "Get yourself figuring about it" and so forth has to be interjected into it, all of which is part of the problem.

Then another thing about problems is they're disgustingly easy to solve. Almost all problems. So we get a whole race of people known as the psychos – they're not quite like the morphos. And these people mock up only problems that nobody will ever be able to handle, so great is their anxiety about the loss of a problem. They've gotten down to a point where they themselves are neither part of the contestants – they themselves are simply the confusion residue. And every time you better their condition they go into ten thousand new problems. See, they just can't rise up scale on the subject of problems; they go into new problems all the time. See, they are the confusion, the debris, the leftover debris of former games and that sort of thing. And they have become the debris. And that's worse than becoming the problem, but not much.

Okay. Well, here's a very interesting question. "Ron, will you say something on an integrated way to train an athletic team? In my case, a badminton or tennis team. Cover the following: Do any of the TRs apply? How about the PE type of instruction? How rigorous

should body and muscle training be? Should processing be specialized? You once stated that you could – one could not be trained on barriers alone. What do you mean?"

Well, I've just covered part of that. Somebody said that – couldn't be trained on barriers alone. Well, let's – just what I took up here: the anatomy of a problem – that's also the anatomy of a game, don't you see? Probably a problem is a game somebody's taking seriously. And you can't just keep putting up barriers, barriers, barriers. Also there've got to be specific problems.

And on any athletic team, mental training is – I was going to say as important as physical training; I would say far more important. Far, far more important. I'll give you some kind of an idea. I was gagging here the other evening, you know, about gray hairs and that sort of thing; and so I brought the gray line down here a little bit just to show you this keeps happening all the time, see? And a little later this week, I'll wipe it out, just to show you – completely, both sides.

Now, function does monitor structure. But thought, for sure, monitors both of them. And an athletic build or activity and so forth, is to some degree dependent on muscular structure, but muscular structure is dependent upon confidence to perform the act. Confidence: can I throw that ball? Fellow doesn't think he can throw it, he will actually adjust his muscles so he can't. Now, women have for so long been taught that they mustn't, can't throw anything, that they're not hunters like the rest of the he-men, they're not Dianas or Amazons and they actually have developed a shoulder joint which does not adapt to a pitch or a throw; Their shoulder joint is quite different than men's. And it has been adapted so they can't get that kind of a swinging action. So they have to pitch underhanded or straight overhanded, but they can never get it here on the quarter or the half. I don't know, I see some of you looking at me rather surprised. Didn't you girls know that your shoulder joints were quite different than men's shoulder joints?

Now, when we see that a whole body could be designed in a certain way along the line, it isn't too much of a stretch of the imagination to demonstrate that a muscle would adapt itself to not being able to throw, or adapt itself to being able to throw in consequence to the confidence a person had in his ability to perform the act. It doesn't all boil down to confidence. It boils down to willingness. And willingness is monitored to a large degree on expected wins or rewards. One has willingness to play only so long as there are a few rewards.

Now, people don't get, probably, as bad as seals. Seals are the worst of this line. A seal will not blow a horn or balance a ball on his nose without a fish. And if you ever watched a seal act, there are buckets of fish there, and every time a seal does the least little trick, he does it and then with great anxiety finishes it off and looks for his fish. And he's got to have a reward right now! And if he is not given his fish at once, that is the end of his performance and he will simply walk right straight out off the stage and that's that. Quite remarkable. He expects an instantaneous, solid reward.

Well, lots of unions are going so far down into effort now that they believe this is very much the case. For instance, they think their only reward is cash. They have lost sight entirely of pride of accomplishment and belongingness. They would rather belong to the un-

ion. They belong to the union rather than to the business, which puts them off the team at once. And they make a game out of the worker versus the business. But the business is composed only of the worker and it must take some interesting mental evolutions to get them in there, you see, and get them to believe that they could fight themselves to this degree. It's quite an operation.

Now, a little bit higher on the scale we find such a thing as an athlete. He wants applause of some kind or another. He wants a little credit for having performed the feat and so on. And he wants the belongingness on the team, the companionship with other members of the team. This is his reward. They feel friendly toward him. And sometimes he'll reach up for the crowd to such an extent he divorces himself from the remainder of the team. He becomes a star or something of this character and he becomes very unhappy in this category. Some people are working for the pride of accomplishment and the reward of just the "thank you" or "good fellow" of one person, who may very well be a dead person – a gone person, you know, a departed ally. They're still in there sweating for Grandma's pat on the head, don't you see?

Now, when you take the goals and rewards into consideration, you have, then, the willingness of an athlete to perform. And if you have his willing-ness to perform, then he will tend to monitor his muscles so that he can perform. In the absence of a willingness to perform for some reward or another, there is no reward. He gets no willingness to perform, he feels there is no reward, he won't perform, he's a gone dog right away. And you'll find him deteriorating. Physically deteriorating.

Now, they have various superstitions, tremendous numbers of superstitions that go along with athletics. It's just like walking in a bunch of haunts. Somebody spilled the bats just before somebody went up to bat or somebody spat on the left side of pitcher's box or you know, it's just on – which shows you the normal mental condition of an athlete. And it's for the birds. They are frail, they are very breakable, they are mentally disturbable and they are, in essence, a very, very misbehaving type of human being. And that is the professional athlete or one who is an amateur athlete of long standing. So you go up against an athlete and you're going up against somebody who is so afraid he'll break his ankle that he normally does. They are normally, at the beginning of a game, patched together with glue and baling wire. You'll see tape on their legs and wrists and so forth. And they're like a bunch of race-horses of some kind or another. They're somehow or other pumped up to go through this particular game and they go through it and they collapse.

Well, this is minimized by a clarification of goals and expected rewards. You clarify an athlete's goals, you bring him up into a position where he can be trained. And I would say there isn't any earlier step as far as an athlete is concerned. Unless it would be the same processes you would use on a psycho. You would have to run very low processes because you'd have to be able to clarify his goals. And that's the first thing you should do with him.

It's quite interesting. I'll recite you a conversation that took place between a Scientologist and a group of athletic coaches. Scientologist was called in by these coaches – very famous coaches they were – and he'd given them a little talk on the subject of goals. You had to clarify the goals of athletes. He'd taken some of my material of an earlier time here with re-

gard to this. And they all agreed with him 100 percent. And afterwards, why, he was sitting at the luncheon with them and sitting around eating – they left the assembly hall and they went and had their buffet luncheon – he couldn't get anybody who knew what a goal was.

He'd given this beautiful speech, but nobody knew what a goal was. They hadn't a clue. And so he asked a runner that was there, of some international fame and who had been brought, like a trained seal, by his coach, you know? And he asked this runner what his goal was for the following year. And the runner thought for a long, long time and he said, "Well," he says, "I'm going to – I'm going to try to equal the record of Charlie Paddock."

"Is that your goal for this next year?"

"Yes, that's right. I'm going to try to equal the record of Charlie Paddock."

"That is your goal? Yes, that's your goal."

Well, this Scientologist spent the remainder of the luncheon working this out on two-way comm with practically everybody present. And he had a Group Processing session going on, really, on a sort of a two-way comm basis. And he made a fellow try to reach his glass of water. And the fellow would reach the glass of water. And he said, "No, no, no, now," he said, "try to reach the glass of water." So the fellow would stiffen up and try to reach the glass of water. Finally had this tremendous cognition. Then everyone around the table did it and did it until they all of a sudden understood this: you couldn't ever try to reach anything and reach it. Not possible! You either reached it or you didn't reach it. But to try to reach it was no goal.

And they began to understand more and more of this. He finally got this internationally famous runner to dream up a goal and agree that was a goal and so forth. The fellow was going to try to improve his footwork when he was on downhill runs. Give you some kind of idea of the difficulties he had getting through!

This guy wasn't going to do anything! And most athletes get hung up in the ridges of counterposition to such a degree that they start dramatizing the past games and they become, therefore, problems.

So problems of comparable magnitude, clarification of goals, what is a goal, and that sort of thing, is the first thing you take up with athletes. And you follow through this with various things.

If you were trying to train them to do something, you would write up some TRs. Tennis: you'd have a TR for standing on the court; a TR for moving from one side of the court to the other; a TR for moving from the back of the court to the net and from the net to the back of the court. You get the idea? And you'd make them get each one of these things pat. Then a TR for holding a racket; and then a TR for swinging a racket. Got this? And mind you, you would take the best athlete to do this with. You're not training a weak one. You're not training a newcomer. And he's the one you'll have the most trouble with this – the best athlete. But he'll give you the best results in the long run. Now, he doesn't break up as he will tell you he's going to do and forget the whole thing and how to do it. He won't. He will simply get better

and better at it and recover his facility rather easily. But you'll have to make him practice in order to get them all together.

Pistol practice – keeping the pistol from going away; holding the pistol still. On a pistol expert, move the person – a number of little TRs, you know? "Keep the pistol from going away. Hold the pistol still. Put the pistol on the table. Pick the pistol up." Get the idea? You just got him very familiar. 8-C with the pistol, I think, was the way that began. The fellow had about three hours of this and went out and broke the national record with that pistol. So it didn't upset him, although he thought all the time that his ability to fire a pistol was being blown up with a big boom.

Now, you would take what they were doing and what they were being trained to do and then, giving them wins all the way, increase them up to a point of great familiarity with what they're doing. And rather than experience, look on it as familiarity. They are sure that they can continue to run 8-C on the court or on the track. The track will be there, that sort of thing. Just familiarity, familiarity, familiarity. And then you have to work on them on a games condition and you really have to teach them games and what no-game conditions are and games. And you do this with PE type instruction.

And the rigors of training should never be permitted to get in the way of rigors of mental activity. In other words, you keep the mental line up.

The way you develop team spirit and that sort of thing is just to get the group into good communication with one another and get them to agree upon their goal. If you got them to agree on their goal before the game, you'd find there were always two or three present that had to be talked into winning it. And then your processing is usually fairly high-level processing, all of which has to do with control of objects and familiarity, location in spaces and so on. You'll find out that you'll have to run many, many assists while you're working with athletes. Many, many assists because they're always falling down. But fortunately your assists will get less and less to the degree that you bring them up scale individually or as a team. It's one of the easier things to do.

I have known of an athlete simply reading the Axioms – they're not stupid as everybody believes; they just don't think much. There's a big difference. Just reading the Axioms and cogniting on them at the rate of about two or three minutes apiece. Say, "Oh, yes! That's this way," and so forth. "Yeah." And give you specific examples of these Axioms and so on. And they're just laid out, "Oh, that's the way it is," and so forth. They really can be swung along pretty quick. But they have been taught to be stupid and they think they mustn't think and they think that if they think they will destroy their abilities. And you have to get them over this. Because their superstition is supplanting their ability to reason. They are as successful as they think and they're no more successful than that. They have to be able to recognize and see things. You can speed up their reaction time and everything else. Ordinary Tone 40 Group Processing works on athletes.

This is a very interesting problem. This is a very interesting subject. I could talk a long time on it but that's the end of the hour.

Thank you very much.

QUESTION AND ANSWER PERIOD

A lecture given by L. Ron Hubbard on 15 July 1957

Now, this period here, just for the next few minutes, I'll take some questions concerning your training, if you wish to place them, and try to dispose of them. Are there any questions relating to these drills processes, so forth that you are doing?

Yes, Marcia.

Female voice: Has it been decided yet whether we're going to, in 3A¹, be using dolls mostly, or not? When we get to it...

Well, there's an actual process in 3A that is very, very easy to audit and you will not be using dolls and probably will not be coaching on it. You'll possibly do just a little bit of hit-or-miss, patch-up auditing – and that's the contacts. Location by Contact² and so forth. You will be using, to a marked degree, dolls at this particular run of CCH A³ – in this particular run. And it may be that you'll just get some fast briefing on CCH B⁴. We might not even teach it again. I mean, there's so much to learn in CCH A. That has not been totally decided.

Nearly everything is fixed in an ACC, fixed very strongly and very unmovably. But when we all of a sudden discover a frailty, why, it isn't part of our fixedness to perpetuate an error forever. Do you see that?

Now, this unit⁵'s training is devoted mainly to cracking all the cases all the way south. It's not necessarily devoted to cracking cases northward at all, don't you see? CCH A actually contains all the processes you would need to dig anybody out of the mire and make Homo novis⁶ out of him if you used them exactly and well. It even includes Trio⁷, a very redoubt-

¹ 3A: same as CCH A. See footnote No 3.

² Location by Contact: CCH 5, a Scientology process used to give the pre-clear orientation and havingness and improve his perception. For further information see HCOB 11 June 57, Training and CCH Processes in Technical Bulletins Volume IV.

³ CCH A: one of two sections of the 18th Advanced Clinical Course which taught the CCH processes. The first of the CCH processes were taught in the section called CCH A, the remainder in CCH B. Though students had to complete both sections, they could be started in either CCH A or CCH B.

⁴ CCH B: the second of two sections of the 18th ACC which taught CCH processes.

⁵ unit: one of the three training sections into which the 18th ACC was divided. The first unit was the Communication Course, the second was the Upper Indoctrination Course and the third was the CCH Course (which itself was divided into two parts, "CCH A" and "CCH B," each part teaching one half of the CCH processes). Students went through each of the three units twice in order to complete the course.

⁶ Homo novis: literally, "new man," from the Latin homo, man, and novus, new.

⁷ Trio: CCH 8, one of a series of processes which have as a goal the separating of time, moment from moment. This process is called "Trio" because there are three different sets of commands for the process. For further information, see HCOB 11 June 57, Training and CCH Processes in Technical Bulletins Volume IV.

able process. Then and Now Solids⁸ and some of the CCH B processes are very, very easy to do, particularly if you know CCH A. But auditing starts with CCH A, not CCH B.

Well, we have had one change in doing 8-C⁹. We're saying – in the training drills it says it's not all right to touch somebody and in actuality we're saying now it is all right to touch somebody doing the 8-C drill. Now, I mean by that just that one little drill that precedes High School Indoc¹⁰; perfectly all right to touch somebody and push them around one way or the other. And that's because there is a silent drill that we haven't any time for. And that silent drill simply teaches somebody to move a body around. So we'd better combine these rather than omit the silent drill entirely. That's just in the efforts of getting in a little more training, not in an effort to invalidate that particular drill. That particular drill is itself.

By the way, do you know, I noticed something today and it was quite amusing to me – do you know that it's rather more difficult to take a moving target for communication than a motionless target? And therefore giving the commands perfectly while walking around as in 8-C – one may have been able to give them more or less perfectly while sitting down facing a fixed preclear¹¹ but walking around has a tendency to unsettle one a little bit. And you have to get used to this particular aspect of it, otherwise just the motion itself introduces error; quite amusing.

I noticed the most trouble – the Instructor noticed the most trouble in 8-C, the most trouble that was encountered was the consolidation of all the steps of the Comm Course¹² into one process, see? One practicing process. They were having the most trouble with consolidating all of the steps of the Comm Course into one action, you know, and getting these things all squared away. So the touch part of it and moving the body and so forth isn't evidently what is needed most. We look at these training drills and we find out that 8-C is the first drill in which a person is using all of these steps in an auditing process, one right after the other. And it takes a little settling down, doesn't it? Of course he gets enough time during High School Indoc and the rest of it to get these things settled down well, but he really shouldn't be settling them down in High School Indoc. That should have been settled down.

It's quite an interesting observation; the first chance to get a sequence of communication, acknowledgment, would be in 8-C. And I suppose if we had a little bit more time, why, we would do that. And very well probable that, just to show you how things go in an ACC – it

⁸ Then and Now Solids: CCH 14, a Scientology process which accomplishes a great number of things, such as straightening out the time track of the preclear and giving the preclear practice in handling time. For further information see HCOB 11 June 57, Training and CCH Processes in Technical Bulletins Volume IV.

⁹ 8-C: the name of both a Scientology process and a training drill (Training Routine 6). The term is also commonly used in Scientology to mean good control or the action of applying good control to (someone). For further information see HCOB 11 June 57, Training and CCH Processes in Technical Bulletins Volume IV.

¹⁰ High School Indoc: the name of Training Routine 7, a precise drill with the purpose of training the student auditor to never be stopped by a pre-clear, to train him to run fine control in any circumstances and to teach him to handle rebellious people.

¹¹ preclear: a person not yet Clear, hence pre-Clear; generally, a person being audited. (Clear: the name of a state achieved through auditing or an individual who has achieved this state. A Clear is a being who no longer has his own reactive mind. He is an unaberrated person and is rational in that he forms the best possible solutions he can on the data he has and from his viewpoint.)

¹² Comm Course: short for Communication Course, a course in which one gains the ability to effectively communicate with others. The Comm Course was included as part of the 18th ACC.

is all laid out; it is taped. And if it isn't better organized at the end of the course so that we could just that moment teach a perfect course, we'll not have gained a thing. You got the idea? We wouldn't have gained anything if we didn't learn anything. And so I'm right in there willing to learn with anybody else.

We do have the edge on it because we know the workability of these training drills; we know more or less how they should be trained. This is the first time we're taking a direct look at them with an absolute determinism there to get the most out of every drill. There's a high possibility, a very, very high possibility that the Comm Course should add – finish up with some sort of a verbal drill in place of the Hand Mimicry¹³ so that we don't run into this same cockeyed thing in 8-C. I mean, this is a debatable question; might be true and might not be true. But it may be that doing it by symbols, which is to say arm motions, doing it by arm motions rather than verbalization, may be what is best there.

These little touch-up points will come up from time to time, so don't be unsettled about them. If you don't understand why there's been a change, then you don't understand that there is a reason behind most all of these changes and that reason is simplicity and improvement on the student.

You could take this course just the way it has started and be very, very successful with it because these patterns are being very successful. But we don't for a moment believe that it could not be improved. We're perfectly happy to improve something. However, it is always unsettling to a student to have something changed in midflight; it's always unsettling. However, most of you are so used to this by now that it probably wouldn't bother you.

Yours is the uneasy track of the pioneer. The only difference between Scientology and pioneering is pioneering trails are usually littered with bones.

Male voice: Boring.

Yes, but ours aren't littering any trail, we're still here.

Okay, are there any other questions about these drills and so on?

Yes?

Male voice: Bill Fisk brought this up in class today; I'd like to ask it of you: why do you say in 8-C now, "Look at that wall," when "Walk over to that wall" is a brand-new command directing his attention to that wall for the first time. Why is it necessary to put "Look at that wall" in there?

It is a combined – you want to know why you want "Look at that wall" at the beginning of the process.

Male voice: Right.

This is a combined process which combines Locational Processing with a doingness

¹³ Hand Mimicry: the name of Training Routine 5, a drill to educate a student that verbal commands are not entirely necessary, to make the student physically telegraph an intention, and to show the student the necessity of having a preclear obey commands. In the drill, the student says nothing, but gets the coach to duplicate hand motions which he makes. For further information see HCOB 11 June 57, Training and CCH Processes in Technical Bulletins Volume IV.

and it is simply an improvement of the process. If you wanted to take – and I'll give you this now as an exercise, just you; you've brought this up. Given not – this is not as punishment, but you're interested in the subject and so is Bill, so I think the two of you independently should be able to do this. I'm not trying to punish you or make fun of you; it's just good mental exercise. Look it over and tell me how many processes there are in 8-C. This is one of the most complicated little mechanisms in Scientology and I ask you to look that over because you may spot a couple that we haven't noticed so far. There are several; a good many. It is simply an additional process.

There is a very simple process which is not too workable, which is the figure-figure¹⁴ end of 8-C which you might be interested in, and that's doing-ness. If you want to take somebody after a long automobile trip or an airplane ride and improve his morale and tiredness and so forth and make him in pretty good shape rather immediately, tell him to look around and tell you something that he wouldn't mind doing. Look around and tell him something he wouldn't mind doing. It's not particularly a good process; it's more or less an assist. And very funny, all the motions of the immediate ride he's been through and all the immediate labor he's been through just sort of go off and you'll see his body go twisting around and so on. And when he's been fixed in a chair over a period of a flight or something of that sort and he finds a scrap of paper and he says well, he wouldn't mind moving that scrap of paper.

And you'll find his perimeter of action goes out further and further and further and then collapses on him and then goes out much further and then collapses on him and goes out much further again on his doingness. But this is just one of the processes which – contained in that.

We hope the fellow will graduate up to a point of where he doesn't mind walking to a barrier. The actuality of it is that you're making the barrier walk to him. It's quite interesting. If you were to run 8-C on the basis of "All right, move – look at that wall. Good. Move that wall to you. Good," you'd get an entirely different process out of it. You'd never see so much figure-figure in your life.

It's true that when you move a wall to you, you would have to move, to keep the inter-relationships correct, the entirety of the universe that several feet, wouldn't you?

Audience: Yeah.

See, you'd have to, to keep the relationships exact so that nothing would crumple up and fall down. But who said that there was any friction between this universe and the outside space? So maybe you do never walk to anything; maybe you simply move the whole universe, which can theoretically move frictionlessly. that many feet. It's something to think about sometime when you're walking down the street. Thank you, Al.

There any other questions?

Well, I want to thank you very much for coming down here, staff, and I want to thank you in the ACC for being here. We're having quite a time here and I think this is the best course we have ever had in Scientology, bar none. I don't think anybody would argue with

¹⁴ figure-figure: a coined term describing a particular type of aberration consisting of always having to have a "reason for" or a significance. Given a fact, there must always be a reason for the fact. Hence we get figure-figure.

that very hard.

Audience: Yes. Right.

Our immediate future here contains five more weeks of slug, and I know seven or eight weeks from now you'll still be starting up at two or three o'clock in the morning and saying, "Okay! Okay. Okay." Or you will hear some ghostly voice around you saying, "Do it!" Yes, something like this could very well occur. But that's many weeks from here and the suffering of the next five weeks is something which I know . . . I'm very disappointed in this unit, by the way. We've only had breakdowns from about one-fifth of the unit; we've only had breakdowns on the part of about one-fifth of the unit to date. Only about one-fifth of the 18th has come unglued at the hinges¹⁵ for a little while. So that leaves four-fifths to go.

I'm going to check – I'm going to say, "All right, did so-and-so blow up, have any difficulty, threaten to leave, commit suicide or something? Jones here, did he-did he really-did he? Didn't he?" So I'll say, "Well if he comes to the January ACC I'll validate his certificate, so ... Couldn't ever have gotten real to him."

Of course we're going on the basic premise, that – evidently, that all men are hysterical. And if this particular planet at this time wouldn't at some time or another cause you to react in an hysterical fashion, then you haven't found out you're blind yet.

I was being audited today, by the way – just a little point here – I've gotten myself twenty-five, thirty hours here in the last few weeks. I'm getting two or three hours at a crack, as work admits. And I had about an hour's auditing late this afternoon, just putting some more time in on it. And for the first time had "Body Can't Have" run on me. And it was quite amusing. I had run it on lots of preclears and I had lots of processes run on me, but I'd never had "Body Can't Have." You know, "Look around and find something your body can't have." Wow!

It's interesting that some of these processes will produce a reaction on me, for this reason: if they were simply inventednesses, you know, they were just invented, all that would run out would be my invention of them. Well, that has never happened. Never happened.

Now, of course you can postulate¹⁶ that a process will produce a certain effect and then do the process and then assume that effect. But if you're doing this unknowingly, you're nuts. This whole basic riddle of have is quite fascinating. It is based on the fact that the only thing that cures the problem is the problem itself. That is what have is. The only thing that cures the problem is the problem itself. But I'll tell you more about that one of these evenings; right now it's a very cool evening so I'll bid you all good night and see you tomorrow night at seven thirty.

Thank you.

Audience: Thank you.

¹⁵ hinges, come unglued at the: (slang) to become emotionally upset or lose one's composure; variation of come unglued.

¹⁶ postulate: (1) (noun) a conclusion, decision or resolution made by the individual himself to resolve a problem or to set a pattern for the future or to nullify a pattern of the past. And reality of course is that sequence which begins with postulates and ends with mass, which we originally defined as an agreed-upon thing. (2) (verb) make a postulate.

WHAT IS SCIENTOLOGY¹⁷

A lecture given by L. Ron Hubbard
on 15 July 1957

18th ACC-01

Thank you.

Good evening.

Audience: Good evening.

Now, I hope you understand that Scientology has something that is different than any other Earth organization of information or knowledge to date. There is a difference. The word *science*, as you know, is a simple word meaning merely "truth." *Scientology* means "knowing" – *scio*. But *scio* means something quite interesting. It doesn't just mean "knowing," it means "knowing in the fullest sense of the word." Now, Scientology is an aim at a total know.

People have a great deal of difficulty describing Scientology to other people for the excellent reason that they try to fit it into a frame of reference with other knows. And Scientology is different than that because it's an aim at a *total* know. And there aren't any other total knows. Hence, you have difficulty describing it sometimes and giving it data of comparable magnitude, and therefore in trying to talk about it people say, "Oh, you mean just like psychology." Don't kill them! They meant well. They don't understand what psychology was or is – that it's not even a science but an operation. They say, "Well then, it's like ..." something or other. Nah.

Well, there have not been any other total knows. As far as the basic attempt is concerned, there has only been one organization of knowledge on Earth which has been . . . had a similar goal – which is the goal of freedom, exteriorization¹⁸, being able to get out of the trap and confusion, being able to back up and take a look at it all – and that was Buddhism, which was developed in a very formal state, but existed long before, by Gautama Siddhartha, who was known as "*The Buddha*," and most of the Western world refer to him as "Buddha," quite incorrectly. A buddha is somebody who has attained a total knowingness or total freedom.

Well now, that was 625 B.C. when that occurred. Buddhism squirreled¹⁹ when it went up into Tibet and became Lamaism²⁰, and many other branches and sects spread from that particular information. But it's interesting that the information itself was not a cult or a sect; it simply had to do with a great many people who wanted to know more about where they were

¹⁷ Editor's Note: The lecture was later published under the title „Scientology Effective Knowledge“.

¹⁸ Editor's Note: The word „exteriorization“ is cut out in the Golden Era audio version of the lecture. Other omissions in the text are marked in Arial

¹⁹ squirreled: altered from the original (materials, procedures, etc.).

²⁰ Lamaism: a form of Buddhism practiced in Tibet and Mongolia, characterized by elaborate ritual and belief in good and evil gods, demons, ancestral spirits, etc.

and what they were doing. It had the idea of freedom; it attempted to answer the question of the hereafter; it did a great many things and attempted to do them.

Now, we actually don't know at this time what Gautama Siddhartha said. His work was very, very poorly preserved. It's quite interesting, however, that we know something about it.

It's quite interesting that we know the same age and period as developing an enormous number of very vital things, at the same time as Buddhism – almost the same period . . . It's like that ancient age in Greece that gave us so many things – the Golden Age²¹ of Greece all happened in the lifetime of one man. Well, it's practically the same thing back there around 625. Within seventy-five years either way of Buddhism, we have Taoism – that's the work of Lao-tse – and at the same time we have the work of Confucius²². It's all there in a pile. Bang!

Well now, there hasn't actually been any declared effort in the direction of total information and intelligence on the subject of man, regarding his whereabouts, which was an analytical, knowing, reasoning approach, having nothing to do with faith or belief, on the basis of take it or leave it – if it's true to you, it's true, and if it isn't true to you, it isn't true – since that time. And that is practically twenty-five hundred years ago.

Now, it's all very well for somebody to come along and say, "Oh, you mean Buddhism." Well, unfortunately that isn't adequate either as a comparable datum to Scientology because the Western world hasn't a clue as to what Buddhism is all about. Buddha was a fat-bellied god that sat upon a throne and, I don't know, for all of them, he ate small babies. See, they think of it as an idol worship. Well, surely enough, in various parts of the Orient, an idol worship did take place – they worship Buddha as an idol and nobody would have laughed harder than Gautama Siddhartha. He would have thought this was hilariously funny. Because it's the one thing he told people not to do.

That, therefore, to the Western world, is not a datum of comparable importance, and maybe . . . You understand we're not talking about the *importance* of the development; we're just trying to talk about its *goal*: has man had a comparable goal to Scientology, and so on. And that therefore would not be articulative.

Well, the best refuge to take in this particular instance would be the refuge into the incomprehensible. And the best comparable datum that you could give somebody would be to say to them, "Epistemology." And they'd say, "Go-o-osh!" You know, "Scientology's just like epistemology." And they would say, "Is that the study of pins or insects or what?" If they've got to do it that way, they're so stupid that you just better baffle them and let it rest right there, and then say, "Give me your hand. Thank you." Best way to explain it I know.

But for our own understanding, we should understand that we are embarked upon something which has not been embarked upon for twenty-five hundred years. And that gives it a rather interesting significance. It isn't that what we are doing is as important as Buddhism.

²¹ Golden Age: a period in which a nation, etc., is at its highest state of prosperity, or in which some human art or activity is at its most excellent.

²² Confucius: (ca. 551-479 B.C.) an ancient Chinese philosopher and teacher whose philosophy of ethics stressed two virtues: the rules of proper conduct and benevolent love. Confucius taught many other virtues, including loyalty, faithfulness, wisdom, rightness and self-cultivation. These virtues he summed up in his ideal of the true gentleman, or "the princely or superior man."

It isn't that Buddhism is as important as Scientology. But both of them attempted to select out the important things – a selection of the importances of life – and to fill man's void of knowing with accurate observation.

It might well be said that Buddha was the first scientist. He did organize his things rather well, if tradition is right.

But we in this modern age of science have not developed out of the field of the humanities anything comparable to scientific observation of the mind. The humanities can be said, at this time and place, to have failed. And what do I mean by the humanities? I mean that group of information which is apparently covered, or is supposed to be covered, by the university.

Now, what are those things? They're psychology, sociology, the various branching studies of the social sciences in general. Do you understand that? There's a whole group of things called the humanities. Now, why didn't these develop anything? Why haven't these lived? They haven't lived; they're a matter of changing fad every few minutes – beyond psychology, which was the work of a single man named Wundt²³ in Leipzig²⁴, Germany in 1879, who believed that all men were animals and has convinced everybody since. But he hasn't convinced us. This was hardly a human study, since it specialized from the beginning in animal studies. But it's included in the modern humanities.

Now, why haven't these humanities developed something? Why haven't these humanities made something out of all of the opportunity, the funds and so on that were available to them? – since enormous funds have been available to these people over the last century. Why haven't they made something out of this? Because they were all used as control mechanisms. Each one of them was given a pitch in some sort of effort to push man further into the mire. And their goal was south, not north. Their pitch was down, not up. They study man to learn how to control him by duress. They study man to find out how to take advantage of him. Psychology at this moment, defined by the United States government, is "a deceitful procedure to trick one's enemies." Let me assure you that in this atomic age we can't afford to have enemies and therefore cannot have something which deceitfully attempts to trick one's enemies.

Here, here is the single point of difference between the humanities and what we are doing. We have found this to be the case, and if any auditor or Scientologist does not at some time achieve an understanding of this, then he has never understood the subject as a whole. And that is to say that the only way you can better man is to better him; you cannot better man by worsening him. The only way you can get an IQ gain on a person is to improve his ability to communicate, to live. The only way that you can make his personality change is for the better. So this is just a little worse than change.

The reason the psychologist believes, at this very instant of my talking to you, that man cannot be changed, we have also discovered here in Scientology: We cannot push him

²³ Wundt: Wilhelm Wundt (1832-1920), German psychologist and physiologist (expert in the study of the functions of living things and the ways in which their parts and organs work); the originator of the false doctrine that man is no more than an animal.

²⁴ Leipzig: a city in Germany; the location of Leipzig University, where Wilhelm Wundt and others developed "modern" psychology.

down. That is very hard to do. It is rather easy to pick him up, because you have his assistance. But you don't have his assistance when you try to push him down. So therefore, if you tried to reduce somebody's IQ, you would have a hard time of it. I don't say that it's impossible, because in Scientology every now and then we can take the Auditor's Code, read it backwards, have the auditor audit by standing on his head and have bricks dropped on the preclear every couple of seconds, and after the right process has been used and misused to this degree, we'll find he's lost his enthusiasm for answering an IQ test.

Now, when it comes to personality changes, it is very difficult to worsen these things. Now, life itself, with all of its mechanisms, its duresses of all kinds, is able over a period of half a lifetime to suppress personality changes, characteristics, talents and abilities. About half a lifetime, something like that, it manages it.

It takes some fellow who was an enthusiastic artist when he was twenty – well, he gets to be about forty, and he isn't quite as enthusiastic as an artist and doesn't respond, and his willingness to be an artist is not as great. You understand that. But it took *twenty years* to suppress this. In other words, the MEST universe can accomplish this on a sort of a gradient scale. So only by allying oneself with the particles in that wall, only by allying oneself with the mechanical laws of life – MEST-wise – only by turning and facing down anything alive and saying "kill it" can we at length suppress the ability of man. It is *hard* to do.

Well, this is the awfulest condemnation that was ever handed out against any activity or era – that it is terribly easy to improve him. It doesn't require anything at all to change him upward. You have his assistance. It takes some good communication, it takes some good reality, and it takes some affinity, and the fellow improves!

Why do you suppose anybody can come into a PE Course, sit down and communicate with one's fellows and wind up improved in IQ? Look, he's only been there for ten hours at the absolute outside, and his IQ has improved? Well, let me show you that these students of the mind that are studying out of the animalistic philosophy developed in Leipzig tell you that man cannot be changed – his IQ cannot be changed; his personality cannot be altered. Which tells you what at once? That they've only tried to worsen him. Now, do I make my point?

[Male voice: Yup.]

The road was wide open for any pair of eyes. All one had to do was desire to better his fellow man. That's all one had to do. What is as rare as a June day in January.

Terribly easy to ally yourself with MEST – terribly easy. Fellow comes up to you, what's the proper thing to do? Hit him! If anything comes around and sits down, why, what's the right thing to do? Well, fix it up so it'll decay. Well, doesn't that stuff do it? It's not that that stuff is bad. But that stuff is there to be *used*; it's not there to *become*.

So it tells us that the humanities were far less interested. But they had withdrawn so far or were part of the universe that they never conceived any future for themselves in exact observation or in other actual scientific principles.

One had to separate himself from MEST²⁵ in order to look at it, to some degree. He had to look at his fellow men and find out what they were and what they were doing. He had to

²⁵ Editor's Note: The word „MEST“ is made incomprehensible in the Golden Are tape.

observe. And the second he started looking, a great many simplicities fell into his lap; he couldn't help it. So you will pardon me if I doubt the sincerity of the forebears of this subject. I believe that there has been a total gap between 1625²⁶ B.C. and 1957 A.D. I believe that because it's too easy.

Now, that's the first thing we must know about Scientology is that by the attainment of a simplicity we accomplish a benefit. By the attainment of a simplicity we accomplish a benefit.

By the invitation of or involvement in a complexity, we accomplish the unfathomable and create a mystery – we sink man into a priesthood; we sink him into a cult. Instead of, as they said in the Middle Ages, "What monastery do you come from, Father?" (as they stood on the crossroads telling their beads²⁷ one at another), why, they say, "Now, what university are you teaching at, Brother?" in 1950 and 57, you see? Same breed of cat²⁸. It's a sort of a priesthood: all knowledge is sacrosanct and it must all be uttered in a certain apathetic tone or it isn't.

Well, tone and emotion have nothing to do with knowledge. Authority has nothing to do with knowledge. Those things I tell you are true are not true because I tell you they are true. And if anything I tell you, or have ever told you, is discovered to differ from the individual observation (be it a good observation), then it isn't true! It doesn't matter whether I said it was true or not. Do you understand?

And you, in handling people, can tell them to look at certain things, and if they can see them and if they're true for them, they're true. But *only* if they can see them. So just carry this same observation another stage. To some fellow who is terribly debased, some fellow who has actually just... aw, just gone all out – he's just been in nothing but hog wallows all of his life, you know? Drunk all the time, dragged out of bars, graduated from the University of Chicago, you know. . . . This fellow who has gone the limit *can't see*. And what is true for him? Blindness. That is true for him.

Now, I can tell you how to show that fellow a truth which would shake him. Put your hand across his eyes and say, "You cannot see, can you?" He would agree with you like he'd never agreed before, because he can't see, whether your hands are across his eyes or not.

Now, that is the first thing that he would have to find out in terms of his own observational power. He'd have to find out that there was a condition where he couldn't see before he would begin to look. And for this individual – all swelled up on significances of one kind or another, all taught eighteenth hand – a very remarkable thing is observable. He'll never learn until he finds out that he hasn't.

And the curse of these intervening twenty-five hundred years has been a pretense of knowledge – inventednesses which never were, which are passed along and people are flunked upon just as though they existed. And we've had a worship of the fable. We have had prayers being sent up to a myth. And man hasn't been looking at all.

²⁶ Editor's Note: Probably went to be „625 B.C.“

²⁷ beads, telling their: saying prayers using a rosary (a string of beads for keeping count in saying a series of prayers).

It's a terrible thing for somebody who has struggled through a tremendous amount of upset – let's say he has been ... this person has been married to somebody and just tried for years to make somebody *see* their point of view one way or the other – or for some child who has struggled up into manhood or womanhood with all of his efforts devoted to getting his parents to *see* something, to take his point of view one way or the other. It's an horrible shock to this person to find out someday that the reason he could never get a reasonability in his family, late in life or early in life, was totally based on blindness which in itself was so obfuscated, overlarded²⁹ that nobody even noticed the blindness. And he himself never noticed the blindness of his parents, never noticed the blindness of his wife. Fantastic isn't it?

One does a terrific amount of living and apparent looking and an awful lot of thinking, and then finds out somebody was stone-blind. Isn't that fantastic? Well, that is the entrance point of any case. In other words, there are conditions worse than being unable to see, and that is *imagining* one sees.

The humanities imagined too many things to see; they never cared to look. And so they failed.

But we must not ourselves fail in this same track. It would be easy for us to do this. We have a complicated nomenclature in Scientology. There are about 475 or 80 words, all of which have special meaning. Fortunately, over 50 percent of these are merely clarifications of their actual English equivalents. But we have a vocabulary of specialized meaning. It's just as good as it explains things. That's all the good it is.

But don't let your specialized use of words throw you out of communication with your fellow man. Know these words well enough so that you can use their alternate phrases – because it usually takes a phrase or a sentence to describe one of these words in English. Be able to do that well enough to go out of nomenclature and into nomenclature again, depending on who you're talking to, and you will not be encouraging blindness. Because a label is just a label. The thing in the jam jar is jam, regardless of whether it says "pickles" on the front of it.

Now, we have certain, definite, positive procedures. As valuable as these things are, if they incline us in the direction of looking at them, not the thing they help us look at, if they incline us (these procedures and activities) to believe that they are a thing, not a means toward doing another thing, then we ourselves will be in the same condition. And we will consider ourselves to be the wisest people on Earth and have to discover all over again that we have to achieve blindness on the way up.

Many a philosopher has been blinded to the truth by the brilliance of his own syllabilization³⁰. Now, wherever we develop an area of special knowledge, such as the training drills and processes (as valuable as they are) which constitute this course, we must also at the same time understand that these things are a means to an end and are not in themselves the end.

A very funny thing can happen. A person can take up what we call Training 0, Training 1, Training 2, Training 3 – all of these drills – and get clear up to 6 without ever having

²⁸ breed of cat: (informal) type; sort; variety. Example: The new airplane is a completely different breed of cat from any that has been designed before.

²⁹ overlarded: added to too much, as with irrelevant or useless facts and information.

³⁰ syllabilization: a coined term for the action of uttering syllables; speaking.

integrated them into a single process. And yet, theoretically, he could perform them beautifully, each one independently, and yet never be able to do them in an auditing session. Theoretically that could happen.

Well, this would be a person who had totally forgotten what they were for, and that is to create the proper communication atmosphere to a session so that an auditing session or a human conversation (that being one of the lower sorts) could occur without jolts and jars. In other words, the end view of all those early training drills are communication, and when one loses the sight of the fact that they make somebody confront and look at – Training 0 – he's lost the benefit of the whole sweeping mass. Do you understand that?

Now, the funny part of it is these things can be lots of fun in themselves. I would be the last person to admit that they weren't positive jewels of genius. But I would be the first one to throw them away if they got in the road of anybody's communication! Remember that, and use them accordingly.

They take a gradient scale from "not look" to "look." And they're a pretty good gradient scale. And they've been in use for a long time now. But we're just now learning that they were too fancy. We found out the best coaching remarks that can be made in teaching somebody to do these things is "Do it!" "Confront it!" Not "how," just "do it." Actually, the whole thing boils down to confrontingness and nothing else.

An individual can't give an acknowledgment because every time he gives an acknowledgment some mysterious force hits him in the teeth. Well, that's simply. . . that mysterious force is just something that he is unwilling to confront, in the present or the backtrack. It's just something he's unwilling to confront. You need the rest of the drills, apparently, because just plain confrontingness doesn't ever stir these things up. Just sitting there ... the fellow has already learned that if he just sits there and minds his own business nothing will happen except that he will vegetate and starve to death. So we have to occasion a further reach.

We have to have a further reach. And that further reach is communication – verbal communication. And it finally winds up with total symbol amputation, and we do it by hand, like wigwags from battleship to battleship. Quite interesting. But it's a gradient scale of communication, and thus it must be understood.

Now, we move up into the upper reaches of that battery of indoctrination steps, and we get into what's called Upper Indoctrination; we have these things in practice. And it is always a lovely thing to watch the first day when anybody who has been through a Comm Course butts into plain 8-C – simple-command process where you tell people to go over and touch a wall. You never heard so much trouble. They never had this much trouble before. Why didn't they ever have this much trouble before? Because this process integrates all the lower training drills and say, "Well, that's all right, sonny. Just do them all at once. That's all. That's all you have to do." Of course, you aren't doing them all at once, and he finds out eventually that you do each one at a time. Fortunately, you don't have to do them all at the same instant.

But what does this wind up to become then? What does this wind up to be? A gradient scale of observation whereby one reaches *out* and receives *in* intelligence concerning life, forms, mass, energy, space and time.

I woke up eventually to discover that these training drills all by themselves, practiced with sufficient rigor and coached well enough and instructed well enough, were steps on the road to Clear all by themselves without any further processing. Why? Because they directly

raise the communication level as an individual. But they take another course. Instead of processing this fellow, you say, "Do it!" And he says, "Ya-ya-ya-ya!" And you say, "Do it!" And he says, "But my head – my feet – I can't – *volumn*." And you say, "Do it!" And then he says ... all of a sudden he says, "*Eooohhh-oooohhh-uh-oo*" – boom! And just about the time he's lying there in the exact position where his mother *always* sympathized with him, he finds the coach and the Instructor putting him back in the chair saying, "Do it!" And the circuits blow up and after a while he says, "You know, I can communicate."

It's a ghastly route to take. It could only be attempted on people of considerable stability, of considerable back-processing and a great deal of willingness and understanding, and I'm afraid wouldn't work on the routine preclear, unless in the process of doing them you made a willingness to be a Scientologist.

A group similar to this one, given as much duress as this had in one week, would be all plastered all over the walls by now. So understanding must accompany any drill, mustn't it? And you survive these because you understand that there's an end goal to them. You understand where they are going and what they are doing, and so your understanding raises your tolerance to a point where you will actually attempt to do this impossible and incredible thing. So understanding has something to do with it, doesn't it? The funny part of it is the understanding is demanded *of you*, and you look in vain for the Instructor to understand a damn thing! Well, that's all to your benefit. It keys in past understanding on you as you try to give it to him and fail.

But when we look this over on a broad view we find ourselves articulate on the subject of where man is going, what man is doing, what the end product could be; and we for certain have sorted out factors that none of the humanities ever sorted out or ever dreamed of sorting out, and didn't even know they would ever *have* to be sorted out – that's more important.

In order for a man to see when he can't, he would first have to understand that he was blind.

Therefore I pity you when someday you find in your midst – thrown to you in a government project or something of the sort – the fact that the old base psychiatrist or psychologist or something or other is going to be put into your particular project, and you're going to be called upon to train this man. Now, there are certain portions of a horse's anatomy which are never mentioned – particularly amongst ladies – but this fellow, this fellow would be best described.

Now, what's wrong with him? And why is he untrainable? Because he's on this terrific pretense. He is staring at fancied information which has never benefited him or any other human being – yet it sounds so wise. It's so impressive to have 18,000 names, not 472. He'll think you're a dog because you don't know these 18,000 names, and he will tell the people around him that you are a charlatan and a cheat because you don't know these 18,000 names. But you know something he doesn't know. You know he's blind. There is a condition worse than blindness, and that is thinking you see something that isn't there.

Now, when we are asked to train such a man, we can do so only if we ourselves know that we, too, have risen from the unseeingness.

It's a very funny thing for a fellow sometime in processing: he sits down, he's being audited, and he says, "You know... you know, I think I've got things wrong." Boy, you said it.

He's not just had them wrong, he's had them upside down. But this sneaking suspicion comes through to him. He sat down there so that you would audit him and thereby prove that he was always right and he was simply put upon by the rest of the world. And he finds out in the course of it, somewhere along the line, that he was dead wrong and, to modify English, couldn't have been wronger.

He sits there and he says, "You know, maybe I wasn't right. Maybe *ya-uuh*, . . . Maybe some of this responsibility was mine. Maybe... maybe life . . . *uh-huh-huh-huh-huh* ... I wonder. Say, you don't suppose I've never taken a straight look at that girl, do you? Or I wonder if I have ever really been part of my job at all." Or as I did to one fortunate individual – he's fortunate because he found this out – he said, "I wonder if I have any right at all to wear these five stripes³¹ on my sleeve."

Now, we weren't asking him to dive into humility; we were trying to build him up. But humility was north! He was on a swollen, pathetic egotism which wouldn't admit his admission of truth that he didn't think he was up to his job. And this he had hidden even from himself. And he had to discover this all over again before he got out of the morass.

Do you know that no blind man thinks he is blind? He may tell you so, but he doesn't think so. I processed a blind man one time and found out why it's almost impossible to process blind people. Because they see all sorts of things. They have all kinds of perceptions. And they're getting audited so they won't have to admit they're blind.

And I audited this fellow up the line and all of a sudden he clapped his hands over his eyes and he says, "My God," he said, "I can't see!" That's fascinating. He'd only been blind for about a quarter of a century. Big cognition. I couldn't understand why he went around ... I just... it just stopped the session in its tracks. On a cognition of that magnitude you would – just let the session go to hell. There was no getting this fellow back into session; he kept walking around the room saying, "I'm blind!" It was a great relief to him.

I never audited him anymore. I closed off that particular session because it was a short one anyhow – I think its total duration was supposed to be fifteen minutes. But he's been a fast friend of mine ever since. I was the only fellow, he tells his friends, who ever showed him an inkling of truth. Only he's got it all embroidered up now to all kinds of truths, but the truth of the matter is, I was the only fellow that ever came along and invited him to find out that he was blind and to stop kidding himself. After that he was perfectly willing to be blind. It was very interesting, but it modified his existence considerably, and he's a very fast friend of mine.

Now, I don't say that we couldn't go on above this point, don't you see, we couldn't go on north from this and have restored his sight and perhaps done all sorts of things, but I merely bring him forward as an example of a big cognition. And me as an auditor sat there, and I thought the last thing in the world we had to discover about this case was that the fellow was blind!

And I've had fellows on crutches tell me all of a sudden, "You know, I'm lame." "You are? What have you been doing for fifteen years with that crutch if you weren't lame?" The fellow didn't realize he was lame. This is a fantastic thing.

³¹ stripes: any of various strips of cloth or braid worn on the sleeve of a military uniform to indicate rank, length of time of service, etc.

Now, we're not trying to pound the truth into somebody's head. We're not trying to beat them down so that they will get any lower. No, we do our best to make them communicate, to look, to cheer up. We're friendly, we're kind and everything's fine. And the guy improves and improves and improves and finds himself on the bottom. And only then can he go up.

Had a preclear one time who used to dope off all the time³². And he told me one day, "You know, I dope off all the time." Well, he'd always said this. He'd always said, "You know, I get doped off. I just get dopey. I get dopey. I get dopey." And one day he looked at me very intelligently and he said, "You know, I dope off all the time." And I said "Yes," and I was about to pass it up because the most obvious thing about the case would have been the fact that he was doping off. And what do you know, it made a big difference to him. It isn't that he didn't dope off anymore, because he did – every now and then – but he had found out about it. And he would go *tok* and knock himself back into awakesness again. These are the fabulous things about Scientology.

Now, it tells you quite adequately that there is an enormous zone, an enormous wonderland, below blindness. It tells you that there is an enormous Valhalla³³ mixed up with Pluto's³⁴ realm, mixed up with fairy tales, mixed up with Menninger's³⁵ works, lying all over below the level of truth. And the truth is a simple thing that anybody could see. And why don't they see it? Because they live in this gorgeous wonderland, which isn't and never will be.

You perhaps don't know the joke of why we use *Alice in Wonderland* in our training drills. It's just a joke, completely aside from the fact that that particular gentleman, besides being a fine mathematician, could also write.

But here is this circumstance – all this imagined knowledge. Somebody commits to memory a sixty-thousand-word treatise on childcare – just commits it to memory from one end to the other. Doesn't understand any part of it. Sees a child coughing and whooping and coughing and just having a terrible time, and turns around very learnedly to the mother and says, "Bronchitis – acute," and walks away. Bronchitis. Now, wait a minute. We don't care how many broncos are around there. A child is coughing!

It actually would require the observation that the child was coughing in order to do anything about it. Now, the *wrong* thing to do about it is give it a new name! That just takes you one step away from looking at it. And you realize that if you were in good shape, the child was coughing and his throat was raw and you looked at his throat and so on, his throat would get well.

Now, let's go into wonderland – the wonderland of syllables; the wonderland beneath the earth of never-never. What is all this? We know it as a dispersal. An individual looks at

³² Editor's Note: This sentence was altered in the Golden Era Tape to „I processed a man one time, he doped off all the time.“

³³ Valhalla: (Norse mythology) the great hall where the god Odin receives and holds feasts for the souls of heroes fallen bravely in battle. The word literally means hall of the slain. Used figuratively in this lecture.

³⁴ Pluto's realm: (Greek and Roman mythology) the world of the dead, of which Pluto was the ruling god.

³⁵ Menninger: Karl Augustus Menninger (1893-1990), American psychiatrist who, with his father, founded the Menninger Clinic in Topeka, Kansas in 1920.

something and it flashes back and he can no longer look in that direction. It kicks him in the teeth³⁶. He thinks it will continue to kick him in the teeth. So he mustn't look that way. He must look somewhere else. And he eventually learns very well never to observe anything, but if he catches sight of something, to go on a via at once and look the other direction. Do you see that? And that is the exact mechanic of how a wonderland of pretended information which became the social sciences was created. Individual couldn't confront man so he turned around and developed a theory about man. He said man was something that was made by the devil in the image of God or something – some such myth. All savage races, *all* savage races, even the American, has had myths concerning man's origin – the Aleut, Tlingits³⁷. You see, he's had all sorts of things.

Now, he certainly couldn't have been looking very well if he'd never noticed exteriorization as such. He must have been blind for centuries never to have included this in his literature. Isn't this fascinating? If any man knew anything about it, he didn't dare say anything about it because nobody else knew anything about it, you see? He stood there as a little island of information that quickly died. He invented all sorts of things about heaven and hell and hereafters.

Then he invented the "functions of the brain," which is the wildest thing I ever heard of; I don't know that the brain has a single function. I know I stopped depending on mine years ago. Someday I will will my brain – I just thought of this – I'll will my brain to science and they can put it in a pickle jar, and it will have served its first useful purpose. I don't even enjoy it as head padding because every once in a while you put a helmet. . . have to put a helmet around it to ride motorcycles, and it's already too heavy. You know? It doesn't work well.

Now, what is this additive, make-it-more-complex thing? Well, we try to look at something, and then because we don't want to look at it anymore, we turn around and look another way and tell somebody all about not looking at it. We tell somebody how dangerous it is to look in that direction. Or maybe we're just feeling pucky one day, and we invent a direction not to look in. We say, "Everybody who looks northeast by north, up through that pass up there, is apt to see the jub-jub monster," and nobody could tolerate that, and so nobody ever looks in that direction. And when you've got all points of the compass sorted out, somebody is totally blind. After that he really *does* have theories.

There are no theories quite as towering as the theories of one who has spent his life in an ivory tower. These theories are gorgeous. They have the beautiful charm of having no possible bearing on reality – which is of course the ne plus ultra.

Now, a thetan on the other hand, all out of thin air, has as his greatest accomplishment the ability to create, form, maintain, a universe. So when he has this ability of creating a universe, this dims out so that he's not doing it very intelligently. And he sees a bunch of things in the universe that he doesn't want to look at – he gets a dispersal there – he combines these two talents. So the universe he builds is below the level of the current universe he's in. And you have to bring him north to find out he's in a trap.

³⁶ teeth, kicks (one) in the: (slang) gives (one) an abrupt, often humiliating setback.

³⁷ Tlingits: members of any of a number of American Indians of the coastal regions of southern Alaska and northern British Columbia, Canada.

Fantastic thing, but I'm sure that you could go down to penitentiaries and take prisoners – some prisoners that have been there for a very long time – and run 8-C on them and get some terrific cognition all of a sudden, you know? The fellow would go around touching the walls, and all of a sudden he'd say, "Iron bars? Iron bars?" He's hung on to them every day you know for the last twenty-five years. "Iron bars? My God, I believe I'm in jail!"

Well, we should understand this across the whole of knowledge. We should understand invented knowledge. We ourselves are sometimes accused of it. Perhaps there are some things in Scientology which were unwittingly invented. I myself don't know what they are. There were a few things that we discarded. I wouldn't say what percentage because I don't think it would be a statable percentage. It's such a tiny little amount of data that we've picked up and then had to discard as incorrect or wrong or a misconception, that it doesn't amount to very much. Most of our data is on the firm foundation of having looked.

And your ability to know the subject is your ability to look. No more, no less than that. Now, the only thing, actually, that anyone can do for you is to provide you with an example of having looked, and perhaps to furnish you a little road map saying, "If you travel up this way there's some scenery." Got it? "And if you look at this scenery real hard, it won't bite you." Some reassurances can be offered. Some drills can be offered that show an individual that he can observe, look and confront, exchange communication with or communicate to. These things can be done. Observation can occur.

And all the observation in the world being done at this moment – all the observation in the world – actual real observation in the field of the humanities, if put totally together into a thimble, would get lost.

Now, I don't say that maliciously. I'm trying to show you something. I'm merely trying to show you that wherever we have succeeded it has been in the direction of a straight communication. And where training and processing processes are successful, they lead toward a straighter communication.

And therefore, the road out is marked by simplicity and direct observation. And the road in is more and more and more and more vias, vias, vias, complexity, complexity, complexity.

It's quite amusing, the evolution – there will be gentlemen hearing these tapes who have taught Comm Courses over the past year or so – but the evolution of a Comm Course is terribly interesting. At first I didn't have too much alertness on this subject; I simply invented the drills as a gradient scale and I told them to teach them and paid little further attention to it. Pioneering work on it was done by others. And it was only when I found out that every time that a Comm Course was established anyplace it soon became much more complex than anybody could ever imagine, did I realize that the people who were teaching Comm Courses had seldom been through them.

In other words, instead of a straight communication – for the first six or eight months of Comm Course history – instead of straighter communication, we were getting more complicated communication and instead of being able to do the drill better, we were succeeding in doing it more complicatedly. You see this? This is to be expected. It's man's natural bent.

Man – before he gets up and looks to find where he is, before he starts to look in a proper direction, discovers he's blind, and then says, "Hey, wait a minute," takes the veil off of his eyes and does take a look – has a tendency to keep diving into complexities.

So there is only one continuing stress in Scientology. That stress, until now, has been added to this subject, I am afraid to say, mainly by myself. And that stress is just this: Greater simplicity means greater communication. And I've been bucking my shoulder³⁸, in the organizations, up against any tendency to complicate a simple observation. And it has been necessary always to take the drill and simplify it, to take the subject and simplify it, to take the organization, articulate it better and simplify it.

Now listen. That it can be done is obvious. I mean, I have the *absolute* proof that it can be done. We have simplified the Central Organization in Washington, DC, to such an extent that we recognize fully there is none here! That tells you we must have looked at it because it's been as-ised. We know there's no organization in Washington, DC. We do know that there are several people in Washington, DC, who wear certain hats, who are in communication with certain other people with certain ends and purposes, and this is the first time we've had a running show that didn't cause anybody headaches twenty-four hours a day.

We dropped the *Alice in Wonderland* myth called organization. We found out the third dynamic³⁹ was an agreement. All right, we'll agree. But in agreeing, let's not die the death. Let's not as-is every individual present simply because we've agreed that there's an organization there. Let's not create an all-devouring, *Alice in Wonderland* monster. You understand this?

We came uphill far enough to recognize that the third dynamic, how desirable and actual it may be in the upper realms of existence, at this level of existence is composed entirely of first dynamics cooperating. Therefore, it isn't possible for the organization to carry a ball independent of an individual. And if an individual in that organization is carrying the ball well, *dhuh*, he's liable to run square onto somebody who isn't. And the organization can never help him out. Now, maybe he can take refuge of one kind or another in the public belief that there is an organization there. You understand that? But, because he's taking such refuge, he should not be so untruthful and so blind himself as to believe that there is actually a somethingness there where there is truly nothing, nothing at all.

Organizations do not bleed, they do not breathe. They do behave, oddly enough, like a single organism – oddly enough. But when the individuals in it cease to behave as individuals, cease to have their own thoughts, cease to be capable of their own initiative, cease to be able to take their own action, then the whole organization boils down to just one man – and he's the only one that could make a decision, the only one who could do anything, the only one who could act. Now, we don't care whether this is a beneficent monarchy or a fascism or anything else. We're merely saying that in the end it boils down to one man.

³⁸ bucking one's shoulder up against: resisting or objecting strongly to (some situation or condition).

³⁹ Editor's Note: „third dynamic“ was replaced by „organization“ in the Golden Era tape.

If we believe implicitly in an organization, we have a situation whereby every agent of fascism in Italy had to phone Mussolini⁴⁰ in Rome to make a decision. And when our military governments went into Sicily and Italy, they found out that the only people who were there who could do anything about the government were these former Nazis⁴¹. They did try to put in other people in government to run the towns and so forth and found out that they'd put in the Mafia. They kicked them out in a hurry, a few thousand deaths later. And what did we discover? What did we discover? They couldn't act or operate because Mussolini was no longer there! In other words, they'd lost their individualism.

So the first thing I must tell you about this subject is that it is a subject, that it depends upon organization only to the degree that communication is assisted, that it is composed of individuals who observe and who look. And if the organization is ever asked on to look, we'd have to recognize something right there or we would be telling ourselves fairy tales; and that is that the organization, not being there at all, must therefore be totally blind. Thus we get the conduct of governments which are totally blind.

All right. The whole subject opens up at its inception with just this: That the simplicity of observation, the simplicity of communication itself, and only itself, is functional and will take man from the bottom to the top.

And the only thing I am trying to teach you is *look*.

Thank you.

⁴⁰ Mussolini: Benito Mussolini (1883-1945), founder and leader of the Fascist Party and premier of Italy (1922-1943). He gained and maintained his power by physical violence against his opposition.

⁴¹ Nazis: members of the National Socialist German Workers' Party which, in 1933, seized political control of Germany under the leadership of Adolf Hitler (1889-1945). In alliance with Italy and, later, Japan, Nazi-controlled Germany entered into a large-scale war with many other nations of the world, which came to be called World War II. The Nazi party was officially abolished in 1945 at the conclusion of the war. Nazi comes from the German word Nazi(onalsozialist).

CCH RELATED TO ARC

A lecture given by L. Ron Hubbard on 16 July 1957

Well, okay. As usual the lecture I was going to give you isn't. But I'll think of something – think of something as you go along.

You probably haven't yet related training in the ACC, which is Academy type training to the ARC triangle. You probably haven't related it because the A is missing, the R is unstable at best, and the C which you expected to be inflow is almost total outflow.

Affinity, reality, communication.

I suppose you think we've left this a long way behind, huh?

Audience: Nope. No.

I don't know if you realize it, but A and R were designed and came about in July 1950 in Elizabeth. And C followed within twenty-four hours.

The ARC triangle is our next-to-the-oldest property. Our oldest property is a bank – the engram, the mental image picture.

But the ARC triangle recently did a terrific resurrection, not after seven days or three days or something, but after seven years it rose sturdily from the dead and again took its place. Only this time we call it control, having-ness and communication.

Affinity, reality and communication are an excellent description of the three basic things on which the universe is built, but without which in balance, life cannot exist. Affinity, reality and communication.

Without affinity – that is, some emotional or felt consideration of proximity – affinity is basically a consideration of distance, but it's that consideration which says that one likes it or doesn't like it. In other words, without some liking or disliking, having some things to avoid and some things to go close to, there would be no game at all.

And reality of course is that sequence which begins with postulates and ends with mass, which we originally defined as an agreed-upon thing. Reality was an agreement. And communication is of course – everybody knows what communication is, it's just communication. Everybody knows that. I mean . . . We didn't have to do any work on communication in Scientology because it was already well understood.

L equals MV squared by the square root of the sine gives you the electrical output of the input on the other side of the ruddy rod. It was the basic formula of communication that was used in the first half of the twentieth century. It was a very well worthwhile communication. It added up of course, naturally, to the fact that if you wanted to communicate with anybody you gave them an electric shock. At least this is the only extant text on communication.

If you go down to the library and look for texts on communication you will find electrical gimmicks and Western Union, and you'll find formulas and you'll find all sorts of things but no discussion down there about one being talking to another being because of course nobody had ever done that. So we had to introduce with this new simplicity this radical idea that one being could talk to another being, that an interchange of ideas could take place.

But if you notice, an interchange of ideas is not very feasible unless there is an agreement of some sort or another. The agreement can take the form of having a mass to talk to, so that we've got a communication via. At least we know what we are talking to if there is something there, and that is reality. And we can simply postulate something is there and talk to it – people do this in New York all the time. We see them walking up and down the streets talking to nothing.

But it works best, really, if we have a reassuring backdrop for our deathless prose. It works best. At least we can get the echo. So talking to something is preferable to talking to nothing, of course.

Well, when two beings are talking to each other here on earth you normally see the oddity of two bodies standing there, not confronting each other and not talking. But there's a lot of words going back and forth. But this is – the reality part of that interchange would be the mass. That is, the platform, whether it's earth or a sidewalk or something of the sort the two bodies are standing on, and the two bodies standing there.

Now space, so far as location is concerned, enters into this. Those are located somewhere – those two bodies are located somewhere and therefore we know where the communication goes to. And whoever receives it knows where to send the answer back to – very necessary part of communication.

And then we get this business of affinity. How far away does a fellow have to be to talk to you? Well, there's more to that under affinity and we have learned there is more under affinity than a consideration of distance.

Yes, affinity is liking and disliking and all the rest of it, but there is more to it. But nevertheless, therefore you have the basic bones of understanding.

Understanding requires affinity, reality and communication. And if any corner of that triangle ARC is lowered, the other two corners lower accordingly.

Now, any Scientologist knows this. It's the most interesting trick in the world that all you have to do to raise somebody's communication level is to hit the A corner of the triangle, affinity, or hit the R corner of the triangle. For instance, you see a policeman out there, he won't talk to you. Why, pick up a hammer, hit him with it – that's introducing some R, and he'll say something – at least "Ouch," something like that.

If you introduce reality into a situation, you could do it just this way. We know that reality is basically an agreement. We used to say it was basically an agreement. Actually we have today the Reality Scale. And that's quite important.

But we've always known all we've had to do – in Scientology we've always known it – all you had to do was introduce some agreement into the situation. You had to agree at least on what you were talking about in order to talk.

It's the most wonderful thing in the world to see a conversation being conducted without any established agreement about what it is being conducted on.

It's rather interesting. You go into a – oh, I don't know – I was up in the middle of a skyscraper one time, found a men's club that was about halfway up the skyscraper. They had soft-footed waitresses and so forth. It was very soothing, very soothing. After the fellow had lost his pile in a bull market or something of the sort, why he could go up there and, you know, cry in private.

And so you go in there, and one fellow would say, "Well, I sold 25,000 shares today of American Can."

And the other fellow would say, "Well, my wife doesn't like mink." And ...

The next fellow would say, "Well, my rug cost \$10,000 – bought it in Brussels."

Very interesting place – I enjoyed the liquor. I didn't know – I didn't know that these fellows had hideaways of this character. I thought that they had them other places; I thought they had only love nests, but they have these places too. And anyway . . . Anyway, it was quite interesting, there wasn't any communication in progress simply because there's no agreement on anything. You'd have thought, well, they're all interested in the market or something like that and therefore they would talk about the market. Yes, you heard more comments on the market than you heard about any other thing, but none of them were sequitur. It was very fascinating.

And these fellows didn't know that the other fellows were there. You got that? Now, you would have had to have established the existence of one of the other people before a communication could have occurred.

It's quite interesting as an experiment to see three or four people sitting around in a room at a party. I did this, by the way, when I was over in London in April, and there were a couple of Scientologists present, and there were some other people too. And they thought this was very amusing – the Scientologists – but the other people didn't realize anything was happening.

I introduced a Miss Jones to a Mr. Smith, six times. I just kept introducing these two people. And they didn't notice anything peculiar about my introducing them six times – because that was the bet I had on with these two Scientologists. Will they notice? They didn't see anything – the girl at first explained to me, "Yes, I – I've met Mr. er – uh – uh."

And I would say, "Well, well, well, Miss Jones, I'd like to have you meet Mr. Smith." All over again, you know.

"Uh, oh, oh, yeah! Well, I-I've met him and so forth." That's all.

Mr. Smith says, "Yes, I – I know Miss er – uh – uh Jones."

"Now, Mr. Smith, I would like to have you meet Miss Jones."

They became inseparable! Nobody could get a word in edgewise the rest of the evening! They just snapped terminals, that was that!

Just a simple demonstration of the practical uses of this very, very old triangle that we have. We just put more R into the thing. We finally got an agreement restimulated in both of them that the other one was there. And they agreed upon the fact they were both there and both located, and thereupon certainly must have had some affinity for one another, and therefore could talk. See, two people couldn't be that close together without liking each other. That just – you know, it just follows. It just follows.

On the last couple of introductions I will admit that I moved Mr. Smith closer to Miss Jones. So it wasn't a pure test. Some A was being thrown into it there. But there we had it. Communication occurred simply by R. And a tiny little hint of A, you know, by getting them close together. All right.

ARC. Well, anybody knows about this. I had a girl who was weeping all over the HASI London. She was over from Ireland, and the hall porter came to me and he said, "Doctor," he said, "is there something you can do about these puddles of tears that keep occurring in the hall?" No, he did tell me, "She feels awfully low." He was Irish too.

Anyway, her father and her mother would no longer speak to her. They wouldn't write her. They didn't want anything to do with her. So I took her under an ironclad discipline on what she was to write to them in Ireland. And I merely told her to write a simple letter through saying that she was in London and that she was working and that everything was fine and she hoped everything was going well at home.

She says, "Under no circumstances would they receive such a letter! They couldn't receive such a letter because they are furious with me!" She had, I don't know, I think she had taken up the piano or something of the sort, and she wouldn't go through with her career and so they had thrown her out into the streets of Dublin. That's quite something to happen to somebody. Anyway – that's really something to happen to somebody. That's why we're having something to do with Ireland. We think there ought to be a country there.

Well, anyway, we wrote that letter and I said, "Now," I said, "just don't do anything about this. Don't worry about it." And she told me a few days later she hadn't had a reply yet, you know – spitting out her fingernails. And I said, "That's okay. That's okay. Now, write them again and tell them you are particularly enjoying your job here. And tell them how the weather is in London."

And so she didn't know about that, but I Tone 40ed it and she sat down there and she wrote the letter and she sent that off.

She got back the most carpingly critical, 1.1 series of slashes you ever saw, and she promptly went into tears and she was going to explain it all to them – explain it all to them, and she was going to dash off this long epistle. And I said, "Nope. Nope. Do you live with anybody?"

She says, "Yes. I have a roommate."

I said "Now, you write her that your roommate is a very strait-laced girl, and that you're very glad to have this roommate and so on."

And so she sat down under a great deal of Tone 40 auditing, wrote this fact back to them. And she received a letter in return saying, "Dear Blank, we are very happy that you are doing well. And we don't feel, however, that you should be rooming with that person." They had changed off any rancor they had to another person they didn't even know.

Well, this girl had seen through this – she had seen that it was totally a mechanical operation, that I was making her do certain things, and she all of a sudden realized that her parents could be handled, and – that was that. She stopped worrying about it and they continued to correspond and everything was all right.

Nah-hah! Well, there is more method than madness in what I am telling you right here. Because A, affinity, necessitates a control of attention. Well now, it's all very well for us to theorize and use in the workaday world, ARC, but let me assure you we've had an awful lot of processes more or less founded on ARC, and they have not in themselves produced tremendous results. They produce good results, but not just spectacular results.

We have seen a lot of things happen by reason of using just plain ARC. But we haven't seen anybody step out of the graveyard and doff his hat. There must be something about ARC which is workable, then, but there must be some counterparts to ARC which are more workable than ARC, since if we know ARC is true, then how do we – and those are basic considerations, very basic – then how do we make it work in this universe, on this planet at this time?

Well, ARC is all very well for thee and me. We can understand A-R-C. We know that the three things add up themselves to understanding. We know how to promote a – understanding with them. But there are very few of us, in spite of our self-criticism and so forth, who have not been able to some degree to handle people before Scientology.

In other words, we were minded in this direction. And then we improved the direction we were minded considerably by understanding ARC and its understanding. Now, you know that's true. It simply clarified our understanding of understanding and its component parts.

But how would you make it apply to this fellow who is just about to be slid into the coffin or the lady lying up in the hospital with her head bashed in, in a comatose state, or the one-day-old child? Now, how do you get it into a processing level?

Well, in the first place you have to realize blindness when you see it, and you have to realize that south is an awful long way south. And the basic entrance of the ARC triangle breaks down to control for A. Bodies and the GE respond to this beautifully. Any preclear therefore would respond to it regardless of his tone level if you were processing him via a body, because this is the body's understanding – it is solid. So therefore A is control.

Somebody comes along and says, "Stand up straighter. Get your heels together. Suck in your guts!" You say, "The guy loves me."

Now, you might phrase it in some other way. You might say, "Damn that sergeant, I could kill him!" Which means, of course, at a GE level, "I love him dearly."

And we have havingness or solid mass in the place of reality.

And we have verbalization in the place of communication. Got that now?

I mean, so understanding takes place in terms of control, mass and communication.

Two nations wish to speak to each other, they start firing bullets. See? They're always surprised that they did that much harm, because they reduced or disorganized the mass. And they say that "We shouldn't have done that." Always after a war they shouldn't have done that. Just like they just that moment discovered, you know, that bullets made holes in walls. I mean, any fool knows this. But the – nations periodically find out that bullets make holes in walls. Someday they'll find out that they make holes in men too, and they'll stop recruiting armies.

Anyway, here we have at the level of MEST what understanding is. Understanding, MESTwise, always takes place in the framework of mass and location thereof, verbalized or electrical or vibratory interchanges. Got that? And for affinity, control.

Now, if you dislike somebody on a mass level, you could simply refuse to control him. That sounds silly. I mean, the choice at the level I'm talking about is to control or not to control. See?

But unfortunately where you have people very firmly connected with mass this is the level of interchange. So if people are going around in bodies, then this is the level to which cases respond.

Now, don't get me wrong, I'm not trying to rephrase or redo the ARC triangle, I'm simply telling you the action level of the ARC triangle when it is in action, or you are going to work with it on a MESTy level.

And A, affinity, becomes control or lack of it.

The R becomes mass and its location or lack of it. See, the complaint is about no mass.

And C is some sort of a vibratory, electrical, particle interchange. Symbols flying back and forth and so on. Solid.

Ballantine Beer sort of thing, you know. They know how to communicate. You brightly, electrically ignite a sign and you slam it over TV and so forth. And I'm sure if you walked into their advertising agent, some punk up on Madison Avenue that got the account executives of the company fooled into thinking he knows something . . . Madison Avenue: that avenue of deceit where advertising is not done, but which we get on TV anyway. They work two or three years to find out that people responded to the fact that when you said "Dove soap is creamy" they bought another brand. Anyway . . .

I don't know if you've read the recent raves about the tremendous advertising job that was done with this new brand of soap, it was just wonderful. A Scientologist could have worked it out in about fifteen minutes and thought it was the least interesting puzzle he had ever had anything to do with. He would have simply shown people that it had mass and you

would have told people that it existed, where to buy it, and you would have tried to get some attractive mass to go along with it so that it would communicate, you know. Then we'd try to give them some kind of a bonus for buying it. You know – you know? We would have just said, "Buy it."

I've listened to TV ads recently, and I was thinking in terms of what if we Tone 40ed a TV ad? I've been listening to the horrible 8-C they run. They say, "Mercury cars are so smurkery. Why ride when you can glide? Your Mercury dealer is located at a certain spot." And this is a communication? Get the dispersal connected with it. It's the same dispersal that we were suffering from when we were running 8-C the first time.

We said, "Do you see the wall?" You know? "Do you see the wall?"

The fellow says, "Yeah, I guess I see the wall."

And you say, "Well, fine." You know, all backwards. You know, don't offend him. Don't move in on him. You know?

And if you'd translated the ad into Tone 40, you'd simply say, "Buy a Mercury car from such-and-such a phone number, such-and-such an address, the price is so-and-so. Call at once, please."

Male voice: Thank you.

See, that's a communication. And people would. It's quite interesting.

Now, you start adding too much directness, however, at this very, very low level that I'm talking about, and you are liable to blow the mass up. Now, a thetan learns that. Every once in a while he loses a favorite piece of bank or service facsimile or something of the sort. He said exactly what he meant to the fellow, directly, with no vias. Got himself fired or something.

Well now, he was trying to communicate directly on a MEST level. And you throw any particles straight out with no slightest via on them at all and something is liable to explode. You have to have some intention with it. There has to be some livingness connected with it and so forth. In other words, you have to upscale it in order to make it.

So people who stick around at the lower end of control – don't want it. Mass – can't have it. Communication – it'll be said for me. People at this level when coaxed to put out a control, when coaxed to put out a communication which is absolutely direct and straight, discover something fantastic: that in order to do this they have to go way up scale or shatter themselves in the process. And after they've been shattered a few times they hit the higher tone range. They say, "I belong up here. What am I doing grubbing around down here in the MEST?" That's basically what a fellow understands when he starts these training drills. It's quite interesting, quite fabulous.

After he blows pieces off of his bank, he finally says, "What am I doing talking through a bank? Why am I moving particles of electricity or something from here to here and saying it's intention? It's possible just to have them appear over here. Why shouldn't I do that?"

Well anyway, that's beside the point. The point is that ARC, to become extremely workable, has to be couched, where you're dealing with masses, in terms of control, havingness and communication.

Now, we've said CCH, by which we mean control, communication and havingness, or communication, control and havingness. And we haven't lined them up so that it's instantly discernible that this is another side to the ARC coin.

But you follow ARC down scale as per the Chart of Human Evaluation in Science of Survival – and if you go down, there is an area below the chart, about 1,000 feet below the bottom line of the chart – now, that has to do with mass.

We already knew that this chart went down to mass. See, we knew the lowest rungs of the chart would be getting solid, but when you get that solid, you know – when you get that solid you're about 1,000 feet below the chart.

In other words, to wrap up this whole thing, the only responses still extant at the bottom can still be phrased in terms of control, havingness and communication. That is, those responses do not entirely disappear. They get very coarse, they get very massy, they get very a lot of things, but they don't entirely disappear.

If life can be awakened into a presence, it will be awakened into a presence or a location by control, havingness and communication handled in one fashion or another.

Now, the first CCH process is a very, very old process, and hardly anybody has recognized its antecedent. We used to process – in 1949 I processed a cat until he'd eat an editor. It was a very remarkable thing. I mean, he'd eat the editor up and spit him out. Anyway . . .

I used to invite writers around to the house and they'd sit around and watch it happen, you know? He really did. I mean, I processed this cat up to a point where he would strike at my fingers. And he was a very timid cat, and I got him to reach for my fingers. And then I'd – each time he'd reach for my fingers, I would withdraw my fingers slightly and he would reach further. And he got more and more and more ferocious, and more and more and more ferocious, and more and more and more ferocious. And so I invited an editor over and he ate the editor up. Anyway . . .

Yeah. That's an exaggeration, an exaggeration really. He ate the editor's thetan. Anyway...

Yeah, this is documented. Documented. The cat's name was Countess Motorboat.

Now, here we find ourselves processing an animal – a cat – just by inviting the cat to reach out, no matter how timidly, and strike at our fingers. And then, gradually, so as not to startle or surprise the cat, we make our fingers retreat and we get the cat striking. Well now, that's a communication line. Lines are solid at the bottom of the Reality Scale – lines are solid. So we are right there at the cat's reality. Cat can't have mass; the cat is below mass, and the cat is actually trying to connect antagonistically with a solid communication line. And so the cat does reach. Well, Give Me Your Hand is just processing the cat, that's all. Only it's a way to do it.

You say, "Give me your hand," and then the fellow doesn't, and we reach over and take hold of his wrists and we take his hand, and we thank him for having given it to us. And after a while he says, "You know, there is some dim, vague possibility that I might have had something to do with that. I wonder if I could possibly reach that far." Not, "Could I control my body?" but, "Could I reach that far over to your lap?" See? "Could I reach that far?"

Well, he finds out all of a sudden there. When he finds out he can reach that far, you've done it, you see? Now you got to get him reaching for the environment – 8-C sort of thing. Well, you'd better reach for the environment in terms of barriers because you just got lines kind of recognized, so let's move him up now to barriers. So we have 8-C on walls; they're good barriers.

Now, when we get him up above that, well up above that, we put him back on lines again and we have Hand Space Mimicry, you know? Get him to locate the mass of the auditor. You got him to locate the environment, now have him locate the auditor.

Now we take him back up and we run such things as Location by Contact and other things. That's "Touch that (object in the room)." We're just making him reach again, aren't we? But he can't disobey these commands, and there's no thinkingness involved in it because there isn't any thinking-ness at that level, and if you're processing any it's a figure-figureness, not a thinkingness.

So that's what ARC becomes. After a long time an individual becomes a body; he isn't anything but a body, people are never anything but bodies, and bodies are dead too. And that's the way it is. A body is mass, so if the body is mass and one is a body, then the realest thing there could be to a body (providing he still had a body – you know he can be below that, we'll go down there in a moment) would be control, just outright control. If he had a body then control would be affinity. If he could control something, he would like it. I'm not talking about your parents. I'm not talking about some of your friends that stopped liking you when they stopped controlling you.

I never made such an enemy in my life one time. I knew a fellow, apparently he and I got along fine in a rather distant sort of way, and one day he said, "Well," he said "get your hat, we're going out to dinner." And I said, "No, I have to wait for somebody." He's been my enemy ever since. In other words, affinity was whether or not control could occur.

Well, now an individual who finds out control isn't killing him winds up liking his auditor somewhat. See that? That's an establishment of a reality level there, and the affinity level at that reality level is control.

Now, he can be way below that (being able to accept control) and kick back against it, and find out that it doesn't kill him and that he can't get rid of it, and he'll wind up liking you too. But it's upscale, it's not downscale. In other words, we use a good Tone 40 control on him, he'll come upscale to having mass, and he can have mass.

All right. Now let's look at what this does to communication. The individual, of course, is willing to talk, willing to say something and so on. He's also willing to receive objects and give objects away and so on. Interchanges can occur.

Now this is what we're looking at when we're looking at far-south processes. This is what we're looking at. We're looking at the ARC where understanding takes place only in the presence of control, havingness and communication on a MEST level. Do you see that? Do you see that?

All sorts of cliches should at once become explicable. "I don't know what's gotten into that boy, I can't do a thing with him." That's a weird remark if you analyze it on a high tone. "I can't do a thing with him, so I couldn't know, of course, what's gotten into him. If I could do something with him, then I would understand what's in him." That's the reverse of it, and that doesn't make sense at all. But nobody notices that the other doesn't make sense, you see? State it in the reverse and it just doesn't make sense at all.

All right. This is the level at which machines of a MEST nature, automobiles and so forth, have to be run. An individual cannot adequately control his car, he doesn't like his car. What does he mean by "like"? Does he mean an emotion? No, he does not mean an emotion, he means an ability to control it. It's as solid and MESTy as that.

You wonder why some married couples don't get along, although she apparently does everything he says, exactly, snaps and pops at once, and yet you say, "Well, she seems sort of beaten down and so forth. And then you decide that you will get her out from under him or him out from under her or bust this up one way or the other. And then you find out they – there seems to be some feeling for each other. You know, just absolute control going on all the time and so forth. Yet they're not detachable. You know, you say, "What is this phenomenon? I just can't understand how she stands him or he stands her," or something of the sort. But what's the phenomenon at which you're gazing? You're gazing where control is affinity. That's how they express their affinity – they kick each other in the pants. Trying to gain control over each other by fighting, below that level, is lovemaking. "I'm going to control you or know the reason why." And the other one says, "I'm going to control you or know the reason why." And this is the sum total of the conversation. Upscale is "I love you dearly." You can understand a lot by just looking at what is understanding at the level of mass. What is understanding at the level of mass? It is control – controlling and being controlled. That – mass itself and communication, and that is understanding.

You know, like a calculus professor wants you to do, or something. No, that's lower than that, excuse me. Excuse me, that's lower than that. There's no mass involved there. That's an inverted figure-figure. "DY, DX – what is the purpose of this subject, professor?" "Humpfff!" You say, "Excuse me. How come the 'Humpff'?" Well, he just told you there isn't any understanding it. And you, being somewhat high-toned, go on with your stupid expectancy that things that are offered are understandable.

I used to try to teach people that psychotics were not understandable, which was what was wrong with psychotics – that's all. I can tell you right now how to understand a psychotic like mad. I can tell you what psychosis is all about, very rapidly, right out of exactly the same material I'm giving you at this moment.

Psychosis is something mocked up so that it cannot be handled. Psychosis is something that cannot be handled. You got that as the control factor? Some thing – now, that gives you the object that cannot be handled, that gives you the control. And of course "mustn't

get in and handle it" gives you the communication factors, you see? But of course there's not much mass there, if there is any – psychos try to make nothing out of their mass all the time. They're a mocked-up nonhandleability.

Now, there's many a spook ally or character you have in the past that you run across every once in a while in session. Quite amusing. You run across this fellow in session, you say, "Oh, now there's Uncle Joe again. I'm sure he had some sort of an influence on my life, but I can't understand what it is." Well, that's what's the matter with it, you can't understand what it is. That would be the shallowest look at it, but that's still a look.

Every once in a while this person will pop up and you'll say, "Well, I know this person influenced my life somehow or another, but I can't possibly tell you how." It's just a little dim feeling you have that there was something there.

Well, that individual, I assure you, was always mocking up to you or around you things that couldn't be handled.

Dear sweet Grandma, you know? She says, "Now, don't go out in the rain because you'll get a terrible cold. Don't eat all that junk before supper because . . ." Got this sort of thing? Well, now that's bad enough, but there's still some affinity in it. She was trying to control it, but she kept mocking these things up that couldn't be handled.

Well, if there was some reason in it, or it seemed to – so that you'd be a better boy or a better girl or something of the sort, why, you didn't terribly object to it. You sort of took it with a small snarl.

But the person I'm talking about is a little further afield. This person that you can't quite tell what's wrong. You run across this person every once in a while in processing and you say, "Well, he – I know he was doing something, and – but nahhh." This person was capriciously mocking up things that couldn't be handled. Tell you about spiders, you know – spiders are under the house, spiders are poisonous. Or he'd tell you about there are snakes in the grass, or they tell you about diseases. "You know, there's a terrible disease known as polio. It must be pretty bad because the president had it."* It's pretty bad over there – bad over there.

But sometimes this person was sufficiently adroit that it didn't sound like it was bad over there. It was just that every part of the environment seemed to have in it things that couldn't be handled at all! You know, you better stay on the good side of this or you better steer around that or something. And they never paid you the compliment of thinking you could handle a cockeyed thing! So we get, theoretically, above 2.0 and below 2.0, and people who are below 2.0 mock up things that can't be handled, and people above 2.0 mock up things (when they do) that can be handled or try to handle anything. Now, there's the dividing line on this control.

People below 2.0 mock up things routinely and only which can't be handled and then brag about it. "Ah, these terrible headaches, they just come and go all the time. And I just can't do a thing about it! They sent me up to Mayo brothers and charged my husband \$8,672.23. I'm not cured yet, it's just terrible! Ahhh, it's terrible!"

Well, it's a very funny thing. Those people are way much further down-scale than you think they are. We say it's above 2.0 and below 2.0, which seems to be a precise line. But it's almost as if we're talking about two different universes.

Boy, when they go around mocking up things that can't be handled and bragging about it all the time, they give an auditor a pretty bad time. They sit in an auditing chair and mock up things that can't be handled. That's all they're doing. And they're just daring the auditor to handle them.

Reference to US president Franklin Delano Roosevelt (1882-1945), who contracted polio in 1921.

Now, you start sawing through with "Give me your hand. Thank you. Huh." And they say, "This can't be handled" – something. They keep offering things that can't be handled and all of sudden this – so on, nothing is happening. Something happens there. You got it?

People who would do that sort of thing – don't go straining at gnats here, because the truth of the matter is, these people are pretty bad off. They are never really successful at anything. They're terrifically destructive. Sort it out, don't just assign this to everybody who walks up the street. Go up on Capitol Hill before you start assigning it. "Can't be handled, can't be handled, can't be handled, can't be handled." See? It's below apathy, it's a sort of a big brag, you know?

Well, that's what this MEST does all the time. They've Q-and-Aed with MEST, they become MEST, they do what MEST does.

MEST does all sorts of wild things, you know? You could learn the laws on which it is built as in physics and you're still nowhere. It's always doing something that can't be handled. Mountains are always falling over on people and, you know – I mean, hurricanes come along and so forth. So much so that nobody even gets sensible about these things anymore. They just say, "Oh well, that's nature." (Not meaning Serutan.) Now . . .

There isn't any reason why that hurricane, by the way, chomped up that much of the Gulf here recently.* They got lots of bombs to blow up in Nevada, but I don't know why they didn't drop one on that hurricane, the first hurricane of this year. All they would have had to have done was drop an impact of the size of any one of these Nevada bombs, and they probably wouldn't have had any hurricane left. But men are accustomed very much to this idea that things in nature can't be handled, and a hurricane is a great big thing. Well, household matches are also awfully big to ants – it's more or less the viewpoint you take on such things.

But here we – here we enter our understanding of life in realizing that there are people around who have no slightest desire to handle anything. Everybody has got something in his life that he doesn't think can be handled, or he doesn't think he can handle. But these people just mock it up all the time, something can't be handled, can't be handled.

Listen to some psychiatrist going on about psychosis. After you've been auditing for a long time you completely forget the actual mid-twentieth-century viewpoint on these things. Boy, "They cannot be handled." I mean, that's the thing, you know? "There's just nothing can be done about it."

Well, we had Book Auditors that were handling psychosis in 1950, but a psychiatrist knows it can't be handled! See, he's just Q-and-Aed with the whole thing, so he'd better electric shock it.

And you say, "Well, why do you electric shock it?"

And he says, "Well," he says, "well, you have to keep scientific records." I had one say that to me one day.

"No, no. Why do you shock the patient, doctor?" I said indulgently. I mean, I was talking at him just as though – could understand.

And he says, "Well," he says, "I-that's it!" He says, "You keep the records!" And he was getting frantic.

And I said, "No. No, no. Why do you shock the insane people who come in here? Because you've told me yourself they get out earlier if you don't."

Reference to a hurricane which occurred in 1957 in the Gulf of Mexico, causing extensive damage and claiming hundreds of lives along the coasts of Texas and Louisiana.

"Well," he says, "I keep the records!"

I gave it up. That's really the only reason why. Somebody had told him to keep the records, so he had to shock them to get a record.

Now, you go around, you dope, and you say, "Why doesn't this fellow understand something? Why can't he see my viewpoint?" Well, he – he's just goofy. That's being goofy in another way, not to recognize somebody who can't see a viewpoint. See, you just – you have to look at it and that's the proper estimation of it. The fellow is stone-blind and stark, staring mad. You say, "Okay, stone-blind, stark, staring mad." If you said it with a loud enough recognition, he would probably turn sane or something.

And you go on burrowing into this, you know, saying, "Why is this guy so crazy?" Well, I don't know why he's crazy – he's crazy! Who cares why he's crazy? I could think up more reasons why he was crazy than he ever could before he went crazy. We're not short of reasons why. You don't even have to get the right one. If you want to do something for him, why, run Give Me Your Hand, Tone 40 8-C, plow him around, square him up.

But he'll go on mocking up things that you are dared to handle. And the preclears that have given you a bad time have done that and only that. You cure them of one thing, so they mock up something else you can't handle.

Their whole game is the avoidance of control. Now, they know how to control other people. You get a service facsimile – you get a service facsimile, of course, which is unhandleable. And you handle these people by not permitting them to handle the service facsimile, don't you see? Sounds smart, doesn't it? That's reactive enough for any reactive mind.

Well, you can roughly divide people then, above and below 2.0. Some of them mock up things which can be handled, and try to handle other things. These are the people who keep the world running. They don't build clocks that can't be fixed. And the rest of the people who

are trying to get membership in the human race – that's pretty interesting, trying to get up high enough to take membership in the human race. A fellow needed a stepladder to reach bottom. These fellows simply keep on mocking up things that can't be handled.

And every doctor, and every asylum, every practitioner of any kind is confronted by these people all the time. Because this is the dare.

"Ah, there's somebody going into practice over there. Ah, ha, ha. No, no, heh-heh-heh! He'll never be able to get to Aunt Bessie's cough. Heh-heh-heh-heh-heh-heh-heh-heh-heh-heh!" "Well, it's no better today, doctor. Ah-huh."

Now, you recognize this as human behavior at the slimier end of the human scale, don't you? All of us have something which we hope nobody can handle. Keeps thetans from getting into our skulls. Once in a while we – once in a while we miss and we forget how to handle them ourselves. Everybody plays this game to some degree, but I'm talking about a dedicated profession. Very well.

ARC becomes control, havingness and communication. Now, you recognize that control, havingness and communication are not the bottom because they invert and become no control possible of any kind. Now, this is the "can't handle it," see? No mass admissible or viewable. And no communication of any kind acceptable; therefore no understanding possible.

Now, that's where it goes. But the funny part of it is, is we've discovered that rung which solves the inversion.

Now, just as we can raise anybody's communication by raising his affinity and reality, just as we can raise anybody's reality by raising affinity and communication, just as we can raise affinity by raising their reality and communication, so can we do all of these tricks at the bottom.

We can remedy control, inability to handle and so forth in his life and vicinity, simply by remedying his havingness or by talking to him or by using straight control.

We can raise his lack of mass by control and communication. He can't have anything, and we want him to be able to have a few things in life – at least our processing – and so we just run control and communication on him. Just – that's all. And we'll find out his havingness will pick up.

You'll find some odd considerations, very complicated, are in the road of all this, and will blow off as cognitions which he probably will never mention. But he will eventually come up to CCH.

Now, if a person has got to be identified as mass and connected with mass, he's in terribly good condition when he is at CCH. He's in terrific condition when he's at CCH if he is there as mass, identified as mass enough to have a condition. So therefore, CCH is pretty high, not low at all. But CCH handles all the inversions of CCH, and this whole mysterious strata, the bottom substrata of the ARC triangle is revealed to view and becomes workable in the hands of an auditor.

Control all by itself will level out all lower inversions on the subject of control, havingness or communication.

Now, the right kind of communication all by itself will do something for havingness and control. Hand Space Mimicry is a solid line. He'll eventually have an auditor.

And Can't-Have on Others, and Have on Self, or the three steps of Trio run one way or another on somebody, "Touch that wall," that sort of thing is a Havingness Process – it's also a Communication Process and so forth, but if you could run "Tell me something your mother can't have," and get a straight answer, why the havingness comes up, so comes up his ability to control and the ability to communicate. So you can hit CCH at any one of its corners and get the other two to some degree. Which is quite remarkable because it permits the auditor to directly address the body and have something happen to a person.

Now, people have tried to do this a number of times in the past. They've put bodies on white tables, put masks over their faces, dropped some ether in and cut out their gizzards. And the fellow is supposed to say afterwards, "I feel much better." And get a big bill. Well, it made him feel better to the degree that somebody took him and placed him, and then lost him, and didn't speak too crossly to him while they were administering the anesthetic, you see?

He got an awareness that something was happening, and just to that degree the operation probably did him some good. Oh, standing them up in the corner and kicking them in the shins for a half an hour would do the same thing as the best operation on earth. The fellow – the fellow would recover from it much more alert. You think I'm joking now, but that's true. I said it's better than an operation.

Now, CCH then should be viewed by you as simply the workable factors at the lower end of the mass scale. You get to – talk to you about reality scales and a lot of other things of this character, but you're just studying this rather high level which solves all of its lower inversions. A fellow who can communicate, who can have, and who can control and be controlled, and is still a fellow and identified as such, and not exteriorized worth a damn, would still be in so much better condition than Homo sapiens that we could call him right there Homo novis. But he'd certainly be at the borderline; he would be a terrific guy compared to most people walking out in the world today.

So CCH is a pretty high level, but it's a description also of all lower levels, the harmonics of which are processed by straight CCH.

Thank you.

THEORY AND DEFINITION OF AUDITING

A lecture given on 17 July 1957

This is third lecture, 18th ACC, July 17, 1957. Just so you'll know the date. Come on up to present time.

I – my goodness, there's change in you people. Yeah, what do you know. I take that back – you don't have to come up to present time, you're here.

Okay. Tonight – tonight we're going to cover some material which has never been covered before in any lectures. And quite interesting that we would have basic material kicking around that you hadn't heard about.

First and foremost of these is the theory of auditing. What is Scientology? What does it do? Well that's fine, we know we audit somebody, by which we mean we process them – process them, exercise them in some way mentally so as to achieve some goal or another.

But what is this thing?

It's very fascinating, it's very fascinating. Something we do all the time and something we don't discuss.

Auditing, originally defined as somebody who – an auditor was defined as somebody who listens and computes, hence the word auditor. And auditing therefore would then – very early in Dianetics, would have been listening and computing. And I suppose most of us were just listening and computing.

But times have changed. Times have changed but the theory of auditing has not changed. Theory of auditing is actually covered in writing in The Original Thesis, wrote in – written in 1947 and it has to do more or less with these rules.

The preclear, the person being processed, is equal to or less than his bank or he wouldn't have one – by which we mean his engrams, his mental image pictures, the things that go boomp in the night and scare him, that he didn't know where they came from until we came along. He is equal to or less than this or they wouldn't be there, just by definition.

If he was greater than they, they would never trouble him. Well, the auditor is greater than, equal to or less than the surcharge, it says in that book, in the engram bank – that is to say the mental image picture collection. And he might or might not be greater than, you see.

But certainly, auditor plus preclear are greater than the engramic content of the pre-clear's bank. And that's the theory of auditing.

As we hook a booster engine on long freight trains to take them over the Continental Divide, so we hook an auditor onto a preclear and he can get over the hump too.

Now that was the first statement made on this subject. Hence this thing called processing.

But there's other material as covered in the Student Manual and new things have opened up as the years have gone on until we can say at last that a preclear or a person being audited in Scientology cannot possibly audit himself. That would be the thing he could not do.

Now that's very interesting, but enormous numbers of tests have been carried forward on this and these tests have rather conclusively demonstrated what I am about to say: that a preclear cannot audit himself. The best he could do would be to handle a mental image picture which was seeking to handle him. To handle people around him, to handle the physical universe, but not to handle himself. That's impossible. In order to audit himself a person would have to set up some sort of a bypass speaker system (shades of Elizabeth, 1950) whereby he'd get in one corner of the room (this is a direct quote from that lecture⁴²) and in a telephone box there, speak, and then the words he spoke would go around a wire and come back into the earpiece. Now, did you ever talk to yourself in a telephone?

Now, why is this? Because a basic ingredient of all auditing is communication. Now a person cannot talk to himself – he is himself. The language is sown with these absurdities. A person talks to himself? No. A person however could go in the corner in a telephone booth and speak into the mouthpiece and it could be run around the rest of the room and it could come out the earpiece. And if somebody put a delay on the circuit he could seem to be talking to himself.

Ah! But auditing is a process to get somebody into present time. And self-auditing must always have half of the conversation out of present time. So the auditor and preclear (and a person auditing himself, if you can imagine that) are in two different intervals of time. That's the first absurdity.

Now it is possible, and this by the way – this statement carelessly made in an article by me many years ago, got an awful lot of people into very serious trouble. It spoke about the great god Throgmagog and it said anybody can set up an analytical mind alongside of himself which can solve his problems for him. And that appears in Dianetics: The Evolution of a Science.

A fellow took this and he said, "Well, if that is the case then that is the way to do it." I've forgotten what he called the thing – he called it something or other. He didn't bother to read the next few sentences. And a whole bunch of people got to doing this one way or the other and it finally damped out or they died off or something.

But the truth of the matter is, it accomplished, in the final analysis, nothing. Self-auditing is just as absurd as, I stand on this side of the stage and I say, "How are you feeling?" Then I stand over here on this side of the stage and I say, "Oh, I'm all right – not too bad.

⁴² The lecture referred to was given on 7 July 1950 and is entitled "Operation of Valences and Demon Circuits." It can be found in Research & Discovery Series Volume 3.

How are you?" "Well, pretty warm but not too bad." Now, you could just go doing this on one side of the stage and the other side of the stage and so on, we could have a long and involved conversation, all of which would eventually amount to exactly nothing.

Now that should tell you something. In other words, somebody could mock up what we call a circuit: some kind of an electronic gimmigahoogit that talks back. Valences – the combined package of a personality which one assumes as does an actor on a stage, except in life one doesn't usually assume them knowingly. Generally he did at first and then after a while he was stuck with it. He doesn't know why he talks like Grandpa. He doesn't know why he chews snuff like Grandma. He wouldn't be able to tell you the answer to those things.

But an auditor could come along and say to him, "Did you know somebody that talked like that?"

And he says, "Oh, I don't know. Hm-hm-hm-hm. Nobody but Grandpa."

"Can you recall one moment or an instant of time when you heard Grandpa talking like that?"

And the preclear says, "Well yes, yes, as a matter of fact I can."

That, expertly done, would finish off that valence.

Why?

Because it can only operate if it's out of present time. And to snap the preclear off that operational spot and snap him into present time is to finish entirely this lag in the telephone wire of the fellow talking to himself in the phone booth.

Now, a person then takes these past moments or incidents of one kind or another and uses them later on to feed back to him from then. And then he forgets where they're coming from and he doesn't know or he forgot purposely and he says, "Something is talking to me" or "I am receiving an effect of one kind or another from the bank" or "from the mysterious past." Or he says something – usually he says, "I don't feel happy, I'm not well." As much as he could have articulated it back in '46, '47, '48, '49. He just didn't feel happy about life. He had compulsions and impressions and psychiatrologus and he had various things.

What did he have? He had something which was giving him orders out of present time. And a person, when they take up self-auditing, use these circuits to feed back to themselves this material in some fashion – and it busily gets nowhere in an awful hurry.

Now don't read this incorrectly. I'm not saying that a person cannot handle his bank, his body, the bodies of others, life and the environment – a person can. He can even think a thought or decide to change himself and change. You understand?

But to undergo a process of auditing administered by himself would be to the end goal, not so much of handling the bank, but as to change himself in some fashion or another.

Well now, self-auditing was almost possible under Dianetics because in Dianetics all one had to confront was an engram bank and that was all there was to it. And naturally an individual said, "I can handle this bank" and a Scientologist today, when he receives a bird or something like that usually goes off immediately someplace where it's quiet, runs the thing

out and comes back to the party. That's the usual thing he does. Somebody gives him an awful emotional shock, he's liable to stand back for a minute and make it more solid and come up to present time on it again.

But please understand that that is a process of handling mental image pictures. Now people make these pictures all the time and they get strewn across the past and then they finally comprise the past and that's it. And an individual could always handle these things. But that isn't auditing himself.

Now, the liability of a person all by himself handling this unknown, double-forked bank is that he didn't handle the worst moments in it when they occurred and he's got two strikes on him already in handling them all by himself later. You see that? Because the only moments that are giving him trouble are the moments he didn't handle. Now he gets the pictures of the moments he didn't handle, he tends to go out of control, and he says, "Oooh, I don't want anything more to do with that. I'll just skip the whole thing and boil off."

Well, an auditor is necessary because at that moment he should be kicked in the shins, given an acknowledgment, brought back to the pitch, made to confront it and be pushed through it and that would be the rest of it. The mechanical side of this is not what I'm stressing. It's just that an individual cannot audit himself because he is himself.

Now a circuit can audit him, he can audit a circuit, but for an individual himself to get auditing, it is necessary for a second person to be there! And this is one of the most remarkable things that some people discover, is that with the other person sitting there auditing them they can handle anything apparently without any worries at all. Now, out of session they say, "Well, I didn't have any trouble with that railroad train that ran over me – I'll just take another look at it." Auditor picks him out of bed the next morning, you know, with wheel tracks on his face.

Now, what is auditing then?

It is more than just assisting somebody to do this. Now we could get that old-time 1947 definition: auditor plus preclear can handle the preclear's mental image pictures, past experience, body and so forth. This is easy.

But this is not Dianetics. This is Scientology and there are a lot of people who haven't learned that thoroughly. Dianetics handled an engram bank, the mental image pictures which composed what we call the reactive mind. We had a concept of two minds. One was a machine called the analytical mind – a computer, something of the sort. And the other was a buried, hidden, reactive mind. Now Freud and various quacks and so forth on the track have had a holiday with this very visible reactive mind. It's – nothing very horrible about it – a collection of pictures of experiences which a person couldn't handle which get locked out of sight. And this then becomes the subconscious, the reconscious, the deconscious, the Freud-conscious. See, I mean, you can sell an awful lot of – you know, you can sell an awful lot of goldbricks and wooden nutmegs to people when they don't know what you're talking about. And the only reason Freudian analysts – they didn't hate me originally, they as a matter of fact have been very, very kind. They only swear silently now. They had a beautiful racket. They were the only pilots through this mysterious realm, all of which was based on sex.

And we come along and we say to people "Now look – look..." Terrible thing to do. Put a big economic dent in things. I don't know if you know it, but a Freudian analysis cost – a basic Freudian analysis on the average in the United States costs \$9,962.53. That's what it costs. That's for true. You can go around and ask analysts what they charge, how many hours it will take and all of that sort of thing and they give you this "Well, it'll take me a year to find out if I can help you and then another year to do something for you, at three or four hours a week at so much an hour." And it is really a huge figure.

Somebody comes along to you and says, "Well, you should never charge several hundred dollars for a twenty-five hour intensive" – I don't know! What are they trying to do – work for the analysts? The analysts thought nothing of charging nearly \$10,000 for putting a fellow into reverse!

Now, this is an economic fact – I'm not just talking. But here was all this hidden mystery, nobody knew what it was all about or possibly they would have said so. The world, after all, is not composed entirely of dishonest men in the field of healing – the old subjects of healing, you know, like barbers and so forth.

Hey, you know what those barber poles are? You do know what the barber poles are – it's the blood running around in a circle into the basin, you know. And the AM A – the AMA won't let their doctors cut hair anymore. Because they never did a good job of it! Anyway, they got them into cutting bodies as being more profitable.

Anyway, here was this world of the past. Now something had taken pictures of everything that had happened in the past and these pictures got hung up, particularly those that couldn't be handled by the individual, and this formed the reactive mind. And because he couldn't handle them then, the pictures continued to give him orders now. And all sorts of orders and perceptions are contained in these things. This is the most wonderful wonderland anybody ever got into. And if you want to know more about it, why, read Book One and do some Dianetic auditing. That's not the subject here. Dianetics: The Modern Science of Mental Health covered it fairly well.

Now, here – here was the Dianetic angle on auditing. The Dianetic attack was upon that reactive mind to make it known to the individual. Which is to say, to make him understand that he could do something about it and it didn't necessarily have a monopoly on doing things to him. And thereby making somebody free of those hidden sectors in his own past. And when a person was free of these things he couldn't handle, why, Dianetically he was called a Clear.

All right. Now, the whole thing turned around and went the other way toward the end of 1952 when we got Scientology. Scientology's a different approach.

We put the person himself in good enough condition so that he can then handle anything. And Scientologically we'd call that fellow a Clear. Not a blank bank, but an individual who wasn't stopped dead in his tracks by life, you see?

So the Scientology approach was to make this individual sufficiently able that he himself, after the fact of auditing, could then handle anything else that came up. Now this is just

reverse end to. Dianetics made the bank so it could be handled – these mental image pictures in the past – that made the bank so it could be handled.

Now, Scientology turned around 180 degrees on exactly the same proposition, included the physical universe and other people into it, and made the fellow capable of handling the bank, body, other people, environment, don't you see?

So Scientology demands that an individual be audited. There's a considerable difference there if you look it over.

In other words, there was some possibility of self-auditing in Dianetics. See, you could handle mental image pictures and chew up energy and do all sorts of interesting things. If that was the goal of Scientology, it would still be the same thing. There are a lot of people in Scientology that still believe that's its goal. And that's not true. This is the other side of it: we want this person to be able thereafter to handle such things, and to do this we sometimes even give him more trouble than he's got! And he learns he can handle it.

But that is auditing an individual. And therefore, the auditing of an individual takes precedence over the auditing of any item or inanimate object or picture. And any way you look at it, an individual cannot audit himself. Now that's one of the more remarkable things because it leads us then to the necessity of asking this one question: "You mean he's going to have to be in communication with other thetans forever? You mean he'll never be free of this in any way? You mean if he got all bogged down again and he didn't run into a Scientologist he'd be in bad shape?"

You could ask all sorts of fascinating questions. Fortunately, you don't have to answer any of them because the answer's quite obvious – terribly obvious. We said in Dianetics that in order to get out of something you better go through it. In other words, there wasn't any running away. That's true. That's very true. But how does this apply in Scientology?

Well, it applies very succinctly indeed. It was communication which got him into all the trouble he's in. And that was communication with somebody else. And the only thing that will get him out of trouble – of the trouble he's in – is communication.

And if he can't talk to himself, therefore communication is not possible in the absence of somebody else. You follow this?

Well, if it's not possible in the absence of somebody else, then please . . . Isn't it true then that he'll just get audited and then he'll just talk to somebody else and then not talk to them anymore and go into the same amount of trouble? No.

He went this thing stone-blind from the beginning. He knew none of the rules – he was making them all up as he went along. And he got them all fixed into agreements and solids and other interesting things and those are the things that are wrong with him.

The things that are right with a person are the things that are wrong with a person. The things that are wrong with a person are also the things that are right with a person. And this is the most fantastic riddle. If you walked up to the Sphinx and asked why this was, she'd probably crack a couple of stone chips off trying to figure it out.

Apparently, everything that is wrong with a thetan is what a thetan can do. Everything that is wrong with a being is the being. That's rather a fantastic riddle. You'll understand this much better in about two seconds.

There are numbers of scales in Scientology, as there were and are in Dianetics. And the Dianetic and Scientology scales are all of them graphic explanations of existence. You notice they're always drawn vertically, and lower on the scale means lower toned or means in worse shape. Almost all of these scales could be drawn as a V or an inverted cone of one kind or another.

Now why is that? Just something in my bank? No. I thought it was once, and then found out – found I was making a little game of happily trying to find cause for it, trying to explain it.

The truth of the matter is – distance tolerance is the key of the affinity scales. Chart of Human Evaluation as in Science of Survival is based on affinity, quality of emotion. And you will find out that distance narrows as a person gets into worse and worse condition.

Now, let's take the reality factor of that and we find out that the reality factors are real to him when he is closer and closer to them. In other words, as he gets worse and worse off he has to be closer and closer to something to know that it's real. This is the distance factor at work with regard to mass or another person or a terminal.

Now, high on the scale, a tremendous distance can be tolerated. And at the same time, a high level of trust and affinity is possible on the part of anyone. And at the theoretical bottom of the affinity scale in the Chart of Human Evaluations, we have no distance tolerable. The distance he can tolerate is no distance, and he can't tolerate that! And he's more or less on an inverted distance. Do you see this?

So when we go up in numbers (although the numbers are arbitrary on these scales) from zero to let us say forty, we actually might as well be saying zero feet and forty feet. Of course, that's not accurate either because it'd be zero milli-millimeters and forty trillion light-years cubed. See? The scale isn't an exact V – it'd flare out like that. You see this: that a person's ability to handle things always has to do with his ability to handle distance. He interiorizes into those things which he distrusts. The more he distrusts them, why, the closer he goes in until at length he is it.

You could set up the proposition – you could make somebody distrust a bedpost and just sit there and decide they didn't like it and so forth and they'd actually feel themselves pulling right in toward the bedpost. And the next thing you know, why, they'd be in the bedpost. And there are many psychos in institutions who are bedposts. You ask them what they are and they'll tell you they're a bedpost. It's quite interesting.

In other words, a person can control at a distance. He has some faith in his communication and so on and he's capable, even if he's some distance away from something. And as his control diminishes, he has to shorten up the distance to make the control possible, doesn't he?

So the more distrust he has, the less intention he can throw out, the less he can reach – any way you want to say this – the less competent he is. And we measure that off in this thing

called tone. We say tone 40, that's competent, and tone 0, that's dead. How wrong can you get? Dead. How incompetent can you get? Dead. How low an affinity can there be? Dead. Only we know – we Scientologists know we can go way below death.

All right. It's just bodies that can't stand death. I'm going to have a talk with a body sometime, a dead body, something of the sort, and find out why this is – why it quits so quick.

Anyway, the graphic analysis of life and its behavior first came from a postulate I made, fortunately for you and for me, back in Bay Head, New Jersey when I was writing *Dianetics: The Modern Science of Mental Health*. I had about two or three chapters deep and I was sitting there – Countess Motorboat, the cat I had, she always sat on the bed right alongside of where I wrote. I remember well writing *Dianetics: Modern Science of Mental Health*. I'd take a sheet of paper out of the typewriter, move it over, Countess Motorboat would pick up her paw off the pile of paper, I would put the paper down, Countess Motorboat would put her paw back down as a paperweight. And she would just lie there by the hour always lifting her paw for the new piece of paper and always holding it in place. Well, I was sitting there in the wee small hours and the Countess Motorboat was being a paperweight and it was very quiet and I could hear the far-off boom of surf and I was all tangled up. I was trying to graph survival. And that graph you see to this day in this – in Book One. And I found out something, that – in trying to graph it, I found out that if I couldn't make a two-dimensional picture of it, of a theory or an idea, then there was something wrong with the idea.

Quite amazing. Quite interesting. I found out if I couldn't make a clear picture of it, it wasn't clear in my own mind. I wish somebody had taught Freud to draw!

And I would have to reevaluate the basic theory, then, until I could finally commit it to a graph which would then communicate to somebody else. Aha, what does this mean? It merely means I had found out that if I couldn't communicate it, I didn't understand it really. And the method of communication of the thing, the shorthand method of communication of it was simply drawing a graph. And if I couldn't draw the graph easily and accurately and show it to somebody else and have him get the idea off of it, then the idea was in some fashion or other incomplete or faulty, because it wouldn't communicate.

All right. That has held true with all of our graphs and charts from then till now. And the first one that this struggle occurred on is the Chart of Survival, that very elementary chart right in the beginning, there, of Book One. About fifteen or twenty pet theories of mine went straight out the window when I tried to draw that thing. They just wouldn't graph. So I knew there was something wrong with them and I kept twisting them round and finally found out, yep, there's something wrong with that. That doesn't jibe with something else. Next thing you know, why, here was a very simple graph of what I was trying to say about survival.

I found out survival had to do with perpetuation – a continuation into the future and so on. I didn't know that at that time.

Anyway – these people in PE Courses almost blow their brains out trying to define it, so I was in there ahead of them, that – wee small hours of that morning. I was really trying to blow my brains out.

Anyway, survival or anything else can be graphed. If it can be graphed, you understand it. If it can't be graphed, you – somehow or other, you're foggy on it. There's something foggy about the whole thing. I mean, there's a misunderstood or not-understood sector in it. Now, reading a graph – if a thing can be graphed, you should be able to get what the graph is trying to communicate.

Therefore we take up these scales now. We say, "What is auditing?" Well, auditing is an expansion of distance, period. I'm sorry, I could have made that much more complicated.

When you first start to audit somebody, why, he has a tendency to practically sit in your lap or back out the window. If he's trying to back out the window away from you, he's on an inversion. He's trying to get the distance, you see, on an inversion. He can't confront at all. But the first moment he can confront, then he'll start to close in; and eventually when he can confront, there is the first real recognizable distance. Up to that time he has no recognition of distance. He recognizes this distance, and he would feel real comfortable when he was real close to his auditor, preferably with the auditor's hand in his or his hand on the auditor's, see? Good solid communication line there.

But a lot of people below this level that cannot stand distance at all are dead in their heads or spattered all over the universe because they couldn't be anyplace or recognize any distance and so forth; they become very nervous when the auditor puts his hand on theirs or touches his, see? They can't tolerate proximity. So they come up scale, but they have no concept of distance while being unable to tolerate proximity, and this is a case of no place to hide.

US government and its A-bomb. It's a case of no place to hide. They've just created one. No place to hide. There's no concept of distance and there's no distance you could put between anything and you, is there? Running away from things, oddly enough, isn't. And that is the oddest thing that you ever heard of. That is the complete puzzler of all time.

Nobody ever runs away from anything because he didn't want to be near it. This just sounds absolutely fantastic. We get a picture of a bear in the woods and the fellow comes up the road and he sees the bear and he doesn't want to be near the bear so he runs away from the bear. I'm sorry – an auditor, maybe a hundred years later, auditing this particular preclear will find out that he never ran away from the bear. Isn't that an oddity?

Now, you might ask why it is in military matters when a body of troops turns tail and no longer confronts another body of troops, why they go all to pieces. I mean a rout is really a rout. You say, well, a few companies turned around and ran away and they got some distance away from the fight and formed up again and everything was all right – except this never happens. The few companies turn around and run away and go to pieces, and in Roman times the end product was a bunch of assorted miscellaneous and mismatched arms, legs and heads lying around the terrain with pieces of broken tinware interspersing the scenery. It was a case of everybody dead.

You say, "Why is it that when a few people turn around and run that they are no longer able to sustain discipline?" Now, you can back up here a little bit in order to move in there a little bit, but for sure you can't run away. Always a part of you stays there. And that is the mental image picture in its most serious state, is the part of you which remained.

You see, the basic truth outed the other day and there is no such thing as a mental image picture. Funny piece of news to give you after all these years. There's no such thing as a mental image picture. We'll go into that in a moment. That's why we have ACCs every once in a while.

Now, the individual walks up to the bear, he doesn't want to be there, he then has a part of the universe that he cannot occupy. Being unable to occupy that part of the universe, the only possible state of mind open to him from then on is dispersal. Nobody ever ran away. Now I'm not just trying to prove up this distance graph, I'm just telling you that the distance always closes, no matter how far you run. Actual distance I'm talking about, between the person and the thing always closes, it never opens up. Hideous, huh?

Well, the one thing that proves that is the answer to it – which just knocks track out, straightens things up just like that – is confront. Confront it. Brace up to it. What part of that thing could you confront? Bing, bing, bing, bing. All of a sudden he's no longer there – no longer stuck at that point. Do you see this?

So the distance into mass or to another being, in actuality closes, even when it apparently goes apart. You'll find somebody who left his wife because he couldn't stand her, eight years later in his sleep talking to her – mutter, mutter, mutter, mutter, yap, yap, yap, yap. You go in a bar, a bunch of drunks have had a fight, haul them outside, and they're still in the bar having the fight! You've noticed this? But very seldom is the winner still having a fight. Only the loser.

I knew a fellow one time – was always going to write the great American novel. And he could never make the grade – never get down to the typewriter, pick up the pen. Very apathetic state. Responding to a little bit of auditing, was quite amazing – he was still trying to write the great American novel. He'd never been able to confront this thing and he was still basically in the engram bank trying to confront writing the great American novel. Not very engramic, but he was still trying. Only he had given up trying, but he was still trying. Never been able to confront it at all.

Knew another fellow one time that had written the great American novel and never said a word about it. Couldn't have cared less. You had to jog him two or three times and say, "You remember that book you wrote?"

And he'd say, "Which one, you mean about the pigs?"

"No, no, no, no, no. You know that. . ."

"Oh, oh, yeah, yeah, that book. Yeah, it's all right. You know, I'm thinking of writing . . ." – you couldn't keep him on the subject.

He had confronted it and he'd won across the boards, don't you see? He'd never had occasion to run away from that book and he was never stuck with it. He'd fronted up to the situation.

People are never troubled with those situations to which they have fronted up. They never have trouble with situations that they themselves have confronted. They only have trouble with those situations from which they ran away – because the closure is always toward

zero. And as the nearness with which they can approach a situation becomes more and more impossible, they approach it closer and closer, and we get such mechanisms as "that which they resist they become" and all kinds of other mechanisms of one sort or another. But that's the basic mechanism of this.

The Tone Scale⁴³, clear as a bell, describes somebody closing distance. The Subzero Scale shows him opening it up again on a falsity. This is the apparent runaway. This is "I'll kid myself, I'll forget all about it, I won't ever remember that anymore. I will block it out, I'll get even with bodies for having done that to me," anything else you can think of but they're trying to – they're trying to open up distance which isn't there to be opened because they closed it long before. Don't you see?

Fellow says, "I'll never, never, never, never, never, never, never be a soldier. I won't! Under no circumstances will I ever be a soldier. Won't go near soldiers. Won't have anything to do with soldiers! I hate soldiers!" One day he goes down and enlists. We had a case of that right here in Washington. Didn't we? And he even wrote congressmen about the horrors of conscription – be a son of a gun if he didn't go and enlist.

Now, how about this fellow that when he sees soldiers it just makes him boil. He'd just love to kill them, that's all he can think of. It just – you know, it just makes him boil and so forth. Well he's confronting late, that's all. Just a little bit late. I don't know what body of troops he didn't walk up to, whether it was the British grenadiers or the fifth Roman legion or the Hun that came into Europe. Some body of troops that he's still not faced up to – and he hates soldiers. Now this is what makes emotional tone. It's the closure of distance. This sort of thing is graphed – the ARC, the Factors, the ARC triangle, affinity, reality and communication are placed in those graphs very prominently. Almost anything is graphed if it is understandable. If you haven't got a graph on it then I don't know what I'm talking about – yet.

Give you some small idea of the number of graphs there are in the Student Manual – scales: there's the CDEI Scale, the Reality Scale, the Effect Scale, the full Tone Scale, the Subzero Scale, the dichotomies, the top and bottom buttons, the Chart of Attitudes, the Cycle of Action Scale, the Scale of Related Experience, the Know to Mystery Scale, the Havingness Scale – I mean there's a lot of these scales. And all those things are, are simply graphs of the ARC factors. How massy is mass and how distance is distance and how much communication does it require.

Well there's only one thing which establishes distance – only one thing establishes distance, and that's communication. So don't be startled. Don't be startled that communication pulls a preclear up out of the depths rather easily. But it has to be real communication. Not via, via, via, via – "I'll evaluate for you, and what's wrong with you is your little sister saw you naked when you were two and that'll be another \$10,000 and two more years." I mean, that's not communication.

⁴³ Tone Scale: a scale, in Scientology, which shows the emotional tones of a person. These, ranged from the highest to the lowest, are, in part, serenity, enthusiasm (as we proceed downward), conservatism, boredom, antagonism, anger, no-sympathy, fear, grief, apathy. An arbitrary numerical value is given to each level on the scale. There are many aspects of the Tone Scale and using it makes possible the prediction of human behavior. For further information on the Tone Scale, read the book *Science of Survival* by L. Ron Hubbard, and the Hubbard Chart of Human Evaluation which accompanies it.

It has to be communication to the person. Well, if it has to be to the person, you'd have to know what the person is and they didn't know that before. Psychology thought right up to the day of its death that a person was a body.

Now, communication is distance. The definition of space in Scientology – you'll find it in 8-8008 – is space is a viewpoint of dimension. Space is a viewpoint of dimension.

Well, what's that but some lookingness, huh? Well, what's that but some communication? So therefore the whole scale is established by degree of look. But look is a sort of a circular communication. You look at something like a radar and it bounces or you do something – if just you are there to look at it. So it has a closure factor with regard to it. So that just plain looking hits this bounce factor but doesn't get into communication, really. Not two-person communication.

Now, two thetans start talking one to the other and they can hold the distance gained. They're not just bouncing something off somebody's nose. They're talking to each other. They hold the distance gained. And actually they go up scale rather rapidly if real communication is occurring. Real communication, meaning is there a certainty of communication. And so they go up scale.

So here you have two live beings communicating, and you have distance opening. In other words, they could be further and further from each other and feel finer and finer about it. Now, if people, the longer they talk, smash closer and closer together, then one isn't talking to the other somehow. There's a mess-up on that communication line. They can talk further and further apart until they can get like a Kentucky mountaineer. All these mountain countries where the people stand on one hill and – it would take three hours to walk across to the other fellow's cabbage patch, so they just speak across the gap, you know – over the ravine and so forth.

Well, they're not necessarily trustworthy but they're sure loud. They're trying to get distance into communication.

Here – here you have this oddity – the basis of the graph, and you have this oddity, processing or auditing. And the basis of the graph is – I don't care what graph it is, it assumes that a certain condition existed and then finished a cycle, worsening. Or was very bad and reversed the cycle and became good. But in all cases it would be how much distance can one tolerate actually between the object and self. If he could tolerate total closure or total width or distance away from it, he certainly would have total communication concerning it, wouldn't he? Well, here's – if he was just obsessed and pushed in closer and closer and closer, why, he'd have a bad time.

Now, people can understand things and communicate to them. People can know vaguely what something is and communicate to it. But when people don't know really what something is, they have an awfully hard time communicating with it. Now, is it real communication between the individual and his engram bank? Well, there's a bunch of spooks and ghosts and shadows and pictures of people and all kinds of things in this bank that apparently talk back one way or the other. But he himself is having to energize the circuit in order to get any reply back at all.

So he energizes this bank and this bank kicks back at him so every time he starts to communicate, the bank energizes and slaps him for communicating. And he gets convinced after a while that he's being punished for speaking, punished for communicating. Because every time he tries to communicate, why, things wake up around him somehow or another, and he doesn't want them awakened because they bite. He has pictures. He has facsimiles that snap back at him.

Well I told you I was going to say something about these facsimiles and how they weren't. Now, we conceived originally and basically a tremendously complicated explanation in Dianetics. We had to figure that there was some sort of a camera machine that took a tremendous number of pictures and laid them on the track for a person to have this many pictures. I've been working at this mathematically for years and I discovered something very fascinating: that it was utterly impossible for a person to store all the pictures he took. But he had them. So we had to figure out there must be a machine there and as an individual went through life, this machine took all these pictures and then he stored them in some peculiar way and we even had a file clerk to get them out.

Well, all that's all very good. It communicated. Nothing wrong with that. The file clerk was there. They would shuffle out into view. But what do you know – they're not pictures! There is no such complicated mechanism. There is no such complicated mechanism as something that takes pictures and then stores them and all of that. There is no such mechanism at all! The object is still there, grown thin, and that's a picture.

If you could look at the wall there and then conceive of the wall as solid now but immediately dim, you'd probably have a picture of the wall. Got that? All right, now let's retain the color of the wall, but we see the wall solid now and then immediately afterwards, although in full color, lacking mass. Got that? It lacks mass. You see it, but it lacks mass. All right. Now take that – take that thing you made of the wall – you conceived the wall as suddenly thinning down and lacking mass. All right, now just look over there and make it a little more solid. Now, how come that makes a little more solid that easily? You didn't add any energy to it.

It means that every consecutive moment of the universe from its beginning until now is potentially as solid as it was then, and isn't because you don't want to confront it. So you thinned it down. And people really only have pictures when they ran away. Those are the serious pictures. Those are the reactive pictures. When they actually almost physically ran away, boy, have they got pictures. The engram bank, the reactive mind, is formed by running away.

In other words, one struck situations, environments that one could not handle at all, and not being able to handle these things he wound up the victim of them. He didn't confront them, and the final result is some kind of a foggy murked-up (quote) "picture." You'll find out that was the way it looked to him at the last moment of duress.

Well, that feels like a pretty heavy load for you to be carrying around. We had a lot of mystery about how one carried around these pictures. Feels like an awful heavy load if they're all solid universes, every one of them. The whole universe in its totality is still there for every consecutive moment from the beginning of time. This sounds awfully heavy.

Well, I don't know why it's heavy since it's only a problem in change of space. You aren't carrying the pictures anywhere. But you left a viewpoint there when you didn't totally confront them and it's still looking. And when you run up and down the track or run a preclear up and down the track you are simply doing nothing but change space.

You got a picture of the old hometown. Well you can get almost the same phenomena as we learned in the 1st ACC by simply saying to a preclear, "Be in your hometown, be in the room, be in your hometown, be in the room, be in the hometown, be in the room." Boy, you got pictures. Certainly he got pictures, because that's why they were pictures, only they aren't pictures, they're the thing!

So we do have one improper word in Scientology and that is facsimile. I don't know what we'd call it – call it a thinnie, I guess.

All it is necessary to do is to bring one into a state of mind himself whereby he is willing to confront those pictures – thinnies, old universes, old places where he wouldn't be before. All we've got to do is put him up into a state of mind, either by confronting them or by some other artificial means whereby he's willing to confront them, and we have a Clear. Boom!

It's as easy as that. Before this course is out I'll show you how to do that. But the point I'm trying to make here is that auditing is a communicating process or a communication process with the end goal of raising the ability of another person so that he can handle his bank, body, others, and environment in general. And that's what auditing is today – it's a communication process. You should realize that it is, if we spend all the time that we spend on communication itself. And you shouldn't be a bit surprised when communication itself becomes (quote) "therapeutic," and people's heads blow off in Comm Courses and things like that, just saying "Okay" to other people. Because somebody's making them stand in there, confront it and say "Okay" to it – and it's probably the first time it's happened for centuries. And somebody just goes boom! Like to blow his head off.

You are sure, I am sure, that you have many moments and will have many pictures of the ACC unit in which you are now enrolled. I am sure that you will feel that you will be stuck all over the track by the end of the unit. Well, I'll leave that up to you to find out.

Thank

you.

WHAT SCIENTOLOGY IS ADDRESSED TO

A lecture given on 18 July 1957

Thank you. Thank you very much.

You look unusually – well, let's just say unusual, let it go at that.

This is the fourth lecture of the 18th ACC, July 18, isn't it? Nineteen fifty-seven. Beg your pardon, year 7 AD. After Dianetics.

Well, these lectures should follow a very orderly course. Each one should take up in turn exactly what should be taken up at that moment. And the outline which was going to be used for these lectures was the Student Manual, but isn't. Because I looked over the Student Manual very carefully on its table of contents and discovered something fantastic: the Student Manual spoke for itself. All it is, is all of the exact data of Scientology, all of the exact data: the old Dianetic Axioms, the Prelogics, the Factors, what auditing is, how it is done, all the TRs, how you sign up a preclear. You know? Just...

And I was so overwhelmed (that's different than being overwhelmed, you know – that's really it, being overwhelmed) that I hardly could make any lectures at all. So I'll just have to go along here on my own steam somehow and muck it out one way or the other.

I take that as a vote of confidence.

Well, the lecture this evening is – could be clumsily stated, what Scientology is addressed to, or what it is shot at, or what it is done to. You know, in this day and age, a subject which has no application is only in favor in the universities. And they teach them there, but people who have to get along in the world and who have to get things done can't allow themselves this luxury.

So Scientology is shot at something. And let's just take a very fast look at what it is addressed to. It is addressed basically, fundamentally and accurately to you. And on that via is addressed to the physical universe, the forms of the physical universe (including live forms) and to all other beings in the physical universe regardless of what they may be, and is also addressed to the nonexistence of many beings who aren't. You got that? It is also addressed to beings that aren't.

Now, there are a lot of imaginary and legendary beings and beasts just like there were in the Dark Ages. The way the ancient mariners kept people from coming over and trading with the American coast was quite interesting. We read it that every mariner of Columbus's day believed that you just sailed so far and then fell off the edge and that there were terrific

monsters and beasts of one character or another who would devour you if you set sail and sailed beyond the sight of land. And this was an excellent way of tying up a monopoly on the part of Icelandic, British, Danish, French, Spanish and some Mediterranean sailors – the entirety of trade with America and the codfish banks. Those Grand Banks up there were quite well known; that's where Columbus found out about it, you know.

So a great many beasts have been invented – not only to debar careless voyaging into somebody else's hunting preserves.

By the way, somebody might be caused to doubt that. It's an interesting thing. It's well known in the Explorers Club, and it's one of the biggest jokes in the Explorers Club is the derivation of the word America: there are seven sources for the word America, none of them America Vespucci. There were the American Indians. There were all sorts of things.

There was a great deal known at that time by a specialized few who wanted a monopoly. And therefore they peopled their preserves with imaginary beings and thus kept out interlopers.

Now, I am not going to tell you that the field of the mind has been only inhabited by imaginary beings. But something of this order is done by the fellow who invents a tremendous nomenclature of the brain or a tremendous nomenclature of the bone structure or something like that and then says you have to know all these names before you can know anything about, and then says each one of these parts of the brain has a specific and peculiar function, and adds to it, "Nobody should tamper with the mind because it bites." You see? I don't say that that is the same thing as the Spanish sailor did with the sea in order to keep guys like Columbus from discovering things. See, I don't say that for a moment. I merely insist upon it!

Now, we have here a functional subject. And in view of the fact that it is a functional subject, it must perforce carry with it a great many routes or tracks or ways to go. And if you have routes through the primeval forest or the raging seas peopled by monsters eighteen times as big as Texas, you get a very snide idea of the sailors who peopled it, you see, with imaginary beasts so as to keep others out. You say, "Somebody was telling fibs." That would be about the least you would say.

You've been told, "Never go across that field over there because it is full of snakes." And then you finally one day by accident in a rainstorm find yourself in that field and you look around carefully and you find all of these snakes are stuffed dummies, fixed so that when you trod on their tails they shoot out their tongues. You can't possibly imagine that they got there by some agency that didn't want trespassers. Oh, no, nothing like that. Oh, no!

But I don't happen to admit ownership of thee and me and any equipment we have come by, by fair means or foul, by a bunch of fellows who think it's their private preserve.

There's one thing that people voyaging early in the levels of the mind (so they said) overlooked, is: you have one and I have one and other people have minds and they aren't locked up in any safe anyplace, and all a fellow has to do is look right where he is and he will see something about the mind. But if he's been told it's very dangerous to fool with the mind or do something with the mind and he doesn't know that those snakes are simply dummies and

those raging sea beasts were simply mocked up to keep fishing preserves, why, he says, "Well, I better not look; I better not look," he says, "I better go blind."

Well now, when anybody gives me the alternative of walking on his private preserve or going blind, his toes are going to hurt. Because I'll walk close enough to step on his toes, too.

And that is exactly what happened about twenty-five years ago, right here in this city. "I was told that the mind was not a subject which should ever be addressed by anyone from the engineering department. Hah!" Unfortunately I was also associate editor of the college newspaper, and after that made it my business to write numerous articles about the psychology department.

However, I wasn't just rebuffed – I was, you might say, failed in line of duty. I was studying the smallest possible particle in this universe. I was studying wavelengths of light. And in studying wavelength I found that the wavelength of ultraviolet still left holes between the particles. And I wanted to know if anything ever went through those holes, because I had reached the highest end of the visible spectrum. Now, obviously we didn't have anything solid yet, and the first application of this was a microscope. I wanted a microscope that would show up virus and show up other things. Very legitimate engineering problem. How do you build a microscope that can see tinier than anything else, than any other microscope ever has? And I tried to get some means, then, of focusing ultraviolet light and making it visible, found out that the ultraviolet light so focused burned anything up that you wanted to look at, and this was a very poor microscope. It ought to only be used, I would have said in later days, on psychiatrists.

But here – here is this problem: what is the smallest particle of energy and where would it be found? And I did a computation⁴⁴ (a lot of you have heard me talk about this, but I've never said very specifically anything about it) – I did a computation and I found out that there was a possibility that there could be holes in protein molecules, and something could be stored. And so I just thought of some arbitrary figures and I said, "Well, if there were a hundred holes in a protein molecule and you put ten memories of an exact still picture in each hole ..." I already knew – I just took those as arbitrary figures so I could compute the rest of it for probability – I already knew there was, I've forgotten, 10^{21} I believe it is, binary digits of neurons, or punched protein molecules, in the skull. And I added this up: if there were a hundred holes and ten pictures in each one . . . Then I did a computation with an old Brownie box camera which snaps at a fifteenth of a second or thereabouts, and I did a computation as to how slow you could snap pictures and still have mental image pictures – which, by my way of thinking, was memory. Because everyone I asked if he remembered something, he said so-and-so and so-and-so. And I'd ask him, "Well, do you have a picture of that?"

And he'd say, "Yes. Yes, I have a picture of that."

And "Well, is the picture in motion?"

⁴⁴ computation: the aberrated evaluation and postulate that one must be consistently in a certain state in order to succeed. A computation thus may mean that one must entertain in order to be alive or that one must be dignified in order to succeed or that one must own much in order to live.

"Yes. Yes."

The picture's in motion – oohhh! How do you get a picture in motion? Well, a fifteenth of a second will give you enough frames to get a picture in motion that doesn't flicker, much. See, I was being very, very, very generous about this whole thing. And everybody I ran into had these pictures. And these pictures were memories as far as I could see. And I wanted to know where they got stored. Because all I had to do was tell somebody to get a picture, he'd get a picture. And I'd say, "Fine, throw it away," or something of that sort, and he'd put it away somewhere, and I'd say, "Get it back," and I – where is he storing the thing, you see?

So I went over to the psychology department to find out. And I'll be a son of a gun if they knew anything about the pictures! "Pictures?" they said, "Pictures? What pictures?" Right now we know what they were: they were invisible cases or black fives. They didn't have any pictures. They didn't know anything about pictures. "What are you doing with pictures?" they says to me. I said, "What are you doing without them?"

"Oh," they said, "there's some little-known authority that cursorily wrote at the tail end of a book that was published someplace else and isn't accepted by us, on a subject called eidetic recall. There is something about that, but don't believe that!"

Well now, here was a fellow trying to compute the smallest particle of energy and he found a whole bunch of pictures and he knew they went someplace. And the confounding part of it was, is I couldn't compute a small enough particle of energy to be a picture that could be stored anyplace for one very excellent reason, is that anybody I asked had pictures more than three months' worth – had more than three months' worth of pictures. And 10^{21} binary digits, each one with a hundred holes in it and ten pictures per hole, didn't store up three months' worth.

Now, this later on came back from Vienna as a theory. It went as a disproved theory, and the computations in it were very exact. And it came back from Vienna about 38 or 39 or something like that, as a fact. And I would have said, "Well, somebody has done independent work," except he'd made the same arithmetical error I had made. All right. I conceived, as we would have said later, that there was a camouflaged hole in this subject. A camouflaged hole. And then I found out that it was a very dangerous and reprehensible thing to look into or have anything to do with the mind. And if it had just been the fact that these chaps were ignorant, I never would have said a word in criticism and you today wouldn't hear me say a word in criticism.

But routinely and uniformly since, I have had them behave in no other way than to make me believe or try to make me believe that I was poaching upon some private preserve, peopled with bogeymen who would bite me. They were pretending ownership of this! And I never had one produce a bill of sale for my head.

Now, I learned more than this. As the years went on, I learned that they were supposed to do things with the mind across this basic premise – this basic premise: that IQ cannot change and personality characteristics are unalterable. Well this, if you please, is a defeatism. They only could be justified in existence if they could change characteristics or IQs. If they can't change something, why are they? If they can't get anything done in this society and if they're sitting there saying, "Under no circumstances must you poach," looks to me like we've

struck a third dynamic mental block in the field of the mind. Nothing more than that. They say, "Nothing can be done and you mustn't do anything." And saying these two things at once was adventurous; they should never be said to anyone with red hair.

Now, I'm not damning these people particularly. They undoubtedly have reasons of their own for their dishonesty. Basically it possibly is something on the order of, if anyone got into their heads they'd find out what they did when they were three, and it was nasty.

But I do not consider they have any right to the brains or sight of thee or me if all they would do is tell us that nothing could be done. Therefore such a group would condemn us to blindness. My total quarrel. Because we refuse to be condemned to blindness, we are here.

All right. Here I have given you a blasphemous picture of the mental sciences of long time ago in the dark ages of man. They failed because their subject wasn't really functional. It wasn't practical and didn't invite anybody to make use of it. The total function was to study. And I suppose someone who is obsessed with the idea of studying can see that as a total function.

But engineers are not oriented in that fashion. They study to do. Got the difference? It's studying to do, not just studying.

I was auditing Mary Sue one day and she told me about a great big place up someplace in the universe where everybody there – great big building, tremendous desks and everything in it – and everybody in there just knew about everything. And I said, "And what did they do?"

She said, "That's it, they just know about everything."

I said, "Yes, but what do they do with this?"

And she said, "That's just it: nothing. They just know about everything. They just catalog all of the things that go on."

"Well, who do they catalog it for?"

"They don't catalog it for anybody."

"Well, who do they send it to?"

"Well, they don't send it to anybody."

So naturally you and I don't know about this place; it's totally out of communication.

Well, it's quite interesting. It's very interesting that Scientology has more background than psychology. It has the background of the Greek, Roman thought, Middle Age thought (which was more or less sparked up by Saint Thomas Aquinas), fifteenth century faculty psychology – these are all backgrounds – the basic philosophies of Hume, Locke, on up to William James and on up to now. It is a consecutive track of development which we have tapped in on, understood, sorted out and made workable. Our findings today are in no great disagreement with the earlier Greeks or a very little-known fellow who lived in the day of Julius Caesar and who wrote a book about the nature of things. There's no great disagreement with these great philosophers up along the track. We are not, then, really in scholastic disagreement or basic disagreement anywhere.

You would be quite amazed at the works of Saint Thomas Aquinas, about 1265, 1275 – I've forgotten exactly when – it was June, I think, I talked to him. Well anyhow, his comments on the subject of knowingness are of great interest to us today. I invite you someday to, if you're in a library or something, to crack a book on Saint Thomas Aquinas and read what he had to say about knowingness. It's quite interesting. He had some curves, he was trying to convince some people of some things, his work was definitely biased in some degree; but we find in his work the early ghost of Spencer's knowable and unknowable theory – we find right there.

And in Dianetics we more or less started out on the premise that there were a lot of things that were knowable and there were probably a lot of things that were unknowable, and we didn't have to know any of the unknowable things to know about the things that were knowable. And that was an advance on Spencer because he just sort of dropped it right there, you see? He said, "Well, they're unknowable and nobody will ever know about them."

And Kant went further than this. Kant says transcendental – I don't know, exteriorization or something. Transcendentalism, I think, that horrible subject is. Yes, I remember. I missed every lecture on the subject at his university. Anyhow . . . Nobody could ever keep me in.

Anyway, this fellow, the great Chinaman of Königsberg, he was sort of adrift but nevertheless he's on our track. I mean, the things he was saying about the innate moral nature of man. He – in *The Critique of Pure Reason*, why, the fellow demonstrates conclusively that there is built into man a series of moral factors, and then he wrote another book which proves conclusively that there aren't. Then he says that these moral factors are something you never get paid for, and then he says in another book that these moral factors are there because you're paid for them and if you aren't paid for them, they're not there. It's quite interesting. But he nevertheless was trying to shake apart some of the basic data of the universe and understand it. He was trying to hang things together.

We actually are working in direct succession, very direct succession, from somewhere in the neighborhood of twenty-five to three thousand years of what's considered formal philosophy. We don't vary anything off of this line at all.

But there has been a variation within the last century. I'm not just pounding something down here, I'm just kicking it in the teeth. In the last century there was a tremendous departure from formal philosophy. Psychology has always been the study of the mind or spirit. And psyche is Greek for spirit. And you will read in all of the textbooks (which, before they were burned, were quite informative) on the subject of psychology that psychology has nothing to do with the mind or the spirit or with man's soul or anything, but is simply some kind of a dissertation on brain cells or brain functions. And demonstrates conclusively that all thought comes from mass and that man is an animal and that's that.

And these words of great wisdom, at complete variance from anything that had been said in all the centuries preceding, were uttered by a chap by the name of Wundt. He was the only Wundt in Leipzig, Germany in 1879. And he is the direct father and the direct descendent of all psychology taught today in every American university except, perhaps, Catholic universities. He's the only authority for modern psychology as taught in universities. And he

has no bearing whatsoever on anything else man has ever thought on the subject of his own livingness and beingness.

Now, that's perhaps to you an extravagant statement but it is not extravagant. I studied it carefully before I made it. And I have read the fellow's lectures and his textbooks, and it was strictly "from what universe?" There is nothing of the tradition of man's thinking or man's philosophy over the ages to be found in that work. But that work, because it is degrading and animalistic, was accepted for reasons best known to somebody else as the formal study of psychology.

And when somebody in the government says the word psychology, he does not mean faculty psychology taught in 1500 – and a pretty good psychology it is, too. It's quite interesting; you read it over, they almost tell you about an engram.

Female voice: Yeah!

Yeah. They almost tell you about a lot of things. They add them up – it would make sense to a Dianeticist. But nothing of this other school would make sense to any of us.

Now, I don't know whether man at large just gave up on the subject of himself and quit, or not. But I know that nobody had any right to quit as far as we were concerned.

Now you, a Scientologist, think of yourself, undoubtedly, as being something new under the sun. And this is not true. You are in the best tradition of man's philosophy on the subject of man. And just because the data has been summated and pulled into sharp importances which evaluate and then which do more for man than philosophy had done before, does not divorce you from this very long track, at least twenty-five hundred years in direct, consecutive length to the earliest records we have on thinkingness.

I mentioned Buddhism: that is actually the formal entrance of philosophy as far as written history is concerned. It was mythology before that time.

Now, here – look here, then: can it be that man was subjected to a raid of some sort or another where all of his information was swept away from him, he was disenfranchised of what he knew basically was true and then somebody supplanted it for activities to their own selfish benefit? Could that be?

But you are in the best tradition. The very best tradition. You will go back and read something by a well-educated man in 1805 and you will find him discussing the possible uses of religion in the control of populaces. And this fellow is not drawing any wool across his eyes – he's talking quite intelligently. He's thinking, he's understanding.

Read something like the work of Edward Gibbon, 1790 or thereabouts. And you find that this man is well in command of an understanding of his fellow man and he is not at any time trying to vilify his fellow man with being an animal and degrading him utterly, even though he's cutting to pieces the totality of Christianity. He didn't forget himself so far as to abandon all formal knowledge of life. Quite informative.

Take an educated man of 1950 and you found him with no command of basic philosophy, no feeling of humanity or understanding of the human race. Something had happened.

An educated man of two centuries ago was expected to know a great deal about human behavior and livingness. But something happened in between there.

Now, it's very gratifying to my ego to stand before you and say, "Well. . ." (That's a Greek word, not a Freudian one.) And it's very gratifying for me to say, "Well, I thought this all up and actually it's just me, you know, it's nobody else; I mean, nobody else had a hand in this." Then we change the violin off to the other arm and play "The Great I Am" on that one. That'd be very flattering, wouldn't it?

But it's basically not true. This work couldn't have been done at all if people had not been thinking in the times of the Greeks, if Buddha had not been writing and talking in his day, if the faculty psychologists had not opened up. And if modern psychology hadn't convinced me to such a degree that they were working an operation, not doing a subject, we wouldn't have had any Scientology.

Now, some important things have happened in Scientology. Basic importances have been sorted out so as to evaluate other data and make a consecutive, organized whole of observations of life. And when that was done we had a tremendous resurgence of information on the subject, our power of observation became tremendous. And it became so large that it dwarfs a power of observation immediately before the point. But it couldn't have been done if Pythagoras hadn't been thinking and talking, Anaxagoras hadn't been in the picture and if Buddha hadn't been energetically walking fifteen miles a day just to talk to some people – we'd never gotten there at all.

It's true of all civilized status that things begin rather slowly and then as you pick up a larger amount of data, you get a sudden integration of things.

The advantageous spot which I occupied was being trained in the East and then being subjected to – also against my will – to Western engineering, philosophy and mathematics. This puts you onto a logical pattern like a highwayman puts a pistol in your stomach. If – it says, "Be logical." It says, with the most critical air possible, "You're wrong." It tells you and teaches you this philosophy, which has never been heard of in the East, that those things are true which work. It ends speculation with application.

Now, when you add that tradition to twenty-five hundred years of formal philosophy and some understanding of the Eastern philosophies and you take a hard look at it, something is bound to happen. Well, it happened. That's all – it happened. And we're here. And we know how to do things. And we probably could have given a witch doctor – if we could pluck a witch doctor out of two centuries ago and set him down here, he could probably show us "Poga-poga, and you show him the magic eye and you do this, you do that. . ." And we'd have probably said, "Well, walk over and touch that wall," and he'd have run out his witch doctoring, you know? I mean, we could have given him cards and spades and probably beaten him at his own game if we applied our own wits to it. You understand? Because we would understand what his witch doctoring was all about.

Now, I'll give you a graphic example of that. The juju of Africa was of great interest to me at one time. And I almost decided I would take it up one day to find out why the dickens these people were actually able to put curses on people with such ease. We have the answer to that. The second you saw any juju boy working on the native populace to extract a few cop-

pers (or his wife), you, a Scientologist, say, "Ha-ha-ha, that's pretty good application of that axiom; yeah, that's pretty good." Or "That mechanical principle is – that's dead easy."

Actually they walk up to you with a long horsetail switch – it's a horse's tail on a little handle – and they fill the horse's tail, see, full of fleas. And they walk up to you and they switch this all around your face, see? And right in the middle of when they're doing it, they say, "Die!" Confusion and the stable datum, nothing else. And of course the guy will – this is done to, is – of course, seizes onto that single clear statement in the middle of all the confusion: he's got it! It's the nicest little engram you ever observed. And there are dozens of them like this, all of which would be easily understood by a Scientologist.

But the funny part of it is, they're not understood by a witch doctor. They're not understood. He just knows that if he does this it works. He's gone on total workability with no understanding.

All right. There are many auditors around who do a certain process for its workability only and don't understand it at all. They go through the mystic rites of 8-C and something happens. And they say, "That's good enough, why understand it?" But the understanding is available; it is there.

Now, you could consider that I am a very – very much of a madman indeed to run down psychology, to run down these other formal studies. You say – I've had it said to me that this damages our position. I'm afraid I was too good a cavalryman once not to understand more about tactics than that.

I used to have a letterhead when I was writing down in Hollywood. Everybody had a fancy letterhead of one sort or another, so I had somebody draw me one of a cavalryman at full charge with saber outstretched and so on. And I omitted the motto under it because it would have been too much for the boys out in Hollywood. And I used to put this on the heading of – make it first page on my MSes and turnovers. They kind of got the point. The motto that went under it was "Ride over everything you come to." Which is, by the way, a tremendously workable philosophy. If you ever feel utterly downtrodden and you can't possibly make the grade, why, just grit your teeth and somehow or other get up to speed on the idea that you can ride over it. And you could make it.

What is that saying, in essence? You understand that at once: that's saying, "Communicate like hell if you're worried about it." But at it. Not to somebody else.

All right. It would be a great error on our part to remain quiescent in the face of considerable counterattack which has come from the various psychology organizations at this time.

If you do not know they are under attack, you could find out fast enough simply by calling up some outfit and asking – you, a Scientologist, don't announce the fact, just ask this university, "What about this thing called Scientology?" And you hear blue smoke and raves and sour grapes, and you might even hear your name as being one of the offenders in the local area. These people, for instance, are always turning us in to people like the Better Business Bureau and so forth in an effort to really do something to quash this down. But they're still mocking up ogres; only they have us to some degree mocked up as ogres.

Well, I'm going to give you something that would help you if you ever confront that, and that is: they don't mock up very well.

Now here – here was the battlefield that Dianetics and Scientology walked upon, and here is the battlefield on which it is fought. And don't get an idea that it isn't a battlefield because it is. It's a great mistake to walk out between two lines of soldiers who are shooting like hell at each other and pretend there's no battle going on; you can get hurt doing that. There is a battle going on. It's a worldwide battle. And the target of that, the end goal of that, from the communist point of view, is ownership of the mind of man. And they have announced this over and over and over and over: 1933, 1935, 1938, 1940, 1945, 1950 and 1957. Their communiques and party line contain this over and over and over again: that they are not going to invade with arms, that their total conquest is the mind of man. Why, just – just this last week it was in Drew Pearson's column that they were giving up over in the London conference because they'd already said their best target was the mind of man.

Well, they conceive this as something that can be owned. They believe that communist philosophy can somehow or another give them dominion so that men can become slaves. Now, that is the battle which is going on in the world at this time and should be understood. They have all sorts of mechanisms by which they do this. But it is a battle. They believe in hypnotism, fixed loyalties of one kind or another, and an idea that nobody can do anything with his mind anyhow. They believe that man is an animal, that he thinks with his brain. They believe that – and teach people (because they know these teachings are destructive) – that all thought emanates from force only, that man has no soul and he has no mind. They had to fight the Catholic Church and the Greek Orthodox Church and they adopted these things. In other words, they're winning with Wundtian psychology. There's not much differentiation between these two subjects.

All right. The world, then, in which you operate isn't just going along stupidly like a bunch of somnambulists. No, no – that's not what's happening. There's somebody in there pitching all the time, saying, "Manhood, thaah; courage, blah. What you are – you should be a cell member, blah." You'll hear this one around you these days – quite interesting little operations, these are – this one is a killer: "It's been thought of before." See? "The cult of the individualist." You'll see this country coming into the grip of these things. They already ruined Russia.

Now, it is a world, then, in which a great deal of propaganda about the mind is flying around. And we're actually doing a cowboy in the white hat and a cowboy in the black hat, like the kids watch on TV. We're actually doing that. There are always two great forces at work in the world: black forces and white forces. Now, there – to get very mystic on you and tell you what I was taught up in the Western Hills of China, there are always really three forces. There's the baddies and the goodies and the gold lodge. And the gold lodge referees it. The black, the white and the gold. And it's quite fascinating.

Now, we could easily flip over into the role of the white in this particular fight because we're the only people on earth fitted for it today. But the truth of the matter is, that isn't where we belong. We belong over in the gold.

Why?

Because we have a belief in the self-determinism of man and his essential freedoms. We've got that so strongly that today we can put him under very heavy control and run it out and make him free. We can even free him from control today. That's quite remarkable.

Therefore we are dangerous. Therefore we are dangerous. We're dangerous to any slave maker who walks up the street. We're dangerous. Because we can bust all his charms, we can turn the spotlight on the monsters in the sea and show that it's an empty sea. We can open the gates on his private hunting preserves that belong to us and walk through. And such people are always dangerous.

Now, fortunately, the subject only works as long as it's used for good. That's very fortunate, you know? Because if we only do good with it, we become not merely dangerous people to have around, but utterly formidable. Utterly formidable. Nobody could do a thing! We occupy a position from which we could not be thrust, to the degree that we have done good and benefited man. And the funny part of the subject is it only works when it is – does good and benefits man!

What kind of a rat race are we in here? Well, I'm afraid we're in one of these rat races that can only win. Besides the Great Okay, we have the Big Win.

Now, all right. Now, Scientology is a doingness subject. I don't think that an auditor could run an engram into anyone. He just doesn't operate that way, basically. But I have seen somebody sort of grit his teeth and decide he better had, for the good of the race or something of the sort, and wind up by processing the fellow. You know, he decides if he added enough Code breaks together and he did enough other things, somebody'd get really dazed and wouldn't be so efficient.

Well, I made a test of that one time, and I found out – this is terrible; I hate to tell you this. It's terrible. It'll show you why this is the Big Win. We decided that by restimulating people we could reduce their ability. So we conducted a long series of very expert tests. And they went this way: we gave the guy an IQ test, ran him into a very heavy engram, snarled him in but good, didn't relieve it at all, and then while he was still grogged and stuck on the track gave him another IQ test and had him finish that one. And his IQ always went up. That's an old-time one.

Well, we increased things to be aware of and increased his havingness and that did it.

Now if you turn around the other way and you strip down his having-ness, you can fog him up. But the fogged-up doesn't last very long; because it's artificially done, it wears off rather rapidly.

Oh, I'm not saying that if you put a bullet through somebody's head you wouldn't do something to his IQ, you understand. But I'm using Scien – – I'm not using psychological, but Scientology processes, to demonstrate this.

The whole subject of the mind must continue to be a free and open and inspected subject. In other words, the information known about the mind should be available to anyone.

Why?

Because nobody owns his mind but himself. You see, there's no such thing as an army composed of a whole bunch of minds that are owned by a general. Now, there can be a whole bunch of soldiers who owe their allegiance to a general and who think in coordination to serve a cause. But to say then that they are owned is to say that they are slaves. And we know at once that this is nonfunctional, since there is no slave-owning state or any state supported by slaves, prosperous or in good shape or alive today on Earth. That's quite a remarkable condemnation of this principle of making slaves. It's a very fast way to go by the boards; just make some slaves. They cave the society in faster, much faster than if it's just left alone. Nobody needs slaves. You need slaves just like you need a glass of cyanide.

All right. The subject of the mind is a personal thing. The contents of your mind may or may not be, or may or – should or should not remain a personal thing; that's beside the point. That is not even a question that could be answered in any other field, save debate or philosophy or something. You know, whether or not you have a right to all of your own engrams and secrets or whether or not they should be aired or something of the sort; you could debate this thing one way or the other. But in view of the fact that you continue to have your mind, no amount of legislation or debate or anything else could disturb the fact that you do have your mind. You see?

And if you have a Ford car, you're certainly, by my thinking, entitled to a how-to-fix-it-yourself book about it. You're entitled to an instruction manual for the machinery you're expected to run and keep in good order.

Now, the state holds everyone responsible for keeping his mind in good order. Well, if you let an engram about kleptomania slip into shape and hook the jewels off the counter of the jewelry store, the state says, by throwing you in the clink for a year or two, that you didn't adequately handle this machine called the mind.

Now, if there's going to be such a thing as social punishment or social criticism, then certainly it would neither be just nor equitable if people did not know how to handle that for which they were being criticized. Do you see this? I mean, if you can get arrested for it, then it's yours. This is an admitted responsibility. And if everybody admits this responsibility for everyone – or no, by anyone for himself – by punishing people for doing what they do, we see at once then that everyone's mind is his own mind and isn't owned by anybody else. Therefore, knowledge concerning it must be available. And anyone which prevents such knowledge from being circulated and so on must have a very queer idea of justice, to say the least.

In other words, they have advanced a very unworkable proposition. They have said, "Now, if you don't think just right then you are going to get punished." Well then, they've said, "You have the responsibility for thinking just right."

Well now, we know that we can't give people responsibility without giving them some authority. Doesn't work at all. Any army says this. Any court of law says this. So it must follow that knowledge concerning you must be yours. Isn't anybody else's. It never will be anybody else's.

Well, very well then. If this is true, all the people with whom you associate and to whom you will speak and so forth also own a mind. And if that is true, then they have a right to know what you know about it. And then if you tell them that, they meet somebody else who owns a mind and then if this other person owns a mind, then they have the right to know what this second person knew about it.

This is why I call it the Big Win. It's the Big Win for sure. We've had road maps and they're pretty good road maps. We haven't had excellent road maps for caterpillar tractors or the caterpillar tractors or bulldozers to run on those roads, but we have them now. In other words, we not only, today, can draw a road map – we could draw a new map and make sure the roads fitted it. So this is a brand-new sort of a picture.

Well, all right. You expected me, in this lecture, to give you some data you didn't have, and all I've given you is propaganda. But the truth – the truth of the whole thing comes down to this: Scientology could not be addressed to anything else but you. Because any time you address Scientology to anything, it is somebody being another you. You got it? So its address is to living beings, basically, each one of which has a vested interest in being alive.

Now, maybe these people are entitled to hope or help, or they're not entitled to hope or help – that's beside the point. If you're going to tell these people that they must behave, which is the greatest cliché on the tongue of man, then you have no right to withhold from them the mechanisms by which they behave. Do you understand that?

So, what is it addressed to?

Well, basically, it's addressed to life. But what is life composed of?

It's basically, from your viewpoint, composed of those things with which you can communicate. And the most vital thing with which you can communicate, of course, is another being.

Now therefore, Scientology directly addresses to livingness and secondarily addresses to this universe and one's own universe, the other fellow's universe – it addresses the associations amongst these things. And you evolve out of this the eight dynamics. And it addresses to all of these things, whether they are there or not.

And out in the final analysis, then, we find out that we are dealing with the most personal subject that we could possibly deal with. Now, Freudians believe that sex is, but that's not true; Scientology is. It's the most personal subject with which we could talk to anybody – about which we could talk to anybody. Very personal; talks about them.

But if we expect ourselves to get along in a world or expect there to be a world in which to get along, why, we haven't really any choice but to go on and use our information.

Now, today Scientology is called "knowingness, study of." But "knowing how to know," that's a sort of a nondynamic definition. Scientology could better be defined as "summed and organized information about you." It's everything that has been known about you for twenty-five hundred years at least. But it's summated so that it's communicable, so that it's applicable and so that it gets some definite results, and then, way over and above all these other things, is capable of changes. It can create changes. And it can create changes for the

better. And it can make things look better and act better and gives one a much broader understanding of life.

We're just on the verge, by the way, of discoveries on the way north. There's less than a third of Scientology wrapped up, to date. But that third includes any being on Earth, and it's just that beings on Earth do not necessarily hit a total zenith.

But there is the subject. And that is that to which it is addressed: simply you. And if you realize that the only way it can be addressed is to make somebody better handle what he has, you realize that it can't be anything but a big win. And that's why I say we're neither the cowboy in the black hat, the cowboy in the white hat or the cowboy in the gold hat, if there is one. We're just us and we're on our way.

Thank you.

THE FIVE CATEGORIES

A lecture given on 19 July 1957

Thank you. Thank you.

This is the fifth lecture of the 18th ACC, July 19, 1957. Right?

Audience: Right. Yeah.

This moment I would like to take the opportunity to correct a couple of corrections which I've recorrected. I said that this was the first time since Buddhism that anybody had done anything about it. Buddhism was the last time anybody had done anything about it and then I told you last night that this was in the tradition of all the philosophy between then and now. That's right, isn't it?

Female voice: Yeah.

That's fascinating, isn't it?

Both remarks are true. Philosophy didn't do anything about it. They just talked about it. Just like most of the intellectuals you get into your group will do. They just sit around and talk about it. What you want to do is go down to the docks and pull up some longshoremen. They'll *do* something about it. Sounds horrible, doesn't it? But actually the smart ones at that level, the clever ones at that level have actually been denied their proper level in society. And out of a large number of people like longshoremen and so forth, why, you will get several of them that could give cards and spades to Einstein. It's fantastic but they will *do* something.

All right, now the last time anybody did anything about it was Buddhism. That was 2,500 years ago.

It must have been pretty good because it has established the tradition of everything that has happened since. And that is why we are in the tradition of the best philosophy possible.

Now you're going to challenge me and say, "Well, Greek philosophy did not spring from Buddhism." I don't know that it didn't. I don't know for a moment that it didn't. One would make that statement on the fact that nobody traveled way back when. Of course, there were few people who traveled that also wrote, since writing was not in vogue.

But there's a fellow by the name of Marco Polo, he got around quite a bit. And you hear him remarking every now and then in his works about other travelers who went back and forth on the same routes.

In the days of Tamerlane when Samarkand was the capital of the world, we hear of an Arab writer by the name of Ibn Batuta who wrote about the peoples of Earth, and he'd just been all over the place.

And man today has an unhealthy attitude toward man of yesterday. He thinks that man of yesterday didn't get around. And man of yesterday got around most alarmingly. In fact, the silk trade and so on between Italy and China was simply interrupted by the creation of the Ottoman Empire and cut much of the travel that was done. What—we even read in the days of the Greeks of nearly everything that Marco Polo wrote about later. Quite fascinating.

In other words, Buddhism wasn't something that was totally located and entirely localized in the middle of China; it was not at all. The lower Tibetan plateau spilled its knowledge out into China proper, a tremendous distance away. It's an enormous distance from lower Tibet over to Peking. I'd hate to walk it. I'd hate to walk it. I haven't; I almost did once—check didn't arrive— but that's another story.

The Buddhist monk took civilization out across an Asia which up to that moment was *very* barbaric. The Buddhist monk went out with reading and writing and painting and pottery making and wearing shoes and he even got some of the Chinese to stop eating other Chinese by this route. It was a wild, mad, barbaric scene into which Buddhism moved. They took the Chinese writing, for instance, to Japan, which up to that moment had no writing at all. And to this day, the writing imported by the Buddhists into Japan is the writing of Japan. It's quite remarkable; it's a total Chinese character system, the basic writing used in Japan, with little tiny wiggle-waggles—katakana —up at the upper right-hand corner of the characters to tell you how to pronounce the character because they are not pronounced the same in Chinese as Japanese, you see? So they have to tell you how to pronounce the character. Japanese newspapers are quite fantastic.

But anyway, Buddhism took practically every civilized art Japan has to Japan except two: boating and fishing and killing other people. And these three arts—two arts and one pastime—were just about all that was native to Japan. Well, its civilization rose from that point and it ceased to be a total barbarism, became a civilized nation to a marked degree.

Well, along about the time this was happening, nothing was walking around in Europe but something in furs—you know, thrown over the shoulder in an abandoned fashion—and one had a rather difficult time going to nightclubs in Paris because of the wolves that roamed in the streets. Of course Paris wasn't founded for ages and ages afterwards; myself and a couple other guys got up there . . . Well, that's a different story. It was . . .

But here was Europe—here was Europe, actually a sponge for culture. The culture came to Europe on a comm lag of some duration. There had already been some people sweeping down from the north that had taken over Greece and they brought a lot of new ideas with them. They upset a matriarchy and these people with their new ideas were quite remarkable people. They—blond, blue-eyed people. And they took over that section of the world and had a communication line back to where they came from and actually their—one tries to find what could have cut man's urge to travel between Asia and Europe rather than, "Did it exist?" It was almost impossible for it not to exist. It's pretty easy—there are sea routes and all sorts of things.

But we don't find any of the sentiments of Buddhism sweeping into Europe. You think I'm—this is all I'm going to talk to you about tonight but it's not, I'm just building up to something. Actually I'm talking to you while I'm trying to think of something, that's all.

The people were very much in motion, a lot of information was being carried back and forth of one kind or another and we find the religion of Buddhism sweeping into the Roman Empire and Europe somewhere around the time of Julius Caesar. And the sentiments of love thy neighbor, turn the other cheek and so on were buildups from this same basic philosophy and they swept into Europe on that route. There isn't much doubt about this. The—even the early Christian chronicles tell how long Christ studied in India. It's not a remarkable fact at all.

But—point something out to you: that this particular activity did not build up Europe but tore it to pieces. Here was a strong, powerful empire with good justice, good roads, good people, into which was introduced a revolutionary philosophy known as Christianity. And in just four centuries there was nothing left. My evidence of this is on very good authority: Edward Gibbon, who wrote the most monumental monument on this subject that has ever been written. And the only reason it perseveres until today the way he wrote it back around the last part of the eighteenth century—the only reason it perseveres is because it's got big words in it. And ignorant people, the kind who censor books, couldn't ever get past the first chapter. And it is simply there by ponderousness.

But it tells this story of the destruction of an empire. From a time of fine—fine troops, good police, freedom of a sort, citizenship, on down to a point where the Roman legions not only would not wear practice armor but would go forth into battle with a cross tattooed on the chest and run like hell. And they were practically lower than the barbarians. They had been swept away by recurring waves of barbarism. They could be swept away because they themselves had been rendered pitifully weak.

What had rendered them weak? As far as I could establish in very cursory investigation, it would be a philosophy which taught that all force was bad. A philosophy which taught that all force must be ignored. And as far as I can trace that philosophy, it seems to be the worst of Buddhism drifted through.

Now, Buddhism was not necessarily good. But its intentions were good. And all it told man was that he was a spirit and that the universe was constructed more or less around this fact. Now, regardless of what Buddhism taught or didn't taught or what its sects or cults taught, this was a new message in the world. But Buddhism did not teach that when one dies he goes up and finds some pearly gates with somebody playing hotcha on a horn. Nor did Buddhism teach that if one was bad he promptly sunk through the forty-mile crust of earth and boiled in the lava inside from there on out.

No, these factors are the earmarks of an operation. And the only reason I am talking about this, the only reason I am risking giving offense to those people who are still saying their Ave Marias—and they have a right to—some people are brave, some have Ave Marias—is simply this: you can take any philosophy and make a control slavery operation out of it. Do you understand this?

Therefore, I am saying to you here that the next resurgence or compilation of knowledge concerning the spiritual nature, actions and behavior patterns of man and this universe coming up at this time could again be roped, hogtied, smothered and used for a control operation.

The first sign of this would be secrecy concerning one or more of its essential parts. It would have to be made into a mystery before it could be made to accomplish slavery.

Slavery and mystery are almost the same thing. Look at the CDEI Scale. Curiosity becomes desire becomes enforce becomes inhibit. Mystery. Dispel the mystery and you've dispelled all.

Now, for understanding, a thing called trust may be substituted. This is true. They're two slightly different things: understanding and trust. Now, trust can very, very easily be made over to enforced faith. And any time anybody tells you to take something totally on faith, they are trying to pervert your sense of trust. There is no reason you, at any time, any place, or any period of the universe should have to take anything on faith.

Now, therefore, any resurgence of philosophic knowledge has to be valued as itself. It is all very well for one to negate his own role or part in this. As a matter of fact, since last night I have had several complaints concerning the fact that I told you that I wasn't responsible for Scientology and several people have come around and kicked me in the shins but good on this subject.

They claim I'm trying to get out from under responsibility concerning the thing. All I was saying was I couldn't have done it without a tradition. So I'll have to take over the responsibility a little bit more just to get back a few friends.

But the point is this: authorship of something is unimportant; very, very unimportant. The point is, a great deal of revealed truth can bring about a tremendous change in the culture of the world. It can bring about a much more highly civilized state amongst barbarisms or amongst what people fondly believe are civilizations.

Now, the ability to make goods does not create a civilization. The ability to wear silk does not make a lady, nor the way to pat a top hat make a gentleman. These are different things.

We have today an interesting state of affairs. When we sum up the actual personality of national governments—and you should understand that nationalism is a brand-new thing on earth. People used to owe their allegiance to their land and to a king or some leader of this type. And now we have this whole thing moved out into some nebulous thing called "nationalism" which was invented back around the time of Cesare Borgia.

This whole subject of nationalism is becoming more and more and more ingrained in man. But unfortunately, he fought himself out of belief in it in World War I. World War I saw, really, the end of fervid nationalism and the beginning of tolerance broadly across national boundaries, just as it saw the actual end of Christianity. Too many nations fighting each other were all fighting, each fighting in the name of God. And the soldiers of those various nations went back home and said, "This is not logical" and that actually was the cave-in. It—later centuries I'm sure will remark that period as the cave-in of Christianity. Everybody was fighting everybody in the name of God. "*Gott mit uns.*"

Now, nationalism does not make for a wide civilization—it only makes for this: legality of crime on the part of a nonexistent being. The nonexistent being can commit crimes which are not permitted to the individual citizen. Kidnapping is legal on a nationalistic basis.

In other words, although you cannot put the government in jail, the government can put you in jail and hold you for ransom: bail. That's kidnapping. That's perfectly legal. And so many other things are legal on a nationalistic basis.

Now, this makes and sets a stage. It's not something I am railing against. I'm just trying to show you with some truth the stage that is set here in the middle of this twentieth century. It is a stage and it is set. And it is quite fabulous to discover that it is waiting for an Armageddon or a civilization.

People are no longer fervently upholding national governments. They would rather tend toward a philosophic approach to politics. Now, whether we like it or dislike it, communism is a philosophic approach to politics of one kind or another. Crude as it is, it's still a figure-figure thinkingness of one kind or another about how we should all go about running the nation; do you understand that?

Now, democracy never has been that, and somebody who says democracy versus communism is saying something like apples versus buffalo. Because democracy is a *system* of government and communism is a *philosophy* of government. And these two things, then, are not at war. But communism could very well invade the world at large and some form of socialism or another could be established and has been struggling into a level of establishment since about 1900. That's fifty-seven years ago. They got—the income tax amendment was one of the first actions of socialism in the United States, and that was 1911. In other words, this has been going on for a long time, these social philosophies of one kind or another.

Now, you have to meet, to some degree, spears with spears. Wooden hand swords do not accord well in a battle with spears, don't you see? You have to have impacts of comparable magnitude before there's a conflict. So don't be puzzled that socialism and socialistic trends are winning today in the Western world. They are unopposed. A system of government cannot oppose them because these things can exist, woven into this system of government. In other words, the system of government can sit right there, democracy, and everybody is a socialist. And there's no dispute between these two facts.

Nobody is very aware of this: that the doors are wide open, that almost any political philosophy of any kind could sweep in today upon these great nations of the Western world. And anybody who lifts his head with an opposing philosophy of existence has raised a spear in the face of spears. Do you see that?

Now, the Russian says that he is out to conquer the mind of man. Yes, that is very true, he is out to *conquer* the mind of man—something on the order that you would shoot bear.

This philosophy is alive today in the world. It is not necessarily good or bad, it is all whether or not the men who use it make it so. So far it has proven very evil. For instance, Russia herself under this philosophy is not able to progress. She has fallen a quarter of a century behind all of the European nations with which she was once abreast. She's having governmental shake-ups of all kinds. But this means nothing. The philosophy is still being exported of one kind or another just tells you that this philosophy, being a sort of a slave philosophy and having a pitch, is bringing with it destruction. Therefore, destruction would be

the end product of any slavery, supercontrol operation, whether it be communism or Christianity or anything else.

Now, these things basically found themselves on truth. And then somebody comes along and for somebody else's good, feels that it would be best to pervert this truth, give it a little curve, omit a couple of things, add a couple of saltshakerfuls of mystery and this is for the good of man. At no time will this ever be for the good of man. There would be no way to temper or reshape the philosophies contained in Scientology so as to fully breast the philosophies of communism.

If Scientology were to win, it would win on all fronts, not merely against some oh, pig-eared ideology that somebody in a cabbage patch thought up when he was drunk. Shows the world's pretty bad off that that is what they call philosophy today. "Woikers of the woild arise."

Something wins, however, to the degree that it assists others to exert control over their own environments. Those things which solely seek to control and nothing else, don't win. They just—this little group here is going to control all those groups across the world. And that—that just doesn't win. The only way a win is achieved is to use what you know to better somebody else's control of his environment.

War comes about because nations—meaning nationalistic nations— weaken the control of other nationalistic nations by propaganda and trade and other things. They don't bolster the control, they weaken it. And sooner or later they drive another nation mad and war occurs. That is the phenomena of war. It's just you weaken the control of somebody somewhere and he gets angry and upset.

Now let's look at this much more personally. If we wanted to handle a police officer, our course of action on a very short-term basis could be to take away from him his ability to control the situation. See now, that's a short-term basis. Criminals do that when they shoot one. You see, they sweep away his ability to control the situation. A citizen does that when he says, "Well, you haven't any right on my front porch, get off of here." It's quite remarkable. He always drives the police officer down into the misemotional bands and the police officer hits reaction. Well, it's quite amazing how easy it is to make Americans hit reaction these days. It is. It's quite amazingly easy; it's too easy. Frighteningly so.

The thing to do in order to handle him would be to get him in better control of the environment he's supposed to handle. In order to solve the difficulties with police, we do not need more barriers on police, what we need is more assistance for the police to handle their jobs. They only mishandle them when they can't.

If we wanted to make a good police officer we'd have to take him out of being worried about the criminal mind and a lot of other bugbears that have been mocked up for him these days. Quite amusing that people dream up things for police officers to worry about. Criminal mind is supposed to be an actuality—it's really supposed to exist. Well, the thing to do for a police officer would be to teach him how to handle the criminal mind and then the funny thing about it is, he would be able to be nice and pleasant and lawful with the other citizens. The wrong way to do it would be to reduce his understanding and control of the criminal mind and this would cave him in. Is that right? All right.

On an international scene, it would be necessary to bolster the Russian government's ability to control the Russian nation, to prevent war with Russia. Sounds incredible but you follow the same chain of logic out and you'll see that that is correct. Of course, we're sort of mad in that direction or something of the sort and we say, "Well, we just ought to knock the rascals out and cut them all to pieces and get it all revolting in all directions and so forth." No, that would not be the right direction.

Now, there would be a danger in partially assisting their control, right? Just partially assisting their control. Because they might come up to 1.5. So you'd have to keep punching this assistance through until he got through the blow band. You see that? You'd have to bring him up there. In other words, you'd have to assist him enough so that he would have enough reality on it so that he would come up above the level wherein he would be dangerous. Is this correct? Do you see this well?

Male voice: Yeah.

Well, because people were never willing to assist enough, they would run people up toward the blow band and then they decided that assistance and helping others control things was wrong. Do you see that? In other words, they didn't do it quite long enough. They didn't do it quite well enough and so they never learned it.

They would always fall short of it. The fellow would start up Tone Scale, he'd get to 1.2, 1.3 and they'd say, "This is dangerous, throw a net over his head."

We had a preclear up in New York one time; it was very interesting, every time an auditor would audit her up to 1.5 where she'd start cursing her brother and sister they would promptly get hold of her and take her into a hotel room and tie her down on the bed until she went into apathy again and this hurdy-gurdy-sandy-andy went on about five or six times. The auditor would build the girl up and so on. We finally had to have a consultation on it where we would—we shot this girl up through the anger band, didn't let her sit in it anyplace and after that, why, they thought this was fine. They were not very good at observation, they thought she was still in apathy.

Now, here we have numerous examples and I have to set them forward in this wise: the first thing I'm trying to tell you is the use of any technology to place another being into duress brings about a disaster. It doesn't matter whether it's on a large, civilized plane or individual to individual or group to group or nation to nation. And you haven't realized it but all this time I've been talking to you about a thetan.

Now let's get down to facts. We said what was Scientology addressed to. Oh, we could say generally it's addressed to other life forms and bodies and banks and the physical universe and it's all these things—it's just all of those things.

No, I am afraid we have to be factual; very factual. That thing which is the observer of the universe and other forms is a being which we call by the mathematical symbol *theta* or *a thetan*. And other people have called this thing a soul or a spirit but they got into a condition of where "my soul is over there" or "I have to take care of my soul or it will not go to heaven." In other words, they reversed on the situation. I don't know where "their soul" was.

And the whole subject has been so grandly misunderstood that we have to take a fresh approach and it would be very difficult for us to take an approach without better semantics.

Even amongst ourselves here and there, somebody every now and then says, "Spirits? Oh, just the thought of having to study anything about spirits just is terrible. I mean, why do you have to bring that up?" Well, I'm sorry I have to bring it up; it would be deadly if you just sat there and looked at the subject of spirits all the time—conceiving a static. But I don't think anybody in the last 2,500 years has taken the subject up. And therefore they've got all these wild ideas about spirits and souls and religion and all kinds of other nonsense. And all of these wild ideas have made them avoid entirely this signal, single datum: that the only thing you can do is assist a spirit to control his environment. That's all you can do. You can't do anything else but that. Because anything else but that is destructive. And because you are part of that environment, you'll get included in.

And if you want to keep any kind of a show on the road in life at all, don't go around planting guys in their heads, hoping that they will then be stiff as pokers and not bother you anymore, because you'll keep falling over the corpse.

Now, to assist the ability to control his immediate environment: in this is a tremendous—a tremendous lot of technology stems from, is grouped with that single statement.

What's a thetan? Well, we have this example which I have used a couple of times before and which I'm going to use right now. Scientology is of course addressed to the material universe and I invite you to take a look at that, would you? Would you look around and find out if there is a universe here right now.

Male voice: Yeah.

There is one here right now. Is that right?

Audience: Mm-hm.

All right. That's fine.

Now, I wish you would observe at this moment that you have a body there.

Do you have a body sitting there?

Audience: Yeah.

You got one there really?

Audience: Yeah.

All right. That is a body. Now, Scientology is addressed to the physical universe and is addressed to the body. You're sure about this body now?

Audience: Yeah. Yes.

All right, that's fine.

Now shut your eyes and get a picture of a cat. Any old cat, doesn't matter—or any picture. Got that?

Audience: Yeah.

All right, now, that picture is a mental image picture which in aggregate consists of pictures of the physical universe or pictures of the thetan's own universe and so forth. But it, in its aggregate, is *the mind*. You got the picture of the cat; all right, that's the mind.

All right, now we have the physical universe, got a body. And I call something to your attention: you've seen both of these so far haven't you? You've got a reality on both of these—and the mind, you've got a reality on that. Mind—so that's three. The mind isn't anything else, you know, but just what you just looked at—a mental image picture of one kind or another. And now let's get the picture of the cat again and answer the question, "What is looking at it?" Now, you can say "me," but just what is looking at it?

Audience: Thetan. I am.

You are. You are. And that's a thetan.

Now, this is the totality—multiplied, it is true—this room and many other parts of the universe. You know, other rooms in the universe or other minds or other bodies or other beings. Now, you have a subjective reality now on the physical universe, a body, right? A mind, and you certainly should have a reality on the fact that something was looking at it, right?

Audience: Yeah.

Well, that's *all* we mean by a *thetan*. Please. Because that, in essence, is all we can demonstrate 100 percent.

Now, these subjects as given to you, physical universe, body, mind, thetan, are each one, then, capable of a reality. Now, you heard everybody say, "Yes, *I* am looking at the cat," didn't you?

Audience: Yes.

So now you have a secondary or agreed-upon reality of the fact that there were other thetans in the room, right?

Audience: Yeah.

All right, now that is your closest approach to a reality on another thetan at this time. Let's just sort this out and see what we know about this subject, all right?

Well now, something mocked up or created or did something with something to have a universe, right?

Audience: Yeah.

And something or somethings made a body or bodies, right?

Audience: Yeah.

And something is perpetually making a mind, right?

Audience: Yeah.

All right. That's total objectivity right up to that point. Demonstrable as can be. But we said something *made* this. Now, it would be very, very limiting on our parts not to assume that you didn't have some share in this. Do you understand? That would be very limiting. See,

if we said, "Well, everybody in the room but you had a—had a share in making this universe," you know? That—make a fellow feel kind of funny doesn't it? Makes him feel pretty good to get the idea, well yes, it's rather factual he did have a—he moves a body around in it, he at least shifts the scenery in it. Yes, he has some sort of a hand in the going thing called a universe. And for us to check out one person out of the whole of people and say, "He didn't" would be nonsense, wouldn't it? That would be nonsense. So we must assume that we all had a hand in it, one way or the other.

Now, this doesn't justify us in saying that nothing else anywhere had no hand in it. This doesn't justify us in using ourselves as a totality, does it? There might have been other beings or another being or any other way you wish to look at it, who also had a hand in it who are not at this time classifiable as thetans.

But let me point something out to you. If you never shake them by the hand, you will not have communicated with them. If you haven't communicated with them directly in all this time, the chances are pretty thin that you'll ever meet one. Pretty thin.

Now, you have met human beings and you do have, as Scientologists, a reality on the fact that they are thetan plus mind plus body plus their environment, right? Well, do you know there is no reason, to handle a problem, to assume anything else but these four factors? We don't have to go into a bunch of speculative stuff about whether or not there is an eighth dynamic or whether or not you haunt hotels after you're dead. We don't have to go into this at all. We can progress from this reality almost in the first moment of conversation with anybody we care to talk to on the face of Earth. In just exactly the order I have just talked to you.

He said, "What is this Scientology?"

You say, "Well, it's the stuff that handles all this."

And he says, "All what?"

And you say, "Well, look around."

And he says, "Well, yeah."

And you say, "You got a body there?"

"Yeah."

"Well, get a picture of a cat."

"Cat."

"All right, what's looking at it?"

"Well, I am."

"Well, all right, that's the four factors of Scientology and those are what we handle. Thank you very much."

There isn't any place—any reason to go anyplace else. There's no reason to go into broadcloth altars or silk vestal virgins. There's no reason to go into necromancy or magic. Nor is there any reason to be appalled by any of these things, since we have found no answers that lay outside the communication level of the four things we have just talked about.

Every once in a while we run into a spook thing. Something that is a little bit—well, we're not—we don't like that too well. But do you know what it always boils down to? Thetan, mind, body, universe. Well, we say maybe we ran into something peculiar, well, it was a thetan who had never picked up a body yet or something peculiar like this. Or it was a whole track between-lives operation where thetans were given a bunch of pictures and a bunch of pictures taken away from them or something of the sort. We run into this phenomena.

Well, let me call to your attention that this does not fall outside what you have just been looking at. It is comprehensible. The only thing that stands between you and totally comprehending it is an interjection of the mystery factor, usually for purposes quite remunerative, apparently, to somebody else—which will pay him off not at all. Somebody's dropped the blinds on it and when we peek around back of the blinds, we find ourselves once more looking at thetan, mind, body, universe.

Now, just because this one seems so solid is no reason there isn't another one. This would be an "only one" proposition. I used to be appalled at the fact that when I was going to school (when they could rope me—they used to every once in a while; I took pity on them) they used to say that Earth was the only inhabited planet. I've read that! At the time I read that I was just appalled. I looked at this and I said *dzzz!* How come anybody would think that? The fact that there are other stars kicking around would rather indicate that it would be a freak indeed that would make only one planet habitable around one star! And I tried to argue this out—great lack of success.

Now, what—what would we have to do in order to get a reality on another sun and another planet and other races? And now we run into really the fifth factor and that fifth factor is *elsewhere*. We have to be able to assume an elsewhere. And now we have left the realm of solid reality and are in the realm of the abstract. The abstract is composed, evidently, only of elsewheres plus somebody's ideas concerning the four things we've mentioned and the elsewheres.

But when we've gone that far, the data can be so many and the proofs so few that we soar up into the most grand confusion anybody ever wished to look at. We find men who all they had to do was sit down and feel the floor, look at the wall, find out if they had a body, find out what did—the mind consisted of and wonder what it was looking at—to find, practically, the substance or the generality on anything there was to confront. And these men, with all of that to study, to look at, to realize, could actually sit around and discuss how many angels could dance upon the head of a pin.

So the study of the mind has been the study of elsewhere. And I'll tell you something. When you exclusively study elsewhere, you never get there. If you only study those things beyond the range of your experience, it is doubtful if you will ever experience them.

Now, a thetan is *a* thetan and we know what a thetan can do. We know that these mental image pictures have, actually, mass. There's an interesting experiment on that. You have a fellow mock up things and shove them into his body and before you have him do that you weigh him on the scales and after he does that you weigh him on the scales and you'll find out he's increased in weight. And if that doesn't prove the mass of mental image pictures, which is

the only thing that's happened in between, why, I'll go back and take psychology. Anyway. . . I'm taking it now, but quite another way. Anyway. . .

Now, there is the woof and warp of experience: the interweave of these factors; the complexity which can be discovered in the physical universe; the differences of forms; the aesthetic evaluation of what you are looking at. Rhythm, cadence, senses of time, all of these various things can enter in and make the picture adequately complex. But do you know there are people around who won't confront things just because there's nothing to confront. They think to confront something they would have to go to a war. There are fellows around—I knew a stage manager one time, he actually directed the Rockettes—interesting job, you would admit—who was begging me to go with me on an expedition to look at savage peoples so that he would have something to look at. Now, he had a bad case of elsewhere-ness, didn't he? I would say that was almost fatal. I tried to give him the expedition and swap jobs with him, but he wouldn't—he wouldn't do me that dirty a trick. He was too good a friend of mine.

So that we find people incapable of conceiving anything worth looking at where they are. They always have to be somewhere else. But in view of the fact that they can't actually be somewhere else while being where they are, they never look at anything. And I'm afraid that's all there is to it. That's basically all there is to philosophy. It's how to be elsewhere when you aren't.

Mathematics is always telling us that the end product will be elsewhere. That's the one constant answer. The barrel will fill up in twenty minutes. That's an elsewhere in time, isn't it? The barrel was full last year. Elsewhere, elsewhere.

Most mental systems, then, are elsewhere systems. What is happening over there or what will happen or what has happened. Now, in view of the fact that the past, for most people, is imperishably recorded on thinnies, they have to be able to be elsewhere at will, or the auditors will, in order to confront the past. But then how could they possibly confront the future, which isn't yet, is it? Or is it? That's a fine question, isn't it?

Now, that's about all the abstract I can use at the moment, is: is the future or isn't it? I get upset when I start running the preclears into the future and telling them, "Make it a little more solid" and they tell me what the stock market is going to read day after tomorrow—I mean, this is upsetting.

Another thing, sending preclears into the past and having them pick up and turn over and read the other side of newspapers which they didn't, then, is also upsetting.

So I would say this is just about all the mystery a fellow could use at the moment—without going elsewhere. Because this mystery is right where you are. Now, if you're stuck in the past, why, the mystery is there in the past.

Now this, fortunately, is a solvable situation. It is an observable situation, it can be confronted and processes exist which permit it to be confronted and auditing drills exist which permit preclears to be audited and so confront them. Right?

Well, there's a lot more about things I'd like to tell you, but if you look it over very carefully, you'll find the end product of them right about there.

Now, we extend each one of these things. The physical universe you see; we could then conceive, because *it* is, the fact that there could be other universes.

Now, each of us has a body—except those two thetans up in the corner of the room—each of us has a body and ability to perceive that there are other bodies around, right? Well now, this becomes very observable that there are other bodies around. It's more observable than the fact that there may be other universes around. Got that?

Now, you can see your own mind rather easily and you can work with and get a communicated reality on somebody else's mind, can't you? But there's just one mind that you really look at, right?

Now, you know that *you* look at the mind, experience the body and experience the universe, right? And by communication, you find that others do the same thing, right? But that was by communication.

Now, three of these factors are then, by themselves, only-ones, and only expanded by means of communication. Is that right? In other words, thetan, mind, universe—they're singles, aren't they? So that bodies are plural in the reality, right? You've got a very plural reality. Now, how in the name of common sense, then, do you think there could be anything wrong with a body? I think this shows the highest form of inventiveness of a thetan. This is the one thing on which he has an observable reality, blunt and factual: that there are other bodies. That's correct, isn't it?

But there's only one universe that he experiences uniformly and routinely, one mind and one self. So there are three only-ones, aren't there? So you'd look for your biggest difficulty in those lines. But in view of the fact that his singularity actually doesn't bother him, except as it impedes him to conceive the multiplicity of other minds—you see, if there were lots more of him, he would then be able to see lots more minds and maybe lots more universes, maybe. It's a limiting factor, the singleness of himself. Nevertheless, I don't see how he could have any trouble with himself.

He is observing, in some fashion, what he is observing. And he must be in an elsewhere state about what he's observing, not to be able to observe what there is to observe, don't you see? So if he could observe what there is to observe, then he wouldn't be in a bad state at all. It's only when he observes what there isn't to observe that we say he's in a bad state.

So we limit the things that could be wrong, then, to the mind and the universe. I seriously doubt if there's anything wrong with a thetan or a thought. I don't think, at a cursory glance, there's any such thing as aberrated thought. I think there would be an aberrated confrontingness, an elsewhere-ness. He is looking at something else while he thinks he is somewhere else.

So this boils it down to the fact that the mind, then, must be somehow or another at fault here. He must be able to have the mind in several places. But if that's the case, then the other factor at fault would be the physical universe around him—this would be at fault then too because of its singleness. But the mind has been carefully taking pictures of this in order to make it multiple. Which comes down to the singleness of the physical universe as the sin-

gle aberrative factor. Therefore objective auditing is always more successful than subjective auditing or auditing directly addressed to the thetan.

And if you don't follow that very clearly and if you haven't got that entirely straight, how by the singleness of the universe . . . See, the mind has multiplied that universe and so itself has a multiple factor. The only singleness we find is the singleness of the thetan, the singleness of the universe. So it must be a fight between the thetan and the universe and there's lots more of the other things. Got it? So the only scarcities there could be would be the scarcity of the universe and the scarcity of self. And I don't think there could be very much wrong with thinkingness. Thinkingness doesn't audit very well. It either audits totally, which is to say, you just get the fellow to confront what there is to confront and that's that, or it really doesn't audit at all. You just change the things it can confront and it has a better opinion of itself.

So it boils down to the fact that Objective Process is the best processes. And if you haven't gotten this straightened out, why, play the lecture back. I'm not sure that I understand it myself.

Thank you very much.

Thank you.

CONTROL

A lecture given on 22 July 1957

All right, this is the sixth lecture of the 18th ACC, the date?

Male voice: Twenty-second.

Twenty-second of July, 1957. The subject of this lecture is control.

As I have said already, control is a dirty word. Freud stuff has no word in it as nasty as control. But let me invite you, if you're going into the subject of control with somebody, to follow this sort of a routine. Now you see, we use a control-type auditing in processing in Scientology and before they wince or leap sideways of – you can say, „Have you ever been controlled by anybody?“ They say „*sssaarruuugglll*,“ froth at the mouth, lie down. Scrape them off the sidewalk, stand them up again and say, „Well, now how would you like that area of your life decontrolled so that *you* can *recontrol* it?“ (And we have two new words „decontrol“ and „recontrol“ and both of them are done by control.) And that's the truth.

An individual who has been made to resist control winds up allergic to control. And if he is allergic to it he's dead, because there isn't anything you can do with anything except in some fashion or another view it or control it. If there's anything else that you can do besides – well, I should say sense it – view it, sense it or control it, it would be, be controlled *by* it. And any old Scientologist knows this thing about the one-way flow: if a flow flows too long in one direction it has a tendency to dam up and fix. And it is only necessary to reverse that to unfix the situation, don't you see?

So we go back into *Scientology*, I think 8-80, on two-way flows – and we understand this control situation at once. It is a very simple thing to knock somebody out by the use of one of these two-way flow things. You get a person getting the idea of flowing something out away from him for a while and he flows this out away from him for a while and all of a sudden he goes „wog.“ Now it is only necessary for him to make that something flow the other way toward him for a little while, just a mental idea of flowing, you know, and flow toward him for a little while for him immediately to wake up. If you have somebody who is putting up mock-ups out in front of him and he starts to go unconscious you only need have him put them in back of him and his unconsciousness disappears, which is quite remarkable.

Well, a thetan who is totally devoted to controlling things and who is not himself in any way to be controlled runs into this same phenomena. The phenomena gets in his road very, very much. Well, if this is the case then you can see at once why control of a preclear is necessary. If he has fought the control going out it is only because it has gone out too long. Don't tell me that a thetan can actually be upset by a miscontrol or a bad 8-C. I think that is just an objection. I think that is just an objection. I think he could take it rather easily providing he himself didn't have a stuck flow on it. If he himself had not done so much controlling

of mental image pictures, which is to say the mind, the body, objects in the environment, if he had not done so much of this then there would be no stuck outward flow.

So somebody comes along and controls him *well* and he objects – much less bad 8-C. But of course bad control, that is, bad placement and bad handling and so on, naturally gets ferociously on his nerves *if* he already has a stuck outflow. Do you see that? He would not pay any attention at all to it if there wasn't a well-worn route. And it starts to come back and it starts to knock him out and he doesn't like it so he fights.

And a flow which flows – there's a little interesting thing here – a flow which flows a certain time in one direction tends to continue to flow until it is totally jammed or stopped. Now it's just the phenomenon of flow all by itself. A flow flowing long enough in one direction in the mind eventually flows harder and harder, not easier and easier. Why? Why? This is only true when energy is being employed.

And the more an individual outflows energy the more vacuum he creates on his side of the flow. And he's creating a nice little vacuum there, and the more he flows out, the more hole he leaves in the Swiss cheese called the bank. And eventually something is trying to pull that back in. He's got a missingness, don't you see, now, in the energy masses immediately surrounding him, and it itself tries to fill itself up by pulling back on the same line. And it's like taking a rubber band and just stretching it further and further and further – *nnnnrrrrrrnnuh* – well, now the analogy is not too good because what happens eventually is it just sticks. His effort to hold it out there is so great that he can only hold it motionlessly out there. And he's got it stuck. All of a sudden somebody comes along and they threaten to joggle it a little bit and that hole where he is tends to fill up too rapidly; he says, „No!“ and he sticks it out there harder, and somebody joggles it and it again tends to snap in. He says, „No,“ and he puts it out there. I'm afraid the solution lies in these two data: one, you can't hurt a thetan and two, the worst that would happen on the snap back is that the bank would disarrange in some fashion and leave him with not so many pretty pictures.

But that flow is ordinarily undertaken by noncreated energy; that is to say, he himself didn't create the energy, he collected it one way or the other, you see. He got the energy from other sources on a misownership and other things that he packed it around. Then he used that energy, you see; one eats and then he makes his vocal cords run – you get the idea? Well, he has just so much energy deposit around the voice, he gets his vocal cords running, and he runs himself down. He eventually will have an actual vacuum right in the vicinity of his voice box. And if he talks too long he talks exhaustedly. Got that? And then he's got a hole there and it's a hungriness for energy and all of this talk is out there on a strung-out ridge of one kind or another. Somebody goes „*snap*“ at it, it snaps back on him, and every now and then we get the actual phenomena – what I'm talking about would be entirely baffling to anybody who studied only in the field of mysticism, such as psychiatry and so forth. Other mystic studies. I didn't mean to malign any mystics, my apologies.

But there is an actual electrical phenomena, a whole series of phenomena, which occur in the field of thinkingness and these things have been observed to have sufficient violence that a person holding the electrodes on an E-Meter has had an explosion occur somewhere in

the vicinity of his hands, enough to knock a hole in his hands and the can. That's how bad that one has gotten. We all know of some of these.

Now here's another one. An individual every once in a while gets a tremendous explosion in front of his face or up on top of his head or something like this. And he says, „*Ppplluh*, what was that, *uulllhhhl* Spooks, wizards, I'm being attacked, something's happening.“ No, nothing happened, he just got too much potential and he got a stuck flow out there, that's all. And one day, somebody wiggled this potential and it went „*snap*“ and you got a complete electronic display. Anybody playing around with such things as electric shocks or anything like this is just being incredibly stupid, because it's the wrong wavelength in the first place. That's a very gross wave action.

But we look at this thing, of this tremendous electrical phenomena which surrounds the being, and we find that mental image pictures are themselves built of energy, they are not some imaginary thing. I love the introduction and use of this word *imaginary*, as it means „nonenergy, nonreal, nonexistent, couldn't possibly be handled.“ It's an operation, the use of that word *imaginary*. Well, this fireplace, of course, is imaginary up here and this microphone is imaginary and the current coming out of that and running that tape recorder, they're all imaginary too if that's the case. See, you'd just have to consider them all imaginary. Actually same order of thing.

Every once in a while we run into somebody who has had some one of these experiences of one kind or another. It was a hot day and he sat down and he was going to rest and he did and all of a sudden – *boom!* Something blew up. He said, „Good heavens, I'm being attacked. Some mysterious thing is shooting at me.“ Well, the mysterious thing shooting at him was this: he was on a high level of activity and he kept pushing out energy and he created a vacuum, an energy vacuum. And he sat down, all of a sudden, and rested. See, and he made a no-potential where he is. And he gets according electrical phenomena.

You can produce practically the same phenomena with any electrical current or various electrical gimmicks of one kind or another: resistors and condensers and so forth. And the electronic engineer can produce this reaction very easily with a condenser. But his ideas of condensers are rather strange too. He thinks you keep pumping electricity into a condenser until it fills up and eventually it discharges in some fashion or another.

Well, we don't know whether it has capacity or not; that's just a handy word to use. But we do know that the electric eel (known as a thetan) does have some funny electrical phenomena which are not any different than the electrical phenomena in life. And this is not unusual because a thetan after all is part and parcel to this universe, and the stuff he sees around him and the currents and so forth were probably at one time or another generated by life.

I want to cause you to think this over just a little more closely and you realize that the current running in that tape recorder at this moment is converted or generated by some life form at one time or another in the past. It's probably, by the way, running on coal, and coal is a bunch of life forms of one kind or another, and they got all condensed and so on. Oh, the cars in the streets are out there, they're running on what somebody would foolishly call „life energy.“ It's not life energy, it'd be energy stored by, converted by or generated by life forms. But it is processed in some fashion, that's the most that we could adventure with a total cer-

tainty, and because it's been processed then it's burnable and heat can be released and you have heat converting into a mechanical action, you've got electrical current flowing up the line, tape recorder runs. Got that?

Well, a person's need to be warm and all of that is quite amazing. I mean, that's one of the sillier things. A thetan does much better in absolute zero than he does in a hot room. But he gets accustomed to this and he says, „I need this,“ and he starts converting energy, one way or the other. He does some interesting things with it.

Well, the second he starts to handle energy he gets all of the phenomenon of electricity, of course: all the phenomena of electricity are there or he wouldn't have any need of eating or anything of this sort, I mean. I could strain at the point very hard to prove this, and I don't know why I should except for this one thing: it's almost totally overlooked. Well now, that this applies to the mind then should come as a shock to nobody. That it wouldn't apply to the mind at all should be a tremendous piece of balderdash. I mean, that would be a real swindle to say, „Well, no real living being has anything to do with energy, you know. And thinking has nothing to do with energy, you know.“ That'd be nonsense.

Well, if it has anything to do with energy then there are certain energy laws it obeys and the things I'm talking about are some of them. Now every once in a while when somebody is running Tone 40 on an Object with shouting, he keeps carving a hole in the bank. He carves a hole in the bank and all of a sudden he gets an explosion of some sort or another. He really feels caved in on, he gets all disarranged. He won't shout and can't shout elegantly because he's afraid that's going to happen. So in training we don't do processing, we just let him shout it out and if it's going to happen, it's going to happen, and if it doesn't happen it doesn't happen, and so what. We at least get him over the agony of suspense.

Now the voice of course is a natural for a stuck flow. It talks in one direction, one direction, one direction, one direction, one direction, and after a while a fellow can't talk very much it's so hard. Now you think it's because your voice gets rough or your throat constricts or some other odd explanation – the cells are mad at you in the larynx or something of the sort. But actually all it is is this electronic disturbance.

Now if you were real smart in handling electricity and – get this – you thought you had to handle it in order to speak, that's necessary too, all you could – have to do is mock up a block of spare electricity out here in a motionless form, stick it in your voice box and your hoarseness would cease. Now you can do that on a cruder way by just mocking up hoarse voices. All you're doing – the significance is meaningless. Just stick hoarse voices, larynxes or something in there, and all of a sudden your sore-throatedness would be at end.

Well, with the shouting you carved a hole and the stuck flow got out there and it's probably already very beautifully stuck; you give it just one more clip and it goes smash! See? All right.

Now other electrical phenomena contain engrams. There are many experiences and each experience in life is represented by a mental image picture of one kind or another which contains real energy, which has real potential, which is measurable in terms of current; and meters which measure current, measures the potential in these facsimiles. And furthermore, they have mass; you can remedy somebody's havingness, have him mock up these things, or

shove these things in, you can increase a person's weight. And there are many experiences which in themselves – and this is what's confusing – contain electrical catastrophes. In other words, you not only can have mental image catastrophes just on handling the phenomena, getting explosions and things like that, but you can also do this one: you can have pictures of catastrophes which when run out give you a repeat of the catastrophe.

Now there's an old experience on the track known as blanketing; most any GE bank has got a blanketing in it one way or the other. And sometimes a person has unwittingly been using the energy contained in this blanketing. And they exhaust the energy out of the blanketing, little by little, little by little by little, and then they find they have to work harder and they have to keep keyed-up more and more and they have to keep working harder and harder. And then all of a sudden they say, „I can't do it anymore,“ make some such postulate, sit down and suddenly rest, *boom!* See what happens? You just get a recurrence of the same phenomena of blanketing. It's something on the order of an electric shock.

Psychiatry – I don't intend to say anything nasty about psychiatry for the rest of the course, but all they're doing is dramatizing this type of phenomena. They're not curing anything, they're just dramatizing. And they're dramatizing mainly a blanketing of one kind or another. Blanketing was just – all a being did was throw an electrical sheet of energy over another being evidently and there was a nice resounding boom.

Now there's many ways to do this, you can produce all sorts of electrical phenomena which affect beings, all sorts. They haven't begun to dream of the number of ways by which a being could be influenced by electrical phenomena. One could say that's about the closest thing there is to infinity, the number of ways a being could be influenced by electrical phenomena. They are just numberless and they all obey the same laws. Fascinating, isn't it?

Now of course you can go back and wipe out all those considerations and make a bunch of new considerations and get another series of electrical phenomena on another track, but people haven't done that. They are still operating on this electrical phenomena.

All right, if they are so operating, and if these laws hold good, then you in processing can command the obedience of this phenomena. And one of the phenomena is the stuck flow of control. People usually control other things by energy. They control by energy, control by energy, control by energy; they don't control by postulate, they usually control by energy. And they control, control, control, and then one day they control just a little bit more by energy and they decide they can't control things anymore. Now there is no other reason to it than electrical phenomena. There isn't, „Well, I failed too many times to control it so I guess I cannot control it anymore.“ No. They just had to try too hard and had to outflow too much and had to work at it too hard and they pushed in one direction too long and they got a stuck flow. And there it is, stuck. And if you could see a picture of this fellow's bank it would have, actually, electrical phenomena showing these various stuck flow. All right.

Practically all flows are aimed in the direction of a control and control is start, change and stop. Starting things, changing things and stopping things, then, become stuck flows. Now you come along as an auditor, you start giving somebody some heavy control. Now listen, somebody may have controlled his bank; somebody may have – unwittingly you know, tell him a bunch of horror stories or other things, the way they amuse little kiddies; that's the

best method of control is get them to read something like „Little Orphan Annie“ and other Eugene Fields masterpieces. Anyway, they have controlled his bank in some fashion, they've controlled his body. But wait a minute, nobody's ever controlled him, not worth a nickel.

That's why we're successful in Scientology, it's nobody has ever controlled the *being*. They have controlled the *products* of the being, but never the being. Got that? Thank you, I see you heap savvy that. Well, if this is the case we are going to produce results, that's for sure. Because one of the things we do is back up this stuck flow of control. A thetan has been going all this time in the universe, a being, controlling things, and very few things have ever controlled him. He has a tendency to snap in on himself those times when he has been controlled, bad or good. And hence you get these various phenomena. The service facsimile and so forth find their basic residence in just that fact alone. The individual is on a total outflow of control, control, control so the closest things he gets to him are things that seek to remedy this back flow.

Oh, people will sit around by the hour and tell you about tough first sergeants they heard of once and, you know, they just hope that these people never controlled the being himself, they merely controlled the bank in some fashion. This idea of „train them until they develop an automatic response“ has practically saturated the universe. They don't ever train the guy. In the first place they didn't even know who the fellow was. No, get some kind of an automaticity in the bank. The whole ideas of training are completely erroneous, because they think if they get some kind of an automaticity going in the bank then this fellow, like a wound-up doll, can thereafter drive cars and tanks and general armies and do other nonsensical things. You see that?

The whole idea is just build it up so it's all automatic; in other words, make a bunch of response pictures, and after that have him go off like a little wound-up doll. And it doesn't work. But everybody thinks it works. So that is the target usually of education, and that's why you're at odds with education at large; education, just ponderous – memorize it, memorize it, don't ever bother to apply anything, just memorize it, memorize it and memorize it, memorize. Don't do anything with it, memorize it, memorize it – “Oh, it doesn't – has no useful application, Mr. Jones, this is calculus.“ „Well, why are you studying differential equations? Because you'll need them to graduate.“

You see, if they could just install enough patterns in the fellow, why, he'd function after that, he'd be civilized. And you get all these misnomers. Well, they all come about from this thing of nobody has ever addressed the being, they didn't even know who he was.

All right, now you come along and you start to control *him* with Tone 40 auditing, see. They're going straight through. And after a while he says, „I wonder if any of that is addressed to me? Could it be that some of that is addressed to me? In the first place, they're not asking me to store up any of this in the bank, but quite the contrary I'm supposed to do it every time, me. 'Give me your hand.' Does the fellow mean me because I don't see anything around here that will give me – give him my hand. I don't see anything around here. Well, maybe if he does this often enough he's going to install a machine and after that my hand will do this.“

And then it doesn't, because by sheer duplication you can utterly ruin any machinery. The one thing that mental machinery cannot do is exactly duplicate. Now people don't believe that, they say, the one thing that machinery does is duplicate. Oh, no it doesn't duplicate. Each time it's got to have a little curve on it, it's got to be just a little tiny bit different. Only a thetan can duplicate, he's the only one that can stand the stress and strain of it. So duplication enters into this thing with this heavy control and he finds out at last there's nothing can stand up to it but himself. So he must be the one who is being controlled. Thus he works it out and you get a back flow of control. That's all there is to it. And then he finally decides, „Well, a back flow came in and even though there was a small explosion, or nothing happened, I found out that I could stand it. I could take it and nothing particular happened. And I wonder if there's any real consequence to this at all.“

And he finds out there's no great consequence to it so he becomes willing to control something. That's more or less a crude explanation of how control works when used in auditing. All right, we examine this very carefully, then, and we find out that control is senior to energy. Energy is the servant of control, not the end goal of control. It could be made so. But energy is energy and if it was just floating around doing nothing it would be chaos, if there was no direction to it, providing one can conceive of energy without an observer of the energy, which is doubtful.

All right, now if we take this idea of energy flows as the only method by which anything can be controlled, we've had it. There is the make-break point of a life or a lifetime. That's why electronics boys have a rough time. They're using too much and too long energy to control things and they are seeking to control energy only, which they themselves cannot even see.

All right, here we have a strata above energy. There is such a thing as controlling by postulate and there is such a thing as a mass without energy. There is such a thing as a mass without fields, there can be a mass with no energy and it is not true that that wall is composed of little things that wiggle. It is not composed of space with an idea or anything of the sort – an idea of little particles. It is simply itself, it is a mass. For heaven's sakes, let's get down to cases. Let's not try to say, „That mass has no mass,“ which is what physics finally got itself into and it got itself into this so deep it'll never dig itself out; dead science right this minute. Because when it advanced into „higher physics“ it said, „That mass has no mass.“ Make mystics out of the lot of them.

I imagine every school of mysticism of the past was founded on a bunch of disgruntled physicists who had made this postulate. Now, that's a reverse postulate. It's all right to say there's nothing there – there is something there, and behold it. See. But now there is something there and we say nothing is there without banishing that and we are in trouble, because we're telling a lie.

Now let's get isness straight. This universe is real, it *is*. The universe is totally real; the floor is the floor, the ceiling is the ceiling. It *is*. And if you went around saying it was is, it would become less and less offensive to you. But if you go around on a second postulate and, while holding firmly in mind that it is, you say, „It isn't,“ you not-is it, you say, „It isn't, it isn't“ – “Well, take that wall, 'tisn't. No floors; floors are very simple, they aren't.“ Now the

least silly of this is they are really composed of little wiggle-wiggles. I don't know how this is, see, but there are little wiggle-wiggles that go around the wiggle-woggles.

And they sound fancy titles, there's nuclei and spooklei and electrons and molecules and, oh, they get all sorts of things. Undoubtedly you can work out matter in these ways. You can say that it does fall apart and various electronic things occur but this doesn't say it was made of it. Because it produces the phenomena does not mean that it is the phenomena.

Now get this as a truism, as a good thing to keep in mind. Because a thing makes something it is not the thing. Because you can make energy is no reason you're energy. And because that wall over there can make electrical fields when treated properly is no reason that it's an electrical field. And so you can of course disintegrate a wall and get all sorts of phenomenon, benomanas and other things out of it, don't you see? You could get a wall to shed almost anything including dog hair if you were good enough at mock-ups. But that's what advanced physics is doing today, they're trying to get walls to shed dog hairs. Well, it's just about as nonsensical as that.

Now in other words, this wall over here is, and don't ever think it isn't, it is. If your body runs into that wall it'll go thump! I guarantee that. Well now, if your body goes into the wall and goes thump then we have to admit two isnesses: the isness of your body and the isness of the wall. And some fellows with more feelings than others would admit a third: the thump.

Now here is this state of being, then: a tremendous continuing postulate of isness, existence, stuck by the effort to take it away. It sticks on the effort to take it away because one has called himself a liar; and about all you can ever do is deny yourself. In other words, we said it is, we all agreed that it is, everybody agrees that he had some part in it. The walls, he sees the walls, he made the walls, they are, various things can be done with these things, we're all set, it's all agreed upon; now let's go around and say, „It isn't.“ Now that we've all agreed upon this 100 percent, it isn't. Boy, that's a wonderful way to make something just stick. And so you see the wall sticking.

Now a wonderful way to get into a trap is to say, „Well, that is a trap,“ dive in head first and then say, „It's not a trap. It's not a trap, not a jail.“ And walk out the door and say, „Any time I want...“ *Clank!* Well, you say, „Well, look, I kind of mocked this up in the beginning, I don't know why I can't get out of the doors easily,“ *clank!* No, you would have to say, „The jail is“ without protest, because the original postulate of the jail was made without protest. The protest came later. You see that?

Now you can vary and alter and do all sorts of things, change mest, electricity, anything you want without too much liability. It does get harder and harder to conceive of exactly where and when it was made up and so make a perfect duplicate. But that's the only thing that happens to it. It's when you say that it isn't that you start to go blind, see, as a thetan. And then you say, „That wall isn't.“ This is actually the total reason 8-C and other processes are so good. You just make the fellow go around and say, „It is. It is. It is. It is. It is. It is. It is.“ Everything brightens up and everything's liable to become solider and stronger and more massive and less massive

and less massive – where's the wall? And then he says, „Well, I can adjust that myself.“ So he has a feeling that he could adjust solids rather than solids adjust him.

Well now, that's the basic control of the universe: it is. One controls something by holding it in existence, doesn't he? That's a part of control, isn't it? Just by holding something in existence he is controlling it. Well, supposing one is busily holding something in existence and then says, „I'm not holding it in existence anymore.“ While he is holding it he tells everybody he isn't holding it. Oh wow! All sorts of interesting things could occur from that point on, couldn't they? Well, we're not interested in how many things could occur because they are numberless. But we are interested in this factor of control.

The universe fixed in place is actually not in a state of stop, it's in a state of change, isn't it? But one must be continuously starting it and then it changes. So „Start the wall“ if run should produce some rather interesting phenomena, as I think some of you have learned. It's obviously stopped, isn't it? Well, this is just another little hooker on the material universe. We are starting it all the time and then changing it. All right, if we're starting it all the time and then changing it, and if we sit around and conceive that it is stopped, boy, is it solid. So you see all sorts of control mechanisms can be built into things, even this universe.

But look, if you're holding it in position all that time it must be, if you use energy to do it, a sort of stuck flow. So somebody comes along and controls *you* to some degree, reaches *you* who are very busy at this and what happens? Well, you've either got to blow up complete or find out that you can rise above energy. You have two choices there, and as a thetan can't blow up complete, the only thing left to him to do is rise above energy. Do you see how that would be?

Well control then even enters into this thing called creation: create and control are right next door to each other. If an individual cannot suffer control himself, his ability to create is rather doomed. He may be frantically creating, he may be trying like mad to create something, but it doesn't mean he's going to keep on very long. He's going to hit that stuck flow. Now, if he's creating with postulates and not with energy flows he could go on forever. And so we will go into the number one trick of control used in this universe on a thetan.

Do you want to know what this number one trick is? It is to make the thetan make a postulate that he himself can be damaged; that is, he has to make a postulate that he can be damaged. He has to think that himself. He can be damaged, he has to think. But a postulate all by itself wouldn't accomplish the job at all, and the modern method of wrapping this up as a complete trap is to make him conceive that he is energy, then damage the energy so as to make the thetan conceive that he has been damaged. Now I'll go over that again. You have to make him conceive that he is energy and that the energy can be damaged, by which he then has it proven to him that he has been damaged. Do you see that?

You can only damage a person thoroughly and enormously by making this identification between a spirit and energy and mass. Now if you make a total identification there you've got it – you've got it made. That's the number one trick. I'm not now talking about communism, psychology or phrenology or nonsense. I'm just talking to you *fact*. This then is a number one operation: it's to make a thetan conceive that he is energy and nothing else. And has no other capabilities than energy and then damage the energy with punishment of

one kind or another, and this convinces him that he is damaged and so therefore convinces him that he can't postulate and he can't function and he can't do this and he can't do that, see? And we – “can't do's” get formed out of this mechanical action. You have a thetan conceive he's that chair, have him believe he's the chair utterly, that he's the same fabric as the chair or is the chair itself. And then you go over and bust the chair in half, and say, „See, you're broken.“ And he says, „Yeah, I guess I am.“ See how that would be?

So he could get all sorts of wild ideas from this association with energy. Therefore, any psychotherapy, practice of philosophy or activity concerning the mind is *doomed to failure and will not and cannot work if it is based on the premise that man is mass*. You understand that? All you'd have to do is look this over and say, „Well, do they conceive man to be mass? Yes, they do.

Well, it doesn't work.“ That's all there is to it, just doesn't work. It's an operation then, isn't it?

The only reason Scientology works is because it disabuses him of this fact and that is the only reason it works. It's addressed to the being and if we were going around fixing up bodies thinking that man was a body and neurons, automaticities, curved in with neurons and that made a cross-circuit of synapses and all of it was a bunch of calves' brains which were jellied or something of this sort and that ran an automaticity in the left leg and that was why he stamped and what his reactions were, we would say at once, „Can't work. Can't work.“ Because it is using and confirming this identification. Now if you go on confirming this identification you wind up with a total unworkability. Because that is the basic misidentification necessary to damage a thetan or put him downscale.

So if one just continues to confirm that, going around telling everybody, „You know, you're an animal, and animals don't have souls and you're just a bunch of neurons and conditioned reflexes and you're just mass and you came from mud. And one day there was a big sea of mud and somehow or other you spontaneously combusted and now you're frogs' legs.“ You know, you just go around, „Yam-yam-yam-yam-yam, please, please believe me, please believe me, please be slaves, please be slaves, please die, die, die because I can't confront any of you.“ Got the idea? Those are all synonyms.

There speaks a man in *terror* who tells all other men that they are mest.

Now the thetan who is convinced he's that chair can provenly be damaged; but a thetan cannot be damaged. So all you'd have to do, really, is disassociate the idea that a thetan was energy, and you've got about 99 percent of his case right there. You could even go through a chant like this, you could make the – run Rising Scale Processing, get the guy Sven-galied somehow into actually thinking the thoughts you wanted him to think without any other preliminary and just say, „I am energy, I'm not energy,“ you see. „I am energy, I'm not energy. I changed my mind, I'm not energy, I am energy, I am energy, that's for sure,“ you know. „No, I am not energy,“ you know. Getting him to get these two postulates, get him working until you've got him shaken up real good and he would go away *a* changed man. You didn't change any bank at all, don't you see? In other words, you just shake up, don't even cure the idea but just shake up this idea that he – and put some divine question into his mind and you've changed his case. That's very far from a lot of processing.

Well, he's controlled so much energy that he himself thinks that he better obey the laws of energy and get stuck in energy. And that's why he gets stuck on energy, he thinks he is energy, he's gone through this proposition „If I produce something I am the thing,“ see, and „if I have a lot to do with energy then by association“ – which everybody knows is the clue to everything, you just associate until you disassociate and then you go to university and study psychology, anyhow. This situation gets into a stuck flow and the second you start to process *him*, not an energy mass, you start to process *him*, he starts to disconnect from all this energy without really wrecking his havingness. Because I don't think you can hurt a thetan's havingness, it's just another idea he's got, don't you see? Havingness works because it exercises his connection with energy. It makes him re-postulate it, you know, until he just wears out a whole flock of postulates and then he feels much better. He says, „Well, I can have anything.“ Well, that's interesting that he can *have* anything.

You take some fellow who's being a bedpost and if you could say, „Get some things you could have,“ and he finally finds some things he could have and first thing you know he says, „You know, I could have all this.“

You say, „Are you a bedpost?“

He'd say, „No, what a silly idea.“

You see this, this is a direct ratio then. Well, you'd have to convince a fellow he was energy before you could damage him. But of course with that goes the postulate that he could be damaged. Got that? Well, he very often sets up the postulate that he could be damaged so as to damage the other guy by example. Somebody said, „Hell was paved with good intentions.“ It's not paved with good intentions, it's paved with setting an example. I know, I had one of the paving bricks one time and went over it microscopically. It was an example. You say, „Look what you have done to me you brute,“ see? „You have slaughtered me.“

Fellow says, „What? A living being can be slaughtered? My, that's a new thought.“ And he goes off worrying about this, „Let's see, he can be slaughtered,“ and you pick yourself up, dust yourself off and you say, „Ha-ha, I guess I got that guy.“

Then one day you do it so often that you forget to get the guy or you run into too many others that convinced you. And it's just a method of going into agreement. You set an example of being damaged, then other people set you an example of being damaged, then you agree with the first time you were damaged because you hung somebody with that and suppressed it, and the next thing you know we got a nice agreement that we can all be damaged. Hence, downscale on cases, difficulty of processing, all these things, actually stem from these rather stratospheric postulates and activities which may or may not be reachable directly by an auditor. They can certainly be attacked on a gradient scale and that's where they're going. But if they could be reached just like that, why, you'd just have your one-shot, one-instant Clear, you know, boom!

Well, now, this whole matter of „I am energy, energy can be damaged, I can be damaged“ is actually a necessary channel to create a good, solid slave society. Now a fellow who is energy cannot get out of a skull, because energy can't get out of a skull. Try to pass a lead pencil sometimes through a piece of cardboard and you'll see what I'm talking about. A person who can't get out of a skull must be to some degree conceiving himself to be the content

of the skull, so he's trying to push his brains outside the skull or something of the sort when you tell him to exteriorize. And it's rather painful, it gives him headaches. Sits in there, you know, kicking brain out through the skull side, his idea of exteriorization.

But this individual who is doing this is actually in no great danger. He couldn't be in any danger, he couldn't be damaged, his abilities couldn't be lessened; we've already demonstrated that it's *impossible* to reduce an ability. About the only thing you can do is reduce its exercise or the willingness to exercise it. For instance, I know some processes, all you have to do is tell the preclear to look at the wall and mock up a mock-up, and over his dead body and muchly to his surprise he mocks up a three-dimensional, total brilliance, total mass mock-up the size of the wall and he sits there looking at it saying, „Yes, I did that. Yes, I did that.“ And sometimes takes him a day or two to get the facility turned off – worries him. He could do that? Well, he wasn't willing to do it.

Now some preclear that you run across who's not willing to be any better than he is, he merely says so, but that's a circuit composed of his wife or somebody, and you make him better and he gets worse, and you make him better and he gets worse, and you make him better and he gets worse – he's going through some kind of a cyclic action. But in no case were you processing the preclear where you had any real difficulty with the preclear. You were processing an energy mass one way or the other. And processing the energy mass, you're giving him the commands through, the commands are echoed by an energy mass which moves around. And so then you process the energy mass some more and so on. You can just go back and forth with this game just almost endlessly. Until you process the person directly you can process nothing.

Well, a tremendous process of course was „Be three feet back of your head.“ But the fellow was so surprised – get that, because that is, although this thetan can be damaged sort of thing and so on is all interesting *ways* he can be damaged, you know, *ways* that the damage can then occur after he's associated himself with energy and so forth – he also has all plotted out in orders of seniority, and top amongst these is surprise. I can make anybody go out of control and actually make his body just start flip-flopping madly, just by making him run on a process that isn't a process which addresses surprise. I'll tell you the process. Process, very simple process: Mock up somebody and have him be surprised, and just have him do that. And he says, „I'm feeling nervous now,“ and you just say, „Well, mock up somebody and have him be surprised.“ The next thing you know, why, he's got all of his clamps about surprise off and all of the surprise that was on more or less automatic in full restim. And he'll just flip-flop all over the place. All right, surprise is one of the methods by which energy could be damaged because he gets that associated with the blow and he has all sorts of interesting mechanisms figured out. But we have to have these basic mechanisms first: one, that he can be damaged and, two, that he is energy. And if we've got those we've got it all made. He can be damaged, that is to say, „I can suffer,“ and so forth.

Christianity, for instance, went ashore on the rocks of this same thing; although they were addressing the spirit rather broadly they actually brought in this mechanism called „hell.“ And there were seven hells originally, and these various hells were all places where thetans could be damaged. But they did this very interestingly: they said, „lour soul,“ which of course made the other operation, you were energy. You were energy and you've got a soul

and you mustn't let *it* go to hell. Now, that's the score. Punishment was entered in – a damage.

Now that wasn't anywhere near as bad an operation, however, as this dialectic materialism-psychology mess that we've inherited in our modern times. Science is going straight ahead on the rocks of „Man is energy, man is mass.“ They're being very, very „thud“ about it. At least Christian practices and so forth were – had a via on it; they said he could be damaged, and you will go to hellfire and you will burn forever and so forth. And they said, „Your soul will go.“ They still had some spirit in it so there must have been some recoveries of one kind or another and I am more or less prone to believe some of the miracles which occurred in the early days of Christianity – in spite of the several Christian churches which now offer large prizes to anyone who can prove that any miracle ever occurred. They say these miracles were never possible. Well, it was founded on miracles.

If you were just to convince somebody that he was a spirit, that he did not have a soul, but he *was* a spirit, just like that and nothing else, you're liable to get a miracle. You're just liable to get one. Every few hundred people all of a sudden, somebody'd walk suddenly or do something, you see. Why, he would slip all the way out of being energy, being damaged, to being himself. You just slip him out through that lineup and you get a miracle; rather easy thing to do. Sudden recoveries of sight would be the easiest miracles to actually perform in that wise because the only thing that would blind a thetan would be energy masses while he considered himself an energy mass.

All right, therefore we have – as we look over this scene, we have control of the spirit as being the highest button of control or processing. Control of the spirit which would be rather direct. And I think that we, without mumbo jumbos and lots of vias, witch-doctoring and all that sort of thing, I think that we have come to a point where we can come very close to doing this quite directly. We can control a spirit. Then the moment that he himself sees that he is controlled and that he is not energy and so on, and sees that he can receive control, communicate and respond to it, he certainly will pull out of the morass just *swssst!* And it should, as we get more and more practiced at it, happen fast. Tone 40 works well for some people and works rather poorly for some people. Well, it's all the direction that it is directed. It has a lot to do with the goal of the auditor and his understanding of what he is trying to do with that process.

But we are probably the first – and this doesn't even include Buddhism – we're probably the first to overtly address this problem very directly and without superstition or mumbo jumbo or the feeling that the gods or whales were going to come down and eat us up because we did something directly to a being, an individual, conceiving him at the same time to be what he is, which we call a thetan and conceiving at the same time that he is not space or energy or mass and that he continues to exist along a time track. And the direct control of this is our direct goal. And when a person can be controlled then he *can* control. And when he sees there is no two-way flow involved in it he's got it made. Therefore I think we're pretty much there, if I can articulate it to you as I have done this evening.

Thank you.

THE STABILITY OF SCIENTOLOGY

A lecture given on 23 July 1957

I don't know why it is but you all look brighter tonight.

Female voice: Good.

Oh, you took that as a compliment – that was because I had some auditing, not because you did.

And this is the seventh lecture of the 18th ACC, July 23, 1957. And we have to cover some very, very important material tonight having to do with auditing.

Auditing is a practice, not an art. Any objections? Psychotherapy in the past has always been an art. Definition of art: something about which nobody knows anything. Anything is an art which can't be defined.

Someday we'll tackle the field of aesthetics and after that, why, we will be able to practice aesthetics. Up to this time we're entrapped by them – we merely experience them.

The entirety of Scientology today so far as its practice is concerned could be considered to be a *fait accompli*, certainly a productive practice when done exactly as it is supposed to be done.

Now this doesn't say that there isn't a field of Scientology today that doesn't go up into the field and the high stratosphere, the ionosphere, the sunosphere of unknown. Because it definitely does. The unknown is still there. But where? Above Homo novis. And that's a pretty good place for it to be. From the grave – cheerful place, worms live there – to birth – there may be a few spots that aren't quite spotted, there might be a few places where you've been where I haven't. But wherever these are, I can assure you of this: we know how to handle them on a mest, human, *Homo sapiens* and even Homo novis level. We know how to handle these things.

Now wherever any subject achieves a high and invariable workability it achieves at the same time a stability. And the stability becomes an area of practice rather than speculation. We know certain things can occur if certain things are done.

Knew a cook once – she was a bride for many, many years. Every dish she did was experimental. And she hung on in agony expecting somebody sooner or later to praise a dinner. And one day it was discovered that she never followed the recipe she had executed before; she never cooked the same dish twice. Every dish she cooked was an experiment. And

this is adventurous but it didn't get many plaudits. Because one could say, „This dish has too much salt in it,“ but in view of the fact that the dish would never be cooked again nobody learned from that data at all. Well, I don't say this particular cook reformed. But I will say that had she discovered that certain people who ate regularly her dinners liked certain things or responded to certain things and if she'd cooked those same things with the same recipe every time, she would have had this tremendous reputation for being a cuisinarian expert. But this reputation she did not obtain and was still making bride's biscuits years after she was a bride. Never cooked the same biscuits by the same recipe.

Now, this is all very well and is undoubtedly adventurous. But it certainly leaves a lot wanting in a performance of an action. Now, nobody's trying to force people into being absolute, unquestioning – be questioning, the day you cease to be questioning you won't be here. Probably if you just stopped questioning you'd exteriorize too. But if you were extremely happy with a result, don't go around wondering how we got that result. Know how we got it; know it was so much baking powder and so much flour mixed up in such and such a way cooked in an oven of such and such a temperature. (Not a General Electric or Westinghouse electric oven; I'm talking about an oven. Even an old tortilla baker from down in the Mex border is better than one of these modern monsters. You turn on the heat and the thermostat is shifted; you know, it's terrific, but it doesn't cook biscuits. It does everything – it'll burn your hand, but it won't cook biscuits.) So, follow a recipe and you get a result. Well, you have the satisfaction of having gotten a result. I don't know what else one's working for unless the satisfaction of doing one's job well.

Of course there's the satisfaction of looking at brand-new horizons. But here is the catch in Scientology today: until you can look at any brand-new horizons you had better dog-gone well know how to make biscuits.

I love these speculative auditors who without knowing that space is the viewpoint of dimension, discover an eighth dimension and leave their pre-clear stuck in it.

In the first place, I don't think there's anything experimental that could be done today that has not been done in Dianetics or Scientology with the body, the mind of *Homo sapiens* and a fellow who could exteriorize and stay exteriorized. No greater ability than that, see. But if he could stay stably exteriorized up to that point, it's pretty well been done.

We have pulled the dead back from the between-lives area, much to their consternation. We have processed the Assumption out of babies before it was well implanted or even cool. We have processed all manner of *Homo sapiens* and even some beasts – other beasts, excuse me.

Homo sapiens, definition of, you know, is a beast who used to have a soul he took care of and sent to hell when he was sinful, but who has now forgotten that he had one. So he patronizes phrenology.

The thing here is that an individual to perceive has to be brought up to a certain level of perception, and I would say the base level from which perception could be engaged upon, above the level of *Homo novis*, would certainly be thetan exterior. Now from that point on I cannot tell you what there is to observe. And from that point on there is a great adventure, certainly. Probably many data that we have only guessed at are rather easily proven above this

level or disproven. Probably many abilities of a thetan which at this moment are only barely skimmed, you know, are not even – not even known, not even guessed at, would emerge. Tremendous numbers of things could happen above that level.

But it is well to understand that up to the level of pretty good shape and able to handle a body rather easily and handle other bodies rather easily, up to that point which is *the* outpost point, there are evidently no further outposts. That's a sad thing. It's a sad thing.

I remember back when Mary Sue and I were cooling our heated brains over E-Meters, pcs, we covered the whole track from one end to the other and left 99 and 9,999/10,000ths in restim. We found out that the same pattern of the mind was just more pattern and that any further advances on it consisted of just more of what we were already looking at. But we covered a lot of subjects which until very recently weren't at all known and which you haven't even had the benefit of information on.

But some of these subjects that we see as new today, why, she and I, working with an E-Meter back in 1951, 52, so forth, with pcs and so on, were actually cataloging phenomena.

How much phenomena was there?

Well I would say there isn't very much in the world of electrical phenomena that we haven't a good clue on. We might not know its exact map, but we have the clue. But this does not blind us to the fact that much phenomena lies way and far beyond, far, far, far, far, far beyond the world of space and electricity and matter and this continuum of incident known as time.

I would say offhand that anyone pretending that matter, energy, space and time as he knows it here in this universe and in his own mind at this time is all there is to know about this subject, I would say that that man was either a charlatan or a stupid jackass. In the first place, three-dimensional space is simply a simple space concept, and to say that there are no other space concepts would be about the same – saying as people who are crosseyed don't see double images. It's simply a phenomenon of perception; that is all this space is.

Energy could be conceived to be a phenomenon of belief. Mass could be said to be a phenomenon of experience.

I said advisedly that energy was a phenomenon of belief because I myself have never seen any independent of mass. And I don't think anybody else ever has either. They are still measuring electricity by magnetic effects, and nobody's ever seen any yet.

You could probably tell some scientists working on companies contracted to the AEC this and they would start to argue and they would probably flip – they'd probably spin in before dawn. Because they know basically this is true. And their stable data tells them that they are in a nonadventurous world up to the point where they begin to reach just about to the boundary and then they find that energy isn't energy anymore and mass isn't quite mass and nothing behaves unless you throw in a bunch of factors to make the equations balance. Their world of stability ends. So even in the science of physics there is a finite end to this matter, energy, space and time which we know is experience.

But here is the great oddity: to know matter, energy, space and time of this universe, one's fellows, the animal kingdom, in other words, the dynamics from top to bottom, is *not* to know *every* universe, *every* life form and *every* phenomenon which could exist. You understand that? Well, on that basis – that other universes of other patterns made out of other things in other ways and behaving on other stable data could exist. You understand that? And we don't know a blessed thing about them.

So before we get too proud with the stability of our subject we should glance upon the humbleness of the fact that all we know is this universe and all we know about any other universe is that it or they might exist. And it boils down to the fact that all we know in actuality is the way a thetan has behaved and reacted so as to culminate in this particular universe, the development of bodies, development of forms, practices, development of animal kingdom, all these various things. But in view of the fact that the remainder of the scientific world has not at any moment a millionth of the information we have, we can still boast a little. But only by comparison with a bunch of dumbbells.

So, when I tell you it's stable, I say its practice is stable. Stable where? Stable for *this* universe. Stable for what? *Homo sapiens*. Toward what goal? *Homo novis*, which is simply stable exterior without too much difficulty.

Don't for a moment exaggerate what you know, and don't for a moment minimize it. Don't do either one, but maintain a clear perspective. You can do what you can do if you do what can be done to accomplish it at this level, this universe, this time. And we have certain practices which I don't think will go out or blow up or disappear so long as there's a universe here. I don't see any way out except the simplicity of what we learn in such things as the TRs. I know that many, many years of a great deal of heated mental activity have given us no more than two or three dozen workable processes which could be counted upon to work under all circumstances. And I know enough about what has gone on before in this universe and enough about what man has responded to to be able to say rather didactically that there's not much chance of this changing.

But that doesn't say, one, that there's no chance of it improving. It can always improve, providing it improves simply. The way not to improve something is to get complicated. If any improvement is more complicated, gaze at it with at least a sneer held in reserve. Somebody says, „Well, we used to do it this way. We used to walk up a rug this way, you see; and now we have a better way of walking up a rug, you see, and it's this way.“ You say, „Oh. Oh, yeah?“

Somebody tells you there's a better way of running Confronting 0 – Training 0, Confronting. (Confronting 0 was the trick name of it originally.) There's a better way of running it. Instead of the auditor sitting in the chair and looking at the coach, what he actually does is lock his hands back of the chair and at each five-second interval, while confronting, he twitches his fingers and thus releases the nervous tension built up by the confrontingness. You say, „Oh, yeah! Yeah. Yeah. Yeah. Yeah.“ It isn't true. There's more to do and whenever there's more to do you should ask yourself whether or not that is the direction progress is made.

Once upon a time people thought they knew something about the universe. They thought they knew a lot about the universe. And then it became more and more complicated, and more and more complicated, and more and more complicated and all of a sudden it has become something that nobody could know anything about.

Well, isn't that remarkable. All he has to do is look at the walls, look up at the sky and count a few stars, he knows about all there is to know about the universe. I mean, that's it. It's basically a very simple subject. You walk across fields and you'll see different colored rocks. You take some ocean water and – or look in the mountains and you'll find different minerals of one kind or another. And you can tie up the color of the minerals with the color of the rocks if you want to. And you could have a good time. But at no time was it complicated until gold became some exact number of electrons spinning insanely around an exact number of protons, which is measured out in so many molecules of *whumph* and flunked in a chemistry test.

Right about then you should say, „Yeah, yeah, yeah, hm, hm, hm, hm, how very interesting!“

Now all that sort of thing does is to lead to greater change at a faster rate. You want to run fresh out of universe, just make enough of those changes. Get just enough chromium-plated Cadillacs that get up just close enough to the speed of the rotation of Earth so you always have high noon while driving – you've just about had it. The apparent distances of Earth will become zero.

Fly up to the sun for another tankful of plutonium and come back before breakfast, and the distance between here and the sun has become so small that you've just about run out of universe.

Get it fixed up so that you never have to look for a pretty girl. You drop two bits in a slot machine and a reasonable facsimile drops out. And you've damn well run out of universe.

There is a point where something passes a peak of advance, and that advance beyond that point is something like taking a three-layer chocolate cake and adding layers of chocolate to it. And you just put on more chocolate and more chocolate and more chocolate. And you'll find out proportionately you'll have less and less cake.

Well now, I do not pretend that all of the TRs or the CCH processes are there. I don't pretend they're all there. I don't pretend that you're holding in your hot little hand the final, complete rendition. That comes up in the Student Manual.

Now, the direction of change to be beneficial should be in the direction of simplicity. That is the direction of change. When a direction is in the direction of complexity it soon becomes individuated to such a degree that you lose it. It goes into the hands of a specialist. And you at length have a specialist on TR 4. He never heard of TR 0, 1, 2, 3 or 5, but does he know 4! And you lose the workable whole of the subject. Now here's why I tell you that we are at something like an optimum stability because we have a subject which is yet in a sufficient simplicity that any person with some study could grasp every facet of it. Now, do you understand that? Much more added to it will bring it into a category where the Director of Processing understands only processing; he can never train anybody. The Director of Training

understands only training and can never process anyone at all. You understand that? The entrance of the super-expert.

And right now, up till this time, Dianetics and Scientology, in spite of numerous changes, in spite of many, many investigations, has remained a subject which was capable of being embraced by one mind studying himself. That's quite remarkable. That's quite remarkable. Perhaps the whole field of science was that way once. Perhaps. It's very possible that it was if Scientology ever existed before. Because right now you have enough tools, enough axioms, enough material, in actuality, to be processed yourself up to a point where you could then follow again any track of investigation undertaken to this moment and advance your investigations beyond the point where they are now in certain definite directions.

Now you can take an old E-Meter, you can build one. They're simply a Wheatstone bridge in spite of the original manufacturer's nonsense. That's all they are, they're just a Wheatstone bridge. There's a few tricks in using them, but there's even been a book written on that, *Electropsychometry*. And with the aid of that and a preclear with fairly good visio who wasn't scared of getting into trouble with facsimiles, you could undoubtedly map the entirety of the genetic line. The entire map of the body from the moment when it arrived on Earth to now.

But I can tell you for sure that you would not find otherwise than that it arrived. It arrived on Earth. It didn't rise in seas of household ammonia. The genetic blueprint all the way along the line is fascinating to follow. Absolutely fascinating. This is a great study that will someday be undertaken, I am sure, but is within the capability of almost anyone in this room right at this moment.

Why?

Because the rules don't vary from anything we know. We have various ways of undertaking it which would be rather fabulous, such as Then and Now Solids. If you just ran Then and Now Solids on a person who kept it firmly in mind that he was his body, which I was running into this afternoon... My auditor was having a bad time with me this afternoon. I was a very bad preclear. I insisted on following some of the auditing commands and found out they couldn't be followed. It's embarrassing. I always follow the auditing command, however, no matter what it does to the auditor.

Now as we look across this vista called the genetic entity line we find all The Factors once more – The Factors, you know, technical piece of writing that belongs to us, man, and we'd find the Axioms and we would find all these various things. In other words, we could take one process on a person who is not too badly off or we could take a person who is very badly off and get him up to a point where he could run this one process and he could go back and then, fixated on the genetic entity line by agreement and constant command and so forth, he would then wind up with a complete map of it and he would be on top and in possession of all this information; even though it were not written down.

Sounds to me like an awful stable subject which will reextrapolate or regenerate itself. You could find this material all over again.

It's quite interesting sometimes to audit somebody who is green as can be, never heard of it before, a person who wasn't in too bad a condition, and Johnny-come-lately hasn't been crashed here on Earth any length of time at all – crawled out of his rocket, picked up an injured kid or a baby or something of the sort and says, „Where am I? I'll play at this game“ – blow him out of his head and all of a sudden have him sit there telling you all about the Axioms. You know, telling you the Axioms, one after another. He'll say, „These are the agreements that the universe is made out of.“ See? And he'll start chattering these things off. Quite remarkable.

But that actually is a tribute to accurate work, rather than something one would regard jealously saying, „Well he's evolving it all again, kill him!“ You know. That's the general scientific way of going about it. Somebody evolved the same formula, you generally have to have him shot or expelled or something. Liquidated I think they call it today in the American universities. Anyway... There are two universities today who aren't socialistic. There are two, so I couldn't say all universities, could I?

Anyway, they have a capability – these Axioms – also of evolving the remainder of the Axioms. So that you take a person and run him on some research process and all of a sudden he'll start to evolve the remainder of the Axioms from the one he was run on, which is quite amusing. I mean, they evolve themselves irrespective of the track.

I want to tell you tonight about two or three of these research practices. There are procedures which you should know about which may or may not have any therapeutic value. But they're certainly interesting. Now if you want to establish certain data, there are certain research procedures which can be run as long as the preclear can stand it, and you'll pick up the required data.

Now, one of those is very interesting, is you mock up something and give it the idea that... Now, the – the actual therapeutic value of this thing is negligible, I assure you. Because it's a games condition to end all games conditions. And the amount of havingness that you put up or mock up or do something with and so forth is not necessarily compensatory for the amount of bank disturbance which occurs. But it's interesting.

Now, if you mock up somebody and give him the idea that – anything – the agreement will either restimulate or the auditing command will run out. If there is an agreement of that nature on that case, then the agreement will come into restimulation of one kind or another and the preclear can tell you quite a bit about it. But if there is no agreement of that nature around, the auditing command runs out instead.

Now, it's already allowed that the fellow can do mock-ups, you see. And it's already allowed that if he does them he won't get into terrible restimulation. But „Mock up something and put into it the idea that _____“ will establish almost any control operation for what it is and get you the rest of the information connected with it, right out of the bank. Bang. Bang. Bang. Give you some sort of an idea.

Here's one. Let's take dialectic buffoonery, I think they call it. Mock up somebody and give him the idea that – you see, this is the games condition you're running – give him the idea that all thought comes from energy. And he'll very shortly tell you, well, that this is an operation to end all operations. And if you wanted to get somebody into *real* trouble all

you'd have to do is simply tell him and convince him that all thought came from energy and matter. „Oh,“ you'd say, „is that so?“

„Yeah,“ he says, „this is an old one. I know I – I got the idea this is very old. I mean, it's been done, it's been done – a lot of things.“

„All right,“ you say, „that's fine. Now mock up somebody and give him the idea that it's all been done before.“ These are simply dialectic materialism statements. There is no originality, all ideas come from force. I see by your faces that you're not too well aware of what this dialectic materialism is. It is a subject, it isn't just nonsense. Those are two of its premises. All right.

A fellow would start telling you about control operations and how these things could be used, and he'd give you an awful lot of stuff on this. It's all right, so the next one you'd say, „Well, mock up somebody and give him the idea that individuality is a sin.“ You know, the cult of the personality and other things that dialectic materialism comes down on with a thud.

Here we fed him three principal ideas out of a broadly understood subject. Now we take his answers and what he has to say about it and what he dreams up while this is being run on him and we put the rest of it down and we will have the practices of it and perhaps some of the things which eradicate it. Now if we keep this up on several people we will undoubtedly wind up with the answer to the eradication of the subject.

Now you got that as a research procedure?

One I have used. Quite interesting. It's a very reliable research procedure. You'll find out that their answers from person to person don't vary enough to bother with. You take the three pins, you see, out of dialectic materialism. Have them mock somebody up and give them the idea that, it puts certain things into restimulation in the bank, the rest of the material which has been known in past ages about this comes into your possession. So that's a fascinating thing to know, isn't it?

Now, Then and Now Solids has the power also of revealing considerable information concerning the subject of life – what has been done, what has been lived – but is not very good as a research procedure because it is too confoundedly therapeutic. Fellow doesn't introvert and figure-figure the way he does on this other one, see? It's too good for him. He gets terribly interested in having been a Roman senator. But that's a personal interest, isn't it? Terribly interested in cataloging just where he was during the great plague, but that is a personal subject. And the research subjects are generalized subjects, not particularized. So Then and Now Solids is not as good as this other one.

All right. All right. The E-Meter is a very, very good research instrument if you know how to use one and if you do not mistake your answers – quivers of the needle for answers when they are merely the fact that the fellow has started to get his – thigh has started itching.

The chap who used to make those things used to give us some interesting things. He had a one-handed electrode – this was never as good as an ordinary tin can, never as good as an ordinary tin can.

I have a vested interest in the E-Meter. Actually, every time the thing – every time I'd want something more workable, why, I'd get it simpler and more capable of registering, and then it'd drift for six months and get more complicated and unusable. And then I'd have to get a model which was more simple which could be used. And I think the final model that came out – 400 – 1 worked on one just the other day and was able finally by cutting off all – practically all of its dials and all of its lines and cutting a bunch of wires with pliers and so forth, I finally got it down to a point of where it would register a case, not passing cars. And it was quite workable after that.

Actually a Wheatstone bridge with a battery in it has only the liability of a comm lag. It takes it maybe a half *a* second to respond to the question you answered when they're battery, DC operated. So you ask the question and then the needle sits there for a half a second, maybe even a second, and *then* registers. Well, you in your swing on through questions and so forth may be thinking that's null and gone off to another question. The pc also, you think, might have thought of something else, and a doubt has been entered into it. So an AC meter is a better meter.

But the use of this thing is something I should give you for what it is worth in case you ever want to follow along some of these lines.

The way you set one of them. Regardless of what kind of a needle or dial the thing has, the preclear with his hands held evenly on the can gives the can a sudden, hard squeeze. See? Just a sudden, hard squeeze. The surge that should produce is one-third of the meter dial. Got that? Anything else is insufficiently correct – insufficiently accurate. If it is less than that, less than that one-third surge, you'll miss some. And if it's more than, you'll think everything is hot.

You've got to cut these things back in their reads so that they read intelligently, so that you can differentiate. And you want lots of things that might possibly flick or read just a little bit, you know, you want those to be just dead as doornails if you're doing research. You don't want that needle jumping at every flick that goes through the fellow's mind. You got the idea? You only want the big ones. You want the two-dial drops, the fifteen-dial drops. But neither do you want it so insensitive that it will fail to pick up what we call a theta bop.

Now a theta bop has become very interesting to us of recent times. It is a certain behavior of the E-Meter needle. It's a hunt. And it goes like this. And it's just that much dial, little tiny bit of dial, and the needle is unmistakably coming over this way and then it goes over and it hunts over on the other side and then – so on, and it's just bopping, bopping. And it just keeps bopping. And that means not a death as we thought it did originally but an exteriorization incident. An incident in which the preclear exteriorized is registered by a theta bop. And that's what that theta bop is.

There are some other characteristics. One is the totally stuck needle. (There aren't many of these characteristics, by the way: they're just the surge, the theta bop and the totally stuck needle. The only remarkable things so far as research is concerned.) The totally stuck needle gives you a case that's just off the bottom of the dial. You could actually hit him on the head, as I have done, with the side of your fist, you know, bang, with no registry on the dial, even though the dial is set on surge, one-third of a dial when you squeeze the cans.

Really. You know? I told him I was going to do it and I said, „All right, here we go now.“ *Pow*. No read. No read of any kind. Just *z-z-zit*. The man could have murdered somebody yesterday and he still wouldn't have gotten any read. That man is fixed against surprise and could be called a surprise-absorber. Nothing will bother him at all. He doesn't necessarily have criminal patterns or tendencies. But criminals also can have this reaction.

Criminals can also go all over the dial. Psychos can be totally stuck or so wild even while sitting still, you know, holding the cans, perfectly relaxed and so forth, and here goes the needle. And you just tune it down, tune it down, tune it down, tune it down until you finally get a reaction on some questions. You'll find that that again is answered by this one-third of the dial surge. But just sitting there quietly they're in total dispersal. And this other person sitting there quietly is in total freeze. Those manifestations are important to anyone doing research.

Well, you can swing on down the line, you can find out more doggone things in less time and put it down.

But here is the great oddity with the E-Meter today: we can run an engram up to a point where it is in full reality. And it's a technique which is quite valuable – it's terribly valuable. And in your forward career you will hear so much about this and you will do so much with this that you will be quite bemused by the fact that it went overlooked this long. Because it is the basic technique of control.

Now it would be one thing to sit there with the needle telling you everything, and if the preclear wasn't getting smarter and smarter and didn't know it himself and couldn't look at it and assist you very much – you would be groping. To a marked degree you'd be groping. There'd be much data that would remain unrevealed.

But you can take an E-Meter today and run the technique which I'm about to give you and actually have the preclear give you the rest of the story, even if he starts in with a circuitry don't-know at the beginning. In other words, you just spot something in terms of time; you spot the fact that it was 1162. Theta bop. He's evidently exteriorized. Magnitude of time – the manual on electropsychometry goes into all of this, by the way – you establish these moments by time. And we don't know what a galactic year is or something of the sort, but the – a thetan evidently does, only he doesn't let himself in on it. And let's say we found an incident with a theta bop in it where the person's evidently stuck in an exteriorized type of incident in 1162. Now before, the only thing we could have done was to have restimulated it and restimulated it one way or the other by questions until the person finally told us what he saw in the picture. That was Dianetics.

Now, let me show you the slight difference between Dianetics and Scientology and explain to you further why Scientology is a stability where Dianetics didn't have a prayer of being a stability. With this process you raise his recall to a point where he tells you – the fellow, you know, I mean the pc himself – where he tells you out of his recall and without the aid of pictures the rest of the incident. Got that? In other words, he gets it on a total reality, full recall basis.

Now, the E-Meter was always invalidative in the past. That is to say, your constant questions about which the preclear knew nothing and about which you seemed to know more and more, finally just drove him into the ground.

Well, what you do with one on research these days – you've all been – probably sat there being invalidated by the needle; it was talking about things you didn't have a clue of – well now, this process reverses that procedure. We find a theta bop at 1162. We've checked it by – we've asked the preclear, „Something bothering you?“ And he said, „I don't know.“ You say, „Well is there anything I should know about?“ And he has a slight drop. And we say, „Well, how long ago was it? A few years?“ and we get no reaction. We say, „Tens of years?“ We get no reaction. „Hundreds of years?“ We get a tremble.

So we say, „Well, was it five hundred years?“ And we get a little drop. And we say, „Was it more than five hundred?“ And we get quite a drop. And we say, „Less than five hundred?“ We get no drop. And we say, „Well is it around 750, is that about it?“ And we get a drop. And we say, „Well is it less than 750 or greater than 750?“ You know. And then get a drop. We're inspecting. Less than 750 is what gave us the drop. We say, „Well then, it's evidently 600 or thereabouts, is that right? More than 600? Less than 600?“ You get the idea? And we find out that it was 602 years ago, 1355. We say, „Is that the date, 1355?“ And it goes wham! wham!

„Well, where were you at that time?“

„*Ahwo.*“ Here we go. See?

All right. Now if we'd located it with that procedure, we would say, „Have you got a picture?“ And the preclear would say, „Well, yeah. I – picture. Doesn't mean anything to me. I mean, it's just – just a little old body lying there on the pavement. I mean, there's nothing to that. See it any day, you know, in the *Washington Post*, they publish dead bodies all the time.“ And this is the point where you would use this technique.

You would say, „What in that scene could you handle?“ And that picture will sort out and sort out and sort out and all of a sudden he will say, „Well yeah, my name was Kleine Schweinhund and we were raiding on the outside of a village just to the north of Rome and I never liked the centurion and he had me thrown in the clink. And I'd just gotten out and he was in a wine store and I remember there was – Tiberius was on one side of him and Maxim was on the other side of him and I didn't pay any attention to it; all I did was shoved a shiv in his back. And he was a member of the same legion and you know, I don't feel so good about that.“

„Well, what's this body?“

„Oh, well, that's just me.“ Well...

Anyway, right about that time if we kept this sort of thing up and didn't let him let the pictures get too automatic, you know, just shift over to other scenes and other things – we just held him there, because the shift is an avoidance of something in the scene, you see. We don't let them go up and down the track: we hold him on *that* picture, until it finally is in total recall. Every time he goes up the track he's running away from that picture. Every time he goes down the track he's running away from that picture. Don't you see? Until he can just put it

there, throw it away or put it there and throw it away, why, it's still got dynamite in it. Don't you see? And you can tell by his emotional reaction whether or not the thing is flat.

Well, in other words, from that point you could actually establish the customs, general orders, name, rank and serial number and anything else of that time and place with the greatest of ease. And furthermore, this has been done and it is of tremendous interest.

Now, what if the fellow running on the meter went up and into the future and started getting facsimiles of the future? Use the same process, „What is there in that scene that you could handle?“

Now, there's a variation, sometimes, evidently required in the question, and that is, „What in that scene could you have handled or could you handle?“ It's a double. See? „Could you handle? Could you have handled?“ There's a difference there you'll notice in running it.

And in the future it would be, „What could you – handled, or what will you be able to handle?“ Different.

And all of a sudden he'd say, „Well, poor old Earth, poor old Earth, the atomic termites finally got loose from the US Army Bacteriological and Insect Warfare Headquarters and they started eating all the paper and no government was possible.“

In other words, you have a great deal of knowledge at your tap and the E-Meter now ceases to be invalidative, because you easily recover any lost ground by the processing that you do.

Now, you could stick with the meter if you wanted to and still keep check on your pre-clear. You could keep checking it up. Might be an interesting thing to do. And when the theta bop is gone, why, the incident is pretty flat; he's onto other things and moving free on the track and you'll get other needle reactions.

It's a neat operation handling an E-Meter. It's a tremendous research instrument. Now what's interesting is that an E-Meter would also detect criminal practices or detect anything else. The E-Meter used by a Scientologist understanding it is undoubtedly – well, it's not even to be compared with a police lie detector. I mean that's in the kindergarten, buy-it-at-the-dime-store variety.

Every once in a while they run into a murder in a past life, you know. And they've got a criminal there and the criminal's sitting there with the – with the blood pressure and the breathing mechanism and all of the other... I don't know, they hang him up with tubes and space hats and things. And he's sitting there all wrapped up and getting blood poisoning from this and that, and they say to him, „Well, did you or did you not commit the murder?“ And then the – everything goes boom! You know. And the blood pressure goes up and the breathing goes uh-hu-uh-hu-uh-hu. And they say, „Well I guess we – guess he's guilty. Ha-ha-ha-ha-ha. Well, we got you now!“

I don't know, they never ask him when he killed somebody. Never ask him the fellow's name. Never ask him if it was a dog. They never get the gen, in other words. They aren't intelligent enough to know anything about this.

But you cannot operate a lie detector or a police lie detector accurately. They're about 15 percent completely inaccurate by police findings. So I don't know, they're 90 percent wrong probably.

When addressed to this, „Did you commit this crime?“ or „Did you speak to that person?“ the reaction is not reliable for the excellent reason that they never clear the auditing session because they don't know how to audit. It's an auditing instrument, the lie detector is. It is not a police instrument that's worth a nickel. And you have to hunt up and down and clear this thing any way from Sundays.

I know of an instance, once, where a person was asked if they had been misbehaving. You know? During a certain period of time. And the needle went, *plongo!* You know, and the person running it says, „Aha, I caught somebody; I caught somebody scarlet-handed right here. *Uh-huh-huh-huh-huh-huh-huh.*“ Only it wasn't misbehaving that the needle was reacting to: it was fear of punishment in case somebody thought – and this is the only thing that cleared the needle; needle kept reacting until this question was hit – fear of punishment in case it couldn't be proved to the person that behavior had been good. See? It was this complicated a reaction that was making the needle ping.

Before you monkey around with the mind, you should know something about the mind. And outside of Scientology they don't.

Well, anyhow, there's a research instrument. Well, there are research processes and research instruments and with these and with various techniques of this character the entirety of our present stability could be recovered. The one thing that probably couldn't be recovered easily would be the amount of technology which has been assembled, investigated and abandoned. And that piece of the work would probably have to be done all over again. Whether it is possible to do that or not I do not know. But it was trial and error, tremendous numbers of people and so on.

For instance, to find out how to train people – take seven years to find out how to train somebody in a subject is rather a critical thing to have happen to us. We should have been able to do it much faster than that. But if we think this is the case, look over the fact that the last 2,500 years of training have revealed no method which trained anybody. No methods.

In the absence of willingness, there are still no methods. And that's very accurate.

So it has to do with goals and willingness and still falls back to some degree on auditing. You'd have to make somebody willing to be trained before training would benefit him at all.

But we are nevertheless justified in this. If the subject were to be reconstructed again from scratch, it could be reconstructed fairly certainly with instruments such as the E-Meter and with auditing. In various ways you could get this whole assembly of knowledge together again. How long it would take I don't know. I couldn't guess at that. I think we've been going at breakneck speed to do it in seven years.

But it is itself, is all I'm trying to say. It is itself. It is a stability in that it could be re-extrapolated. It could be re-created. It could be gone over and put together again. And that is

important because it doesn't leave a lot of tag ends hanging out that there's no explanation for.

Now, there's one word I would give you of caution in practice. Don't do a thing unless you have some understanding of it. If you don't have an understanding of some of the things you are doing, then you certainly had better look it over from all sides. Because to learn something by rote, to learn something just because it is and to deny it your appreciation, by which I mean your ability to understand it, is not to have it at all.

Now the subject is there. It is a thing. On low – on its lower levels it is a stability. And being a stability at this time it is capable of being understood. There are lots of people who understand every quarter of it.

If you don't understand some quarter of what you are doing in the TRs, in the CCHs, in some of these others you could only be criticized if you didn't try to look at it again and so understand it better; and if you didn't ask anybody about it out of some misguided pride, you would be denying yourself a full knowledge of the subject.

Now that's what you're here to attain. That's what you're here to learn. You could extrapolate the entirety of this subject from one end to the other, put it back together again. Certainly it's an easy job to look over that part of the subject which is here and find out if you do understand why these TRs exist, why these processes exist, why we're doing what we're doing and how these various Axioms work, what the Code of a Scientologist is, why it is that way and what the Code of the auditor is and why it is that way.

If there are any blank spots here, now is the time to haul them out, take a look at them, and don't put it off till tomorrow if your Instructor's giving you something today that you don't understand: you look at it harder and understand it better and you will go out of here much, much wiser than you came in. And that's what we intend to have happen.

Thank you.

AUDITING STYLES

A lecture given on 24 July 1957

How are you this fine, beautiful, cool evening?

Audience voices: Dandy. Good.

Good.

And this is the eighth lecture of the 18th ACC. And this is July 24, 1957. Tonight I'm going to talk to you about styles of auditing. About time I did!

There are three auditing styles. The first, which we will not letter or number, is called Informal Auditing.

Informal Auditing – with no slur intended – that would be the kind of auditing done by a Book Auditor who had simply read something of the subject and plunged in. You know, it is still auditing; but you'd have to say that it was informal. He has not been trained to audit, he doesn't have any vast view of precision in the auditing, he sees no particular reason to maintain the auditing commands stable – no stability necessary. Duplication: he has – not impressed with that and so forth. Nevertheless, funny part of it is, this kind of auditing does get results and, therefore, we would have to dignify it with some kind of an appellation and that we would call Informal Auditing.

Then there is Formal Auditing. And this is that type of auditing which is done by a trained auditor, which pays attention to duplication, which handles the origins of the preclear, which gives the auditing command best calculated to handle the case at this particular time in the auditor's opinion and which carries on in such a wise as to permit two-way communication to as-is many of the preclear's problems and difficulties as they come up. Formal Auditing has a dependency upon two-way communication for its workability: it depends upon acknowledgment in order to sweep away many of the difficulties which the preclear has and depends as well upon a very high maintenance of ARC with the preclear, that he knows is being maintained; and quite in addition to this consults the power of choice of the preclear and increases it. That's Formal Auditing.

The next type is Tone 40 Auditing. And Tone 40 Auditing is of considerable interest to us because, although it is the highest toned auditing, it is preferably addressed to the lowest toned cases. The highest toned auditing – the lowest toned case. Now, Tone 40 Auditing will work on anyone. And one who becomes expert in Tone 40 Auditing will find that he will use his facility with attention – *intention* in his Formal Auditing, and that is as it should be. But Formal Auditing is not Tone 40 Auditing; and Tone 40 Auditing is not

Formal Auditing. It is itself. And the highest toned is used on the lowest toned case, preferably.

Now, does this mean that Tone 40 Auditing would only be used on a low-toned case? No. But it is the only thing which could get to a low-toned case. And we'll go into the anatomies of this later. Therefore, when faced with a comatose, psychotic, highly neurotic, or immature case, or an animal, you would have nothing – no choice in the matter: you would simply do very good Tone 40 Auditing.

Now, people as they come up the line, all the way on up respond very well to Tone 40 Auditing. There's no particular reason to say that it is *only* used on people who are completely missing from amongst us. But its greatest effectiveness is upon these cases; and it is the only known form of auditing which reaches them and, therefore, it has its proper bracket amongst such cases. And it has this to recommend it: run on a high case or a low case, it blows circuits out of the preclear that he himself has found difficult to handle.

But when you have no case but only circuits confronting you, you have no choice at all – you have to run Tone 40 Auditing. Tone 40 Auditing is why we can say we have gone all the way south.

But Formal Auditing is much faster than Tone 40 Auditing on cases above a certain point. It is faster because it uses the preclear's ability to as-is, under the artificial conditions of auditing, things which have been troubling him and which would continue to trouble him outside an auditing session. And so we get this two-way comm, understanding, acknowledgment, all combining to sweep away much of the difficulty and debris which have been bothering him.

Now, Formal Auditing combined with an excellent process would be the fastest means of handling any case above 2.0. That would be the fastest means of handling the case. It would not be faster to handle a case above 2.0 with Tone 40 Auditing. It would produce a different result, it would do different things, but it would not necessarily be faster. Don't you see?

Now, to understand this clearly is vitally necessary since people believe that Formal Auditing with acknowledgment, handling the origin of the preclear and so forth, is a sloppy Tone 40. It is not sloppy Tone 40 Auditing! It is itself and demands, if anything, greater ability on the part of the auditor and the handling of his tools than Tone 40 Auditing does. Particularly it demands of the auditor that he know his theory and be able to put it into practice. And when the preclear comes up with something, to put the exact adroit question to make him come up with a little more of it, to put in the exact adroit question that makes him come up with the rest of it, and then with a cheery „okay,“ to continue on with the session. The preclear saying, „What do you know! You know, that's right, I always have hated ducks. Yup, that's right. Yeah, we got someplace in this session. I found out I hated ducks. I didn't know it before.“ But whatever cognition he achieves, his knowingness is increased and because he's being rather permissively handled – only apparently, let me assure you – his power of choice is quite important.

Now, you should realize that below 2.0 there is no power of choice. You say, „Well, we should all be self-determined.“ Well, that's fine, that's fine. This is not the same statement as: „You should always consult with the preclear's self-determinism.“ It's not the same statement at all. Because below 2.0, you ask this succinct question: *What* self-determinism?

Well, I can tell you what his determinism is below 2.0 and that is why you can draw such a chart as the Chart of Human Evaluation. Zoom – draw it right across the boards. The reason for this is very easy to establish. It's a patterned determinism below 2.0, which has as its end product: „Give 'em things they can't handle and they'll become so engrossed with those that they'll never get to me!“ They are automatic mechanisms which have been developed on an identical pattern by everybody, because they were the exact things that could be handled least by other Homo sap. And those things which were *least* able to handle became, at each point of the Tone Scale as it descends, the pattern of that person's behavior. And when somebody finally does handle or invalidate a slightly higher level, they drop to an exact pattern lower level. And so you can draw people below 2.0 – whose only goal, by the way, is to be terrifically unpredictable; that's their fondest hope – people below 2.0 – that they will be totally unpredictable. They think that's the way to be and they develop this pattern which is totally predictable!

And the totality of the pattern is: here's something you or they can't handle! And this is so horrible, so terrible – or at covert hostility – so indirect, that nobody could handle it and, therefore, these people consider themselves safe. Safe as can be. There they sit in the middle of a bunch of precomputed experience which nobody could handle. And below 2.0 you never talk to the person, you just argue with one or another circuit. That's all. And these circuits can be the most confounded things. You get somebody in propitiation: „Oh, yes, I'm trying to get well. I'm trying to succeed all I can. And the auditing has done me a lot of good, lot of good, and of course my headaches are on stronger than they were at night and I'm not seeing very well now like I was before the session, but ah – but I know you're trying and it'll all get better, I... I know that.“ What can you do in the face of such a circuit? One: recognize it's a circuit. And two: use Tone 40 Auditing.

This is not a matter of judgment when you're using CCH. You can always start with CCH 0 or 1, as the case may be. If he's out of communication, you could always start with 1 – CCH 1 and proceed on up the line. And CCH 1 either won't succeed at all or it will blow his head off. And when you've gotten up to the ones which require a little bit of criteria or judgment on his part, such as Book Mimicry, you can always go back down to the bottom and go over it again to see if it's just a little more there. You can always do this circle on the lower CCH processes; and you would pick up any case there was and you wouldn't get any sleepers.

You know, you do get sleepers: person appears to be in good shape, they get perfect mock-ups; they're what we used to call the wide-open case; they – mock-ups are all perfect, they described everything perfectly – just nothing to it. And you just audit engrams and they didn't change and you audit more engrams and they didn't change and you audit more and more and more and *mmrrrrnnmmrrrr*. They were usually giving you this: „Yes, they're trying hard to get well“ and „they'd succeed if it wasn't for the number of blunders which you made in session,“ and so forth. Nothing was real to these people at all. Nothing could have handled them that we know about now except Tone 40 Auditing. You were just talking to a circuit; there was no preclear present. You'd have to wake up the preclear. Well, how would you do that?

Use the lower CCH processes with Tone 40 Auditing. Preclear says something, it has only one end in view: to give you something else you can't handle. That's the only goal,

something else you can't handle. You got that? Something else. And you kind of handle that a little bit, scares them to death, and they come up with something else you can't handle. And they'll finally get frantic in the number of „can't handles“ that they hand you one right after the other. You're validating circuits and we've known for years that you mustn't do that. Well, Tone 40 doesn't do that. It just takes it for granted that anything the preclear says is a circuit and skips it: says, „Well, here I am processing the preclear and I'm just going to process the preclear.“

Well, oddly enough, a thetan will respond to Tone 40 that won't respond to Tone 4.0. All right. So, we just process straight away up the line and you'll find out this person has all sorts of actions and reactions which are quite in the line of good progress. After a while they say, „Well, you don't want me to say anything. That's what it is. You just don't care what happens to me!“ Well, that's just another circuit.

Anybody who is in good shape should be able to stick his hand out. Anybody who's in good shape should be able to walk around the room by the hour touching walls. Anybody who's in good shape should be able to do Hand Mimicry extremely well. And anybody who's in good shape – and this in the first four steps of CCH is the killer – should be able to do Book Mimicry very well, without much stumble. And they can run up the line on these lower CCHs until they hit Book Mimicry – and here you're doing a more or less formal audit – and they'll fall all over themselves trying to make a duplication of the motion with that book! That is quite amazing. But that has happened to many of us and is simply a matter of sight-muscle coordination, which a person should be able to do. But this one in essence is a test of: how well coordinated *is* this fellow?

Well now, if somebody blows on Book Mimicry, you've almost had it because you would have to get ahold of the book and make – with his hand on it – make it do the duplication of the command which you just did, back and forth, back and forth. And that's the way you'd handle it until you considered it a little bit level, and then get him back there on Give Me Your Hand. (Which is not the auditing command, but is the name the process was known by originally.)

All right. An individual with excellent coordination – exterior – may also be unable to coordinate the body that well; he might not be that interested. It's quite interesting to notice that a thetan in terrific condition, just getting the idea that he might do something with the body, would present almost the same picture on Book Mimicry as a body-plus-thetan in mediumly awful condition. That's because you've called the body in as part of the process – the handling of the body is part of the process. All right. But anybody would fall through at that point and his willingness would become very apparent at that point. You see that? You find out that people are in pretty good shape if you went up the scale from CCH 1, 2, 3, get them into Book Mimicry, which sits at 4 now. And you'll find out this fellow will keep trying, try to get the coordination a little better, try to square it around a little better. Won't do him any harm. He'll get very interested in the process.

And you'll find somebody that just – you just were very careless in passing him up the line – will hit Book Mimicry and they will just say, „No!!!“ It is just too horrible to contem-

plate. Too horrible to contemplate. And you just know you went too fast and you pick it up at the bottom again and graduate it up to Book Mimicry.

But the first two: CCH 1, CCH 2, are definitely Tone 40 processes and must be run as Tone 40 processes and must not be run with Formal Auditing. See, they definitely are Tone 40 processes and they must be run that way. Now, some of the remaining steps also run as Tone 40 processes, but don't have to be; they also can be run as formal audited processes.

All right. Now. An auditor's power of choice, then, is present to a marked degree from CCH 3, Hand Space Mimicry, upwards – Tone 40 or not, as the case may be. But it's either Tone 40 *or* Formal. It is never a sloppy Tone 40. Never! And you don't Tone 40, Formal Auditing. They just don't cross. If your intention is good while you're doing Formal Auditing, you can say, „I am using Tone 40 intention.“ Well, that's very interesting too. Why aren't you using Tone 40 intention all the time? Your preclear will respond better if you use Tone 40 intention – respond much better. But it's Formal Auditing you're doing and the difference between the two is simply this – I'll describe these two auditing styles; we won't bother describing Informal Auditing – but the two auditing styles of Formal and Tone 40 can be described in this fashion: Tone 40, you might say, is between the thetan (who is being audited or who will discover after a while that he is being audited), and the auditor; and all else is considered circuitry. That's it. It just is, as far as the auditor's concerned.

Now, we get a process going and all of a sudden (Tone 40, you know, you're asking him for one of the body's hands and taking it and putting it back in his lap), you freeze the process. Give the command. You thank him for it and you retain hold of his hand and you say, „How are you doing?“ This, that, the other thing, so on, still holding on to his hand.

You say, „Aha! But you've lapsed into Formal Auditing.“

Oh no, you haven't. That's all for the auditor: he's simply trying to establish state of case. Now, naturally people can blow circuits and do all sorts of things while one of these freezes is going on. It'd be strange if they didn't. But it's not for the preclear – one of those freezes – it's all for the auditor. You understand that? All for the auditor. He wants to know where he is on the Know to Mystery Scale. He wants to know where the preclear's getting to. He wants to know what all that twitching in the preclear's left leg is all about. Just to find out if the preclear is changing or is moving in the session; that is what is desired. So give the command for the extension of the body's hand, take the preclear's body's hand, thank him. Without putting his hand back in his lap this time, ask him how he's doing and so forth. All we're trying to do is just that: just establish the state of case at that moment.

When we've established it, we couldn't care less about what else is happening. We might even spring a cognition, we might do anything in it; but it's all for the auditor – all for the auditor. We put his hand back in his lap and repeat the command and go on with the Tone 40. And the preclear says, „Well, I feel a little bit tired now,“ and we go on with the process. And the preclear says, „I have a pain back of my left ear that's killing me.“ And we go on with the process. You understand that?

Because we more or less determined that he would advance these things anyway to protect himself. He's just doing a protection mechanism where these things are walking forward on an automaticity of protection. And until we were very well assured that this preclear

was actually capable of some self-determinism and personally capable of some criteria of one kind or another about his life and what was going on would we, then, engage in Formal Auditing.

But we wouldn't then run CCH 1 or CCH 2. We would run some upper process and we would do it on a Formal Auditing basis. And when the preclear said, „Oh, wait – wait just a minute, I – huh-huh...“

You say, „What's going on?“

And he says, „Well, I just remembered. My father used to beat me three times a day and twice on Sundays. I never remembered that before.“

You say, „Well, you got a somatic that goes with it?“

And he says, „No. No. Yes! Yes, that's what that is. That's what that is. Yes.“

„Well,“ you say, „all right. Now, how are you doing now?“

And he says, „Oh, I feel a lot better.“

You say, „Fine. Thank you.“ And get on with the process. You see?

What'd you do? He said something, you answered him, you asked a question, you amplified what he said, you make him say a little bit more on it, you made him realize something about what he had said. In other words, you've fished a cognition. And you, having understood it thoroughly to your satisfaction and therefore his – which is very interesting because if you don't understand it to your satisfaction, why, you've never understood it to his; it's downright magical this particular fact – and then you sail on with your process, give him the great „Okay,“ and away we go!

Now, what if the preclear says, „I'm terribly tired now,“ and so on? Well, naturally, under Formal Auditing, we'd just knock off, wouldn't we? Because we're not enforcing auditing commands, are we? We'd continue. But, he'd never find out that it was over his dead body! Do you understand?

He said, „I'm awfully tired now.“

And you say, „Well, we have been sitting here for quite a while.“ It's a fact. „We have been sitting here for quite a while and we've got quite a little while to go.“ And he'd say, „Well, I guess we have.“

And you say, „Well, let's get on with it.“ It wouldn't [be] the way you'd handle it in Tone 40.

He'd say, „Well, I'm a little tired now.“

And you'd say, „Extend the body's hands into my hot paw.“ (Whatever auditing command you're using.)

Now, here's a vast difference. Here's a vast difference. It's a difference of understanding of people. And unless you understand that people lie below self-determinism and rise up into it, you would not understand that these two auditing styles are addressed to, really, two different states of case.

Now, the same case can be a different state of case. And what is absolutely wonderful to me is that many auditors never realize that a preclear changes. And I often wonder why in the name of common sense they're auditing him. He's changing all over the place. He's just change, change, change, change, and the auditor keeps on treating him at 1.1. Well, the auditor actually can slam him back down to 1.1 with very, very bad ARC. Fortunately, he can't slam him down there permanently again. It isn't in his power to do so. He'll knock him down there maybe just toward *him*, but the person will respond out in the environment at large. This is quite an interesting thing. We have to understand, one: that people can change, before we can audit.

Now we have a devil's own time – there's some old cult or another, they existed in the middle twentieth century, that insisted that nobody ever changed at all. And the funny part of it is, it's almost impossible to teach people of that belief how to audit. One, they couldn't possibly take it seriously because their stable datum is that no change is possible. So why should they audit anybody? Well, that is an extremity. That is an extremity: the person who just believes – by personal conviction, by training – that everybody remains the same no matter what happens. And now, that would be an extremity.

But there is this middle ground where, „Well, I know her, she's awful 1.1, she always has been 1.1 and she always will be 1.1,“ and yet the person has received auditing; they're probably now 1.5 and they'd bite your head off.

It's almost incredible that auditors will still run a comm lag on this, but they rather tend to. Even I find myself doing this occasionally. It's very difficult; if you're of the kind of temperament that must have everybody exactly characterized and pegged at all times, then you're sometimes uncomfortable in Scientology because you meet Joe and Joe is, oh wow! You know, he was one of these apathy cases and it was all sob when he got happy, you know; he'd cry, he'd come clear up to tears, you know. And you'd meet Joe, and you'd say, „Well, I know Joe.“

And one day somebody comes along and says, „Well, I was audited by Joe the other day, and I feel fine!“

You say, „What!“

And, „Yes. What's the matter with Joe?“

„Oh, I don't know. There's nothing the matter with Joe really. (Code of a Scientologist! Code of a Scientologist!) Are you sure you feel all right?“

Well, Joe got audited by somebody and Joe is now about 3.2. And you meet Joe and you say, „How's the weather out in your part of the world?“

And he says, „Well, it's probably going to have the usual spring weather.“

You've moved him up into conservatism, you know, and you say, „Can this be Joe!“ And you say, „Well, I should have Joe around here; he'll impress the public that I see and people come to the group and everything; he'll impress the public because we need a good, conservative member of staff.“ You know? And two months go by and you get ahold of Joe and he's running the group for you and everything else; and you stick your ear in one night to

find out how he's running the group and he's saying, „Boy! This is the dog-gonedest subject you ever had anything to do with! It's terrific!“ You know: adjectives, adjectives! Somebody got hold of him and processed him and he's up in enthusiasm. Just Scientologists aren't reliable, that's all; they keep getting better.

It's quite an interesting thing, though, that people continue to overlook this. Actually, they have tremendous background, backlog of experience that tells them that people remain the same, you see. Their mother never changed – not in all the years they knew her! But it's quite interesting that somebody can get a stamp on him that says 1.5, you know, or somebody gets a stamp on him that says 0.5, and people just stamp this on him, you know, and everybody agrees on it and you got a total group reality on the fact that this fellow is some below-2.0 tone. Everybody but the guy. He gets some auditing and even though he's doing well someplace or another, why, people tend to hang up on this one just a little bit. And it comes as quite a surprise and sometimes rather upsetting to find out the fellow's changed on the scale.

That's one of the – one of the things, by the way, that I have a little trouble with. I have a little trouble with that because broad judgment on a certain person is liable to hang up just because amongst many people you don't have as rapid communication *as* you do with one. You see? And a lot of people have the idea somebody's still hung up somewhere on the Tone Scale and it'll take them several weeks to find out this is no longer the case. And then they find out this is no longer the case and we have a different attitude toward the person. But during that period there, it's quite marvelous that the person has gotten into good enough shape to take the beating he gets. Because sometimes he does take a beating.

So anyhow, it's necessary to appreciate this fact that change occurs. And even more so today because change in CCH is more rapid than it used to be and a person can move out of these rather tenuously held – do you know it's awfully difficult these days – pardon me, it probably always was difficult to hold a low-toned position. They actually blow up quick. You hit them in the middle and they tend to explode and I don't know how one manages. It must be awfully uncomfortable. But before Scientology he was able to hold on to it quite easily and quite well; in spite of himself or anybody else he would just go on through life at this level and eventually sag down maybe half a point to grief or something like that, and finish his days as a weepy old man or something. But these rapid changes are discombobulating.

Now, I can tell you a process that will break somebody from a psychosis to a neurosis rather rapidly – if you can run it – providing he is actually holding on to some very strong psychosis. And that's one that you know well and which we know now as – you knew it for a long, long while. It's just ARC Straightwire, which is now a training drill. It's a fascinating process. But you get somebody who's spin-spin-spin and if you put the question to him and he does get the question and he does answer the question, he's liable to go click-click-click and he's just neurotic.

And I never used to give up a psycho as a bad job, way back in the old days. I would just never give them up. I would always keep asking this embarrassing question of auditors on staff and around in the field and so on when they tell me about this case they're having an awful lot of trouble with. I'd say, „Have you run ARC Straightwire on the person?“ (There

are some people here who've even heard me say that.) „Have you run ARC Straightwire on him?“ Way back when, you know.

And they'd say, „Well, no. It's almost impossible to get his attention that long.“

„Well, try it.“

We had one that was hanging around the Foundation. He'd been around the Foundation. He was from someplace way up north somewhere; and he'd been out on a lighthouse or on an iceberg on duty or something for years, and he was strictly spinny. Oh, he was awfully spinny. He just came in – he didn't walk, he pirouetted – and he came in and they audited this on him and they audited that on him and tried anything they could think of to audit on him and so on. And they – suddenly I noticed him one day in the shop and I said, „How long has he been around here?“ And somebody said, „He's been around here for several weeks. He's had quite a bit of auditing. There's several of the student auditors who have audited him and so forth, and nothing much seems to happen to him.“ And I said, „Well, that's very interesting.“ And I walked into the room where the fellow was sitting there and I just told him, I said, „Now, recall a time that's really real to you.“ You know? (*snap*) (*snap*) (*snap*) About five questions and he said, „Whoooo, where am I?“ That was the end of that case.

It wasn't because I was *that* good. I gave him his first smell of reality of the bank, don't you see? And that's how that old, creaky process used to work – and would work today.

Well, we've had for many years a process, which if you could get the question to him, would produce a rather phenomenal result when addressed to a psychosis. And this has always given me the idea that a psychosis is awfully frail. And of recent years, I've had the opinion that states below 2.0 were very frail: they broke up very fast. Well, what would cause this opinion?

These states are an assembly of circuits which have just one common denominator. And when you can get the common denominator of a lot of objects, you can handle all of them. And that common denominator is: you can't handle this and neither can I. Unhandleable manifestations. Well, naturally, we get the idea that these cases crack up fast to the degree that we can handle these manifestations. And when we get better and better and more and more practice and less and less dismayed by these horrible things that, oh, I don't know – well, you couldn't imagine a Scientology practitioner winding up in a spinbin from some auditing or something. I mean, it's pretty hard to figure out. You'd say, „Well, why didn't he go see a friend if he was feeling bad about it, or...?“ It'd be kind of unbelievable. You just wouldn't believe this easily.

Well, this is the first thing that is believed in psychiatry. „Well, I don't know, he's in there consulting every day – he'll be down in Ward Nine here in a couple of weeks!“ They believe this is going to happen. Why? Because these people are handling conditions which can't be handled by classifying the conditions which can't be handled. And this is their idea of handling the condition, is just to classify them. You'll see them all sit around and say, „Well, he's got Kraepelin's disease. Yes, that's right.“ „He's got Menninger meningitis.“ And they'll classify these various things of one kind or another, and this gives them some sort of an illusion of handling them. And then they notice one day that the fellow's still spinning. But

they've classified him! They put him in the schizophrenic category. And the fellow insists on spinning, so they say he's willful.

But when bluntly called upon to handle one of these they considered an unhandleable thing – and it does tend to kick them into the spinbin. I'm not running down psychiatry for a change; I'm just telling you about an accurate observation of this. And you look down into any sanitarium and you see somebody down walking in circles, well, it'd be a head nurse and you'll see somebody else walking in some other cell and that fellow, one time he was the head surgeon of the place, and so forth. In other words, they wind up in their own spinbin.

Now, Scientologists wouldn't do that. Not today. It just wouldn't happen – it's not thinkable. We find it a little bit difficult to understand, I'm sure, how they would wind up there and how they would give up that easily. Well, it is hard to explain unless you're content with this explanation, is: they Q-and-A with the circuit. And the circuit says, „It can't be handled,“ and they say they can't handle it. And if they can't handle it, therefore, it is more powerful than they are and they wind up in the condition that it says. So the circuit is boss.

Now, somebody the other day wrote a book on laughter, and he says that laughter is a complete and entire manifestation of neurosis and is nothing but neurosis and laughter is neurosis and people who laugh are indisputably neurotic and there's nothing can be done about it and it's all that bad over there. And he's written a whole book on it and he's proved it conclusively from beginning to end, totally overlooking the fact that the only psychotherapy which is reported in the Middle Ages was: get them to laugh! And he's criticized all the comics of the day and everything else. He laid it all out: „Well, one is nuts if he laughs.“

Well, let me assure you that laughter has been known to be therapeutic as long as man was. I get a bunch of guys together, go out sailing, something like that. The boat gets sopping wet and everything goes to the devil and you haven't anything to eat for a day or two and you finally drag up on the shore and get into the shelter from the storm and they sit there looking exhaust-edly, and the only real agreed-upon sign that is given that, „Well, it's all over and we're okay now,“ is they'll start laughing like hell. And I've seen people laugh like fools. How could we get into this much trouble – look at us! And the only thing with which they can reject all this is laughter. So their inability to laugh – if they are unable to laugh – is actually suppressing any release from the duress they have experienced. And this has been just known by man just for more years and decades than you could easily count.

And this fellow comes along and tells us, evidently with a straight face – and furthermore is given a full, great big page of review, very serious – and he says that it's neurotic! Well, that's wonderful because laughter is about the only thing that could handle most anything. Got it? It can handle most anything.

All right. So this guy has Qed-and-Aed with a circuit which says, „Laughter is bad“ so that the circuit can't be handled. And if you were reading the book, you would be reading nothing but a circuit. Furthermore, I'm sure the book reads that way. I'll have to get a copy – I'm sure it does. Something like Gertrude Stein's poetry, or something: „Is a girl, is a girl, is a girl, when I was a rose, oh thunder!“ Gertrude Steinian poetry.

But here is an example. An individual – I'm giving you this as a social example, I'm not trying to come down on psychiatry – here are these people who are totally confronted

with nobody-can-handle-its, see, and they go into the terrific duress of electric shock and knives and things that bore holes in the skulls and all sorts of things in some fantastic effort, even though they know none of these things do any good whatsoever. And they'll tell you they don't do any good for the patient. (And I think these things are mainly designed to give the psychiatrist a little relief.) But, you see, they get frantic with this situation.

Now, there'd be two ways they could handle this sort of thing. One would be simply to realize that it was something there which was not supposed to be handled. It was something that was not supposed to be understood, either, since understanding and handling come awfully close together. Remember I told you that your understanding of a psycho would be advanced if you realized that a psycho was being un-understandable. See? Now, you can understand something that is not understandable: well, that's psycho. Well, we just put our oar in here just a little bit deeper into this puddle and we find out there is something there which is a concise delineation and motto and that is simply this common denominator of all of these circuits and machinery and behaviors and so forth, is „You can't handle it.“ See? Not supposed to be handled. Nobody's supposed to be able to control, handle it or anything else. It's a total barrier.

Well, think of a bunch of fellows going up against that sort of thing professionally, one way or the other, and just describing what can't be handled all the time – doing nothing but that; they'd get swamped sooner or later, wouldn't they?

Well, there is a way to handle it. Many ways to handle it. Many, many, many ways to handle it in auditing today. But chief amongst those is bypass it.

Now, the mayor sends the cops. Right? The cop's a robot. You shoot a cop, you'll just have more cops. You got it? There's a cop, cop, more cops, more cops, more cops. They're robots, because nobody sent them – I mean, pardon me – the person who sent them can't be contacted. See, there's nobody there in authority while you're talking to a cop. Right? He's got his *orders* which came from Lord knows where. Well, you have a totality of handling cops if you start to handle cops. Got the idea? You just handle one cop, you get another cop. You handle that cop, you get another cop. Shoot another cop and you get some more cops. You get the idea? And then get the FBI in it and they want publicity. In other words, evidently the more cops that you would handle to get them out of the road, why, the more cops there would be. Don't you see? Well, the answer to it is to talk to the mayor. You could probably do something about the situation if you could talk to the mayor. You got that?

All right. Now, we get a situation here then where the person that needs auditing is the mayor. And if you audit the mayor, you don't get more mayors. In other words, there's a finite end to the situation. You audit the mayor, you got him. Then maybe he'll send his cops out and have them pick up cigarette butts or do something useful!

Now, the other part of the analogy is, is only those people who are weak or vicious – uniformly, routinely and always – use police. In other words, the more scared a person is, the more he would really try to get something to front for him. Wouldn't he? He himself couldn't front up to anything, so he'd get some employed force of some kind or another to front up for him; and he'd just get more and more people fronting up for him. But the weak, the very, very weak resort to police.

It would be a strange day when you would call for the cops to do anything. It's not any critical thing to call the cops, but at the same time it's not something you do every day. If somebody is parking in your driveway, why, you leave a note on the car or something. Or you let off his brake and let him slide into another car up front. In other words, you do something about it yourself.

But the very, very weak person wouldn't do that. He would go around and he would tell the cops. And the cops can then not tell you who sent them: they're not supposed to. And don't we get an interesting situation!

I'm putting it on a third dynamic level only for one reason: not because I hate cops – they're beneath my dignity – but simply to give you an analogy of what is happening with the thetan. He gets very, very weak and he sends out circuits. And the circuits are totally irresponsible. They are not what sent them out. And you can audit them and audit them and audit them and you'll get noplacement, noplacement, noplacement. And that was the basic secret behind validation of circuits. Do not validate circuits, remember? And you start talking to circuits and validating circuits, you just get more circuits. The thing to do is to go talk to the mayor. Got it?

So Tone 40 Auditing just bypasses all the cops and goes and talks to the mayor. You got the idea? No matter what the cops say, Tone 40 Auditing still talks to the mayor. Got it? Now, that is what happens.

Now, if you think a person is forevermore going to send out circuits to front for him, then you have actually invalidated the results of your own Tone 40 Auditing. Sooner or later the fellow woke up. As a matter of fact, as you run Tone 40 Auditing for the auditor's benefit – freezing the process every few commands – you'll find the fellow will go up from the *mystery*, right straight on up the line – up to *know*. He goes up rather rapidly. He comes *up* out of the subzero scale, he comes *up* to apathy. And sometimes if you don't check with him like this, you fail to note how he is arriving. And he comes up through apathy, he comes up through the minus Tone Scale in the misemotional band and he comes – starts coming on out the top.

Well, he still has things to handle. He has all the debris of all the things he mocked up that weren't to be handled. Don't you see? And there's tag ends of all of these things all over the place. And now he'll start cognizing on them, however, and he'll start mopping up. But he himself is now confronting life; and on that person you use Formal Auditing. That's the way it splits up.

Now, it's quite fascinating that this can be laid out this neatly. And it was just for this unit that I managed to get it laid out. Because it wasn't this neat just a few days ago. Because it hadn't been articulated: it was merely being done. There's a big jump between doing something and talking about what one is doing. Sometimes actors can act right up to the moment when you start to explain – or you ask them to explain acting; then they're liable to fall to pieces. I can get at any automobile driver that's got a lot on automatic out here and ask him how you drive and get him so he couldn't even start his motor. Just crack up the machinery a little bit by asking him to explain it.

So, between being able to do something observably, there's a little period of confusion ordinarily before you come out and are able to articulate it cleanly. And we've gone through that period: we've just passed through it with regard to these auditing styles.

Now, it actually doesn't require a great deal of judgment on the part of an auditor as to when to use what style. Because if he always started with CCH 1 and went up through 4 and then went back to CCH 1 again to find out how the fellow was doing on it, he would wind up with having mopped up the case – providing he didn't spend too confounded much time on every case doing this but only did it when he found it was necessary. And if the auditor kept checking up on the preclear – on how the preclear was doing – and by what the preclear was saying, evaluated his position on the Tone Scale and went on up the line. This is all almost routine. But an auditor could make a tremendous mistake by continuing Tone 40 Auditing to the end of time and never shifting off onto Formal Auditing at all. Because he'd deny the pre-clear the benefit of as-issness in two-way communication. An individual, then, would get ahead a lot faster if he was given Formal Auditing than Tone 40 Auditing, but would still progress. You get the idea?

Now, we face up to this: that there is probably a fourth auditing style. That style will be discovered when it is needful. That I am fairly sure. But I could adventure at this point to tell you kind of what it would be like. It would be nonverbal, totally exteriorized auditing. And they would have a very definite series of steps that should be accomplished while doing it. And I could just give you that nebulous a shape to it because, for sure, we have run into this horrible position: one, accurately and well applied, Tone 40 Auditing used with CCH lower steps, moves a person up to Formal Auditing, which when well applied, moves the person on up the line so rapidly that we have found that most of our auditing commands (as originally issued in the spring of 1957) are relatively unworkable after a period of time. They're insufficiently precise. So these have had to be reworked. Why?

Because an individual doesn't just blow out of his head, which anybody might do. He picks up an understanding of himself as himself rather rapidly and gets up to a point where people, who are rather routinely exterior, normally exist most of the time. In other words, we take this fellow who is dead in his head and slogged out and knows everybody is after him and carefully strains his coffee every morning and feeds some to the cat because the restaurant owner might be poisoning him, and we take this routine, ordinary, run-of-the-mill *Homo sapiens* and we move him up scale rather rapidly to a point where he will function well and do well and is a bit exterior. And we move him up to a point where it becomes inconceivable to him to be totally identified with a body and he doesn't see how this could work anyhow. And the auditing command right about that point – if it's wrong – becomes incomprehensible to him. Such a command as „Touch that wall“ is found to be unworkable. „Give me *your* hand“ is unworkable.

I can sit around all day and „Give me your hand,“ and you'd never pay me the favor of thanking me for it. And then you would say, „Well, I mean your body's hand.“ But you didn't say so and therefore I'd have to hold on to the beginning of the session throughout the remainder of the session in order to execute the auditing command. I'd have to say every time, „Oh, you mean – you mean give me that hand down there. All right. I'll lift the hand and give it to you.“ And many other commands are in this same category.

People move up top precisely, too swiftly under CCH to show that we can no longer afford to be totally hopeful. The auditing command must be terribly precise. Thus CCH as developed in the spring underwent some changes, and this ACC has catalyzed these changes and these changes are now being made in HCO Bulletins coming out on them and the CCH you see in the Student Manual is accurate and does express those changes. They are correct in the Student Manual which is published in the middle of '57 – being published right this minute. They're correct in it, but they're not correct on this unit's sheet.

But then it's about time you got over the fact that a command was a magic incantation, anyhow. You have to give the command which will run all the way. Well, in view of the fact that these auditing styles do pull a person up all the way, then, I can tell you that if this alters the precision of command and demands a much higher precision of command, it will someday demand, for an all-the-way-north case, a highly precise type of auditing for the all-the-way, almost all-the-way-north case. And what kind of auditing will that be?

Well, I'll just tell you it will be a nonverbal auditing of some kind or another, not necessarily a non-MEST auditing but certainly a nonverbal auditing. It'll probably have different types of communication; we'll probably have training drills that teach you to do more than squeak while out of your head; there'll be other ramifications to it. But the day has not arrived when we either have it or need it particularly. And we will just let it come about in the course of events.

To bring a case from all-the-way-south up to Homo novis, comfortably exteriorized, it is only necessary to know Tone 40 Auditing and Formal Auditing.

And the only thing I wish to tell you here in this lecture is don't confuse the two. They are definitely, immensely different, one from the other. If you use Tone 40 intention while doing Formal Auditing you are not doing Tone 40 Auditing. Please, please understand that.

The two auditing styles are actually quite simple. Tone 40 Auditing is taught in the Upper Indoc and CCH A unit. Formal Auditing is taught in the Comm Course and CCH B unit.

And you're learning in this ACC unit two auditing styles. Please take them apart, examine them, look at them very carefully, understand them and use them well. Because you will need both of them to get anyplace with a preclear today.

Thank you.

THE MIND: ITS STRUCTURE IN RELATION TO THETAN AND MEST

A lecture given on 26 July 1957

It's a real good thing you're here tonight. We're going to talk about Technique Zed.

Audience: No!

Everybody that's been in an ACC knows about Technique Zed, but it's Technique Zed that we always talk about when they're absent; and we always tell them when they're absent that we have just discussed Technique Zed and so on. This leaves them well up in the air, you see? Well, Susie was absent the other night, so I told her, „Good heavens, you've missed Technique Zed.“ And in all seriousness she came into the Instructor's conference and she says, „Quick, tell me what Technique Zed is!“ She fell for it, hook, line and sinker. But there really is a Technique Zed.

Tonight we have some interesting material for a change. I notice people trying to hold their hearts and so forth.

This is the tenth lecture of the 18th ACC, July 26, 1957. Come up to present time. Anybody hearing this on the tape will have to go back, won't they? Well now, that's the subject of the lecture tonight. The anatomy of the mind of Homo G. Sap.

Picanthropus erectus didn't have any trouble with the mind; he only had trouble with teeth. But when his teeth receded sufficiently to get these teeth confused with the mind, he thereafter started biting himself with something he called a mind.

There were some old witch doctors back along the line; I knew one of them, a lazy, no-good dog he was, but he actually did have something – to be technical – did have something on the ball. He used to lie up on a rock. And when the sun was shining he'd lie on this big flat rock and watch everything that was going on down in the caves, you see? And he had a couple of boys that had been orphaned by too fast a spring by cave wolves and saber-toothed tigers and so forth – and he had these two boys and they'd run around and he had trained them to listen very, very well. And everything they heard they brought back to him; and then he would have seering sessions in which he would sear the people good and plenty, castigate them for all the things they'd been doing wrong and they would not know at all how

he came by this information. But he had to have a solution before he could do this. He had to have the solution to this problem: how can we make people retain guilt?

In other words, before it did him any good to pick up these bits and pieces, he had to get people to retain guilt so they would thereafter be reminded and would walk the straight and narrow and would not forget to leave the haunch of venison on his rock. Very interesting.

Talking to him one day – has an office on Park Avenue – and he told me that this whole subject of guilt was a very engrossing one. In fact, it was all there was to psychotherapy. Guilt. And in a session whereby you were „psychotherapeuting,“ all you had to do was pretend to plow up guilt and thus get people in the frame of mind that they could feel guilt, and they would separate with a lot of gelt. Actually, his tactics hadn't varied at all over a great period of time, even though he was now on Park Avenue.

So let's begin at the beginning, and let me show you that guilt has nothing to do with it. Guilt has nothing to do with it. Memory does. That memory which makes a person feel guilty is simply an inflowing memory which he cannot confront. That's all there is to guilt.

Well, we've polished off Freud's psychotherapy and the rest of the things. What else will we talk about tonight?

Oh, if you think it over very carefully that is it, see: an inflowing energy that one cannot confront, you see, and that would be guilt. Now, if you restimulate this, the individual keeps getting inflows that he can't confront and he goes on feeling guiltier and guiltier and guiltier the more we talk to him about guilt and the more we look for this thing called guilt, right? The more we look for this thing, the more we restimulate these inflows, because the guilt ain't. See, that's just another consideration. It isn't. Guilt isn't. And when you search for something which is not, what do you get? You get a lot of things which are not, and none of them are the correct not, and all these things together form a very large knot. And this is what is called the human mind, and which man wrestled with there back in the Dark Ages; way back, way back in the, I think, twentieth – twentieth century, if my memory fails me.

Anyway, the mind has been very, very engrossing mainly because it is the primary control mechanism by which men seek to control men. And when they go all out, when they go all out on control, then they start fouling up people's minds any way they can think of.

Now, if you wish to bring any release to this situation, or any freedom to it at all, you actually have to go into the business of freeing minds. Because all abilities, capabilities, physical energies and everything else depend upon this thing called a mind, which has a high monitoring value, or had, on *Homo sapiens*.

Individual feels down today, he feels upset, nothing is happening – today is like yesterday, as far as present time is concerned, but some other factor or influence enters in.

Now, we could go so far as to say we don't even know if there is such a thing as bacteria, but we'll give people the benefit of the doubt and say, „Well, there is such a thing as bacteria that is itself not generated by the body.“ The body, you see, can generate bacteria and can generate bacteria of very many types and classes, all of which are tremendously fascinating – which can even be viewed under microscopes. And I think this is very smart of bodies to be able to do this.

But bacteriology, a subject which was discovered to save the French wine industry, would have had people believe that these things somehow or another floated through the air in some fashion. And of course you can grab a bunch of spores out of the atmosphere and plant them and things grow, but there is no complete proof of this transfer as such. Now, as soon as I tell you about this, this whole subject of bacteria starts folding up on you and it's very unsettling. And if a bacteriologist was listening, he would be more surprised than you, because he doesn't know this. Why do they believe that injecting somebody with some germs or blowing them into his nose or something like that causes these germs then to breed, as such? „Well,“ you say, „well, they make cultures of these germs and they pour them in.“ That only proves that germs grow; it doesn't prove that they breed.

I'm not dragging a long point here. You can produce various phenomena with cells and small animal organisms and so on. You can do some wonderful things, but I don't know that any of these diseases are done by any of these germ strains. I'm not sure of that at all. And I think the only reason anybody else pretends he is sure of it, is he's got to have *some* explanation. And you can mock up the whole concatenation of logic and rationale of bacteriology and you can wind up with some of the most beautiful results and gorgeous experiments that you ever cared to inspect, so long as you don't enter this particular datum: the body itself is capable of generating bacteria.

Oh, you don't believe this, huh? You don't believe this.

Well, it can generate any kind of bacteria you ever heard of, totally independent of any other kind of bacteria it ever heard of. What's the proof of this?

All right. Shoot a man in a nice aseptic sand, totally purified area in Arizona. Hot day, you see? You have him fall in the middle of this totally purified plot, but the sun is shining brightly. And I assure you that this fellow will putrefy.

Now, very few people have conducted this experiment. But it's a logical experiment to conduct. The body can, when it wishes to get rid of some excess part, generate putrefaction, which is to say, a conversion of parts into pus-like matter. Well, you can do other things to the body and cause it to generate other things, all of them more or less in the direction of putrefaction. The body can putrefy itself. Well, if it can putrefy itself it can obviously mock up bacteria, all on its little old lonesome. And if it can do that, then we have to ask the question: is it then possible for it to mock up everything else whenever set an example?

When set a proper example of tuberculoses, will it then generate tuber-culouses? Is it the tuberculi which generate tuberculi, or can the body counterfeit tuberculi? Well, that line of questioning and that pursuit is – not been adequately followed at all. There – we would find then that very probably many diseases, if not all diseases, were autogeneric. Set a proper example, the body goes on and does them.

Well, the only thing that opens this up – is because Dianetics and Scientology have presented too many examples of diseases that just went *pfft!* And the auditor wasn't auditing the bacteria. Let me point that out to you. He was not auditing the bacteria and yet the disease vanished. Well, he was auditing the person. Well then is it possible that a person generates diseases, completely irrespective of the body? Is this amongst the capabilities of life forms? Well, it evidently is.

A live being is capable of generating destructive measures. We have to assume that. And a little inspection of life, if anybody ever got out and looked at it – and they didn't there in the twentieth century. Most of the people in, practically, early part of the twentieth century, never looked at life. But if you go out and look at life rather directly, you will find all around that life generates, amongst other things, destructive methods, destructive measures, destructive procedures of one kind or another. We go around and look in a city where they have a – had a slum of one kind or another and we find the contractors there busy tearing up slum dwellings – they're going to build an apartment house. Well, life has to destroy in order to build on that site, according to the postulate. They just were very backward in those days and they had to do everything according to the mest universe laws. And what is this all about, then? I mean that if life – why do we balk at this idea that a live form can generate a destructive measure or method? Well, it obviously can. It obviously can. And this trick of putrefaction is just a trick of getting rid of a body which would otherwise lie around and clutter up the streets.

Somebody calculated one time that the forests of the world, were there no dry rot or other wood-destroying measures – we won't say bacteria because we don't know that's there, but we do know that the wood-destroying measures and methods are there – somebody has said that the world would be about a hundred feet deep in undecayed timber if no termites or anything ever came along and chewed it up. Clearing away the debris is evidently one of the methods of life, and clearing away debris is rather easily done with bacterial means, if you want to call it that.

In other words, life does not only mock up life, it mocks up death. And in view of the fact that life, a living being – by which we mean a thetan – cannot die, it's very obvious that death is some kind of a consideration or another that is simply mocked up and whammed into something. It's an agreement of some kind or another. It's an agreement based on: „I've gotten tired pushing this mock-up around – I think I'll get another one.“

All right. The methods of getting rid of the old mock-up also include destructive measures. Well, destruction is normally chaotic. Chaos, destruction – these things go rather hand in glove. These are quite similar phenomena-chaos, destruction, confusion, that sort of thing. You surround a human being with enough confusion for a while and he has a tendency to sort of go to pieces. We've all observed this. You take soldiers in battle and that sort of thing, they have a tendency to age enormously. For instance at Dunkirk, the evacuation of troops from the Dunkirk beaches found amongst them many young men who had become gray haired overnight.

Well, Dianetics and Scientology had another look at this and found out that this destructive impulse, just as such, was reversible – you could take care of the thing and many people who have gotten gray haired, under auditing have had their hair turn back to its natural color. This has happened many times. Matter of fact Susie gets a kick out of me. She can normally tell when I've been working too hard or something of this sort because the gray in my sideburns goes up and down like tide, having nothing to do with the growing of hair. The hair doesn't wait to grow, you see? It's just a straight, outright mock-up. And my hair'll be gray way up into the hairline very far and then I'll get a couple of days rest and it won't be gray and it's very silly. Well, when I got away from corvettes in World War II, I had gray

hair. Well, we've many times reversed this process in preclears. We sometimes don't do it with great certainty. Sometimes we set out to give somebody brown hair who now has gray hair and reverse the thing. And we very seldom wind up with a redhead but we may not be totally successful in this. Well, why wouldn't we be totally successful in this? Well, something has something to do with this and that's all I'm getting around to.

Medicine had the idea that structure monitored function at all times. That's their basic teaching. When you're talking to somebody in medicine you're sometimes talking at cross purposes because he doesn't understand this primary thing. I remember in Kansas City I was giving some lectures, a medical doctor came up to me and he said, „Even though I have to unlearn my basic principles in medicine, I'm going to. You've sold me on the idea that something else is possible.“ And I said, „What do you mean by the basic principles?“ And he said, „Well, I was educated in medical school and ever since that structure monitors function.“ In other words, the body would monitor the mind. Fellow is [un]happy when he doesn't feel well; therefore you cure the body and the mind is better. And he said, „Now according to you this is reversed and you say that function monitors structure.“ Well, that's a fair statement of it, but not a totally accurate one.

The actual statement is this: life monitors structure. And naturally there's an interchange between the two, so to some degree, structure monitors life. Got that? Well now, if you take life on an Axiom 1 basis, and 2, you will discover then that there's an interchange between matter, energy, space and time, and this timeless being – this timeless living being. There is an interchange between the two. So we're not going to be very definite anymore and say totally that function monitors structure. We're going to say that structure can be clarified through life. In other words, you can handle structure via life. And you can also handle life, until it gets wise, via structure. In other words, structure can monitor livingness, and life can monitor living-ness and you have an interchange of livingness when these two things are together. Right?

Well, what's in between them? There must be some gradient scale of a solid gold brick and a massless being. Yes, it's a gradient scale of matter, energy, space and even time. And that interconnecting link by which life handles small energies and thus handles larger and larger and larger energies and thereby gets a gradient scale of response, we call the mind. And this mind is capable as it is energized by a thetan or as it is monitored by structure (see, it can be handled either way – life on one side, structure on the other side, mind in the middle) why, it is capable of anything that life could do or anything that structure could do. See, it's a sort of a mystery sandwich. Well the meat, the mystery meat, actually was the mind; and an understanding therefore of this interlink, on a totally functional, structural, mechanical, draw-a-map-of-it basis, is absolutely necessary to a living being who is trying to live. If he's got a missing link in there that is a total mystery to him called the mind, he's going to be at best poorly oriented. He doesn't know how he's connected to that stuff, how he's connected to mest. He doesn't know what keeps dragging *him* along the time track. He doesn't know why he's there; he gets very confused.

Now, there's another scale called the Curiosity, Desire, Enforce, Inhibit Scale – the CDEI Scale – and this scale is one of the more interesting scales because it tells us the cycle

of response to havingness. One first is – it's also a cycle of response to a lot of other things, but particularly it matches up with the Havingness Scale.

A person is curious about something, then he desires it and then an enforcement to have it occurs, which winds up with his not wanting anything to do with it and being stuck with it.

A fellow will listen to a sales talk – he's got a 1938 Ford and nobody will buy it off of him and he – you keep asking him, „Why don't you just run it off the road someplace and forget about it?“ And he says, no, he can't do that and there's no sale for them these days and he goes on and on like this and he just can't get rid of this car. Well, to some degree he's stuck to the car. What stuck him to the car? Actually all the experiences he's had with the car. Call it nostalgia or anything of the sort. Now, he's gotten down to a point of where he doesn't want the confounded car and he can't get rid of it. And this is the „I“ point of the line-inhibit.

All right. This tells you that there must have been a CDEI on this thing called the mind, this interconnecting link between structure and life. There must have been a CDEI.

Now, we can theorize in many ways as to the creation of the mind, but that would be theory. We are much more interested in the workabilities of this. Of what is the mind composed? Well listen, after this midpart of the twentieth century, don't let anybody push you around into believing it's composed of impulses or repressions or guilt or something – you know, a bunch of considerations. Because the thing – anybody stating it like that is simply saying he doesn't know a blasted thing that he's talking about. Of course a mind contains thought. That's very obvious, isn't it? In other words, there'd be more stored thought as it comes up toward life than there would be mass in it, right? Well, it's got thought in it. Why then give these thoughts a bunch of control designations? Somebody could say it has reverence in it; it has – “A man is no good if he is not reverent.“ „A man is no good unless he can experience guilt.“ „You must be able to apply yourself so that you will think the right thoughts.“ Oh, balderdash.

Let's not characterize the mind in such particularized control terms. Let's just say from the point of livingness as we proceed towards structure, the first entrance in is thought – thinkingness. And as the thinkingness gets more and more fixed and solid, we eventually come to the first points of energy, nebulous little bits and parts of energy, and then this goes over into more and more solid masses and when we have a fairly solid mass with – like a mental image picture which contains a lot of significance, we have just about got the middle ground.

Now, that's a facsimile. We call it a facsimile – mental image picture. We have had to make up our own terms for these things merely because man had never noticed them. He had never thought it worthwhile to look at this; he was too interested in a bunch of control mechanisms.

Now, the mental image picture has been mentioned in literature many times, but the anatomy of it never included the fact that it *was*. People thought they saw these things. People imagined. One line I quote directly out of a very old textbook, about 1949 I think, something like that – December 49. This textbook, by the way, came off of the American Book Company lines, the last volume of that text came off the lines immediately before the first volume

of Dianetics: The Modern Science of Mental Health rolled off the book rollers. It was very funny; here was a psychology textbook – I beg your pardon, I – it wasn't a psychology textbook, it was published by the University of Illinois; I don't know what they teach out there. Anyway, just as this last copy rolled off, I was standing right there and the people of the American Book Company were showing me what a beautiful, fast job they were doing on my book. They were being very nice about it. And I saw these blue books coming through the rollers and I picked one off the line rather loosely and looked at it. And so help me, it was the basic textbook of psychology, or whatever it was – of the mind, of the University of Illinois. And it was rolling right along and the last of these went off the line, *clunkety-clunk*, and the first of my book appeared, *clunkety-clunk*. And as the first copy of my book rolled off the rollers, it knocked the last copy of that book on the floor. So I picked up the blue book and I said to the fellow, I said, „Can I have this copy?“ and he said yes; as a matter of fact it used to be in the old Foundation libraries.

But anyway, this book – this book was very nebulous about all this, but I quote all it said about mental image pictures: „Very often, small children and morons think they see pictures.“ End of observation. They think they see pictures. Well, I don't know what people think's biting them when they've got a nice big juicy facsimile hanging around their ear giving them an awful earache, but it certainly isn't something they *think* is there! It's there. It is.

In other words, we first have to grant isness to the mind before we can recognize any part of it. It is. Just as much as mass in the solid form is. Isness. We have to say it is. Not somebody thinks it is, or dreams up these things or something of the sort. We have to recognize that it's there. Now, if you're going to repair a radio set, you're not going to get anywhere handling one that is not on the bench, that you just think is there. You'd be balmy. You'd be utterly nutty. If the little boys in white suits came by with their butterfly nets, you'd go; you'd be standing there at the radio bench repairing thin air. Screwdriver, you know, and pliers and soldering, you know, and so forth. And wouldn't be a thing in sight. And the little boys in the white suits would definitely break out their butterfly nets and you'd have had it. In other words, people that try to repair things that aren't there are crazy, aren't they?

You got it?

Audience: Yes.

So if the human mind didn't exist and had no anatomy and had no mass and wasn't in any way, shape or form, anybody that repaired it, before Dianetics, must have been nuts. Isn't that right? And they were. Naturally. You start to look at something to which you're granting no isness at all, you're trying to look at something and all the time saying it isn't, you wind up in an awful state, right?

Well, now we see this mistake being pulled on the walls. People go around all the time and they're saying, „Well-1-1-1, it's not very real-1-1, but... It really isn't there, but...“ you know. You know, they walk down the street and the sidewalk isn't there and one day they get hit by a taxicab that isn't there and they lug them off to the hospital and sort them into the assorted parts bin.

Now, here we have, then, a very fine example of what not to do. If you're examining something, why, grant it some isness. Now, science learned this trick in the material world a

long time ago. They learned this quite well. They said if there's a ghost knocking on the windowpane, there *is* something there. And that actually is the basis of all physical sciences which have been with us now for a couple, three hundred years. All right. If something is knocking on the windowpane, it is there.

Now, they went whole-hog and they said there is no such thing as a ghost. This is an unwarranted assumption. I could say easily that scientists very seldom see well enough to see ghosts. When I first heard that ghosts didn't exist in this century and place, I wondered if I'd gotten the wrong address. I felt awfully invalidated. And everybody was telling me when ghosts did exist, that they were very afraid of them. Invalidate, invalidate, invalidate. But science tells us that if something is knocking on the window, there is something knocking on the window, that it is done by physical means. Now, stage magicians, which in other times didn't have to resort to these physical means, were forced by this to actually practice entirely with physical means. But it still is a fact that even in stage magic, or ancient magic, that if something happened, there was something there, don't you see? And when there is something there and you say there is nothing there, you're either being crazy or just hopeful.

Now, the study of the mind then must have been very vastly impeded by an unwillingness to grant beingness to structure. And it worked this way: people who became incapable of seeing that wall, looking more shortly, thought they saw something and then tried to disprove it and that was the only basic information we had on the mind. It had to be a good, straight look. We had to look at the mind and we had to say, „What's there?“

Well, all kinds of things are there. These mental image pictures are there, and the – you might say, the machinery that handles them, the cross-interlocks of pictures of one kind or another, the various basic mechanisms of structure in vignette. We see the physical universe out here big and bold, and then shut our eyes and we see a picture of the physical universe. Well, that isn't any decay of vision or other things I've heard it called – I think „optical persistence“ is its name. It's not optical persistent, it is a picture of the wall. And if you were to measure the exact mass of the picture, you would find out that it did have a tiny little bit of mass. It was a thing.

All right. We found out then, about the mind, that it did have structure. And for somebody to say, „Well, the mind is function and structure is structure,“ is a misnomer. Houses have carpentry work in them. Houses have beams and two-by-fours and eight-by-sixes and so forth, don't they? Well, so does the mind; so does the mind – except they're interlocks of pictures of one kind or another. Some are on the massive side, some are on the very, very light side. These pictures have thought in them. It is easier to associate a picture with thought than it is with mass, to tell you the truth, because they're closer to thought than mass, when they are closer. But on the lower end of the spectrum it is easier to associate some pictures people are dragging around with the structure end of the thing.

Well now, when one of these lower ones gets into restimulation, moves itself off of its assigned place on the time track and snaps against somebody's nose, his nose hurts – and that is the final test of it. You hit somebody with a two-by-four and he'll get a bump on the head. You hit somebody with a mental image picture and he will get the bumps indicated in it. It says you get eight bumps out of this picture, you slap it against him, he'll at least get seven.

I remember when Dianetics first came out, I received a tremendous number of letters. I haven't received too many letters quoting on this same phenomena since. But for some reason or other, people were obsessed for a couple of years with throwing their wives into measles engrams and then taking them to doctors who would then say, „Your wife, I would say, had the measles except there is no respiratory congestion.“ Had all the spots, had the fever, had everything else and it'd be a case of measles that lasted about three days. A fellow would hear about the time track, he'd decide well, the proper place for a wife of course is in a measles engram if they exist. And he'd shoot the girl down into a measles engram, the spots would turn on, fever would go up and it never occurred to the silly bloke to run the rest of the engram through like it said in the book. He'd lug her off to an MD who would diagnose it as measles without any germs or respiratory difficulties.

Well, what had he done, in essence? He'd taken the pictures made by the girl when she was a little girl having measles and he'd taken these pictures and he'd simply splashed them up against the modern body. That's all that happened. And when this juxtaposition of space between present time and the old picture was made, the body – call it structure – reacted to the content of the picture, just as easy as that.

Now, in view of the fact that people live many wild, wide and variegated ways and they have tremendous numbers of very interesting experience – except mostly what gets wrong with people is they don't have enough happening to them and so they get bored to death. That's factually true, you know. If you want to give somebody trouble with the mind, don't give him any place to put his pictures, such as up against the noses of highway robbers, you know, and mutinous crews and – no drama, no drama. And he has a – too many drama pictures, he doesn't know what to do with them and life is too boring so he pulls in some of the drama pictures to have some drama close up. You can say that this sort of thing happened – it'd be much truer, by the way, than the fact that he got the pictures because of guilt. Now, let's – he's just bored.

I was talking one time – I investigated the police one time or another and it was a very interesting job. I wanted to find out what policemen thought of criminals and what policemen were; and I went down and got myself a badge and became a police officer for a while. And they never got wise to me. They thought I was a good cop, but I never used to get into fights and this mystified them a little bit and they thought I must be bored with life. And it didn't upset them a bit when I left the force. I used to see them afterwards from time to time and say hello. It didn't upset them a bit that I left the force because they knew I must have been leading a very, very bad time. I'd been on the force for months, never been into the hospital, never had to have my fist bandaged up, you know? It didn't occur to them that there was any other way than all this superdrama to handle people in a drunken area. And all – they thought well, you joined the police force, you get all these fights; cops and robbers, cops and robbers, cops and robbers, cops and robbers, television, television, we got it now. See? Television. And we thought that if we didn't get that drama, well, you had no reason to be police and Hubbard just wasn't getting any of this drama so naturally he left – he went out and did something more interesting. He's just unlucky – lucky. Criminal walked up to him, would never draw a gun or anything like that, the fellow would say hello and go on his way – or walk down to the jailhouse.

I had one of them discuss it with me when I was resigning. He said, „Well,“ he said, „you’ll do something else, you’ll get some more excitement.“ He said, „Don’t feel bad about it.“ He said, „A fellow can’t live in the middle of a vacuum forever.“ Never occurred to him there was any other way to handle life, than just handle it, see? You had to handle it with drama.

Well anyway, an individual, for whatever reason or rationale, does make pictures of what goes on or what he does. Now, we say he makes pictures – let’s say he permits them to hang in suspense, or he permits something to associate itself like pictures, or he permits a picture phenomena to occur. And in the early days we just characterized these things as pictures and that was that. Well, actually it’s a little more simple mechanism than we thought it was. Really, he’s just sort of stuck around in that moment of time, and the scene has gotten very thin and this is a picture. And he, by changing space slightly – because thought can be everywhere – of course can see this picture right in front of him at any time.

Now, the funny part of it is he also has the capability of mocking one up out of whole cloth. He just mocks one up. Well, telling the difference between one that was mocked up and one that actually happened, people think is the cause of it all. They say, „Well, he hallucinates. He thinks the pictures that are not real are real, you know, and it never really happened, but he thinks it happened and he’s crazy and so forth.“ Well, putting this in a picture category, a picture is a picture regardless of what it’s of – it is just a picture. Now, you say it is of something that happened, well, then we would have to say well, it must be a special kind of picture which is the residue of what happened. Say that’s all that’s left of what happened. Or we’d have to say he mocked it up. But it nevertheless is an energy mass and does have very many purposes. It has a tremendous number of purposes. And we look at CCH and we find most of these purposes in CCH – the purposes of the pictures. The pictures have thought in them.

Now, some of these pictures are clean out of sight – they are there totally, but they’re missing. The individual went unconscious but the picture stayed there anyhow. Well, for sure an individual who goes unconscious will get the picture because the picture’s totally collapsed upon him. Then with great surprise, as you start to audit him, he sees these things peeling off from him. Well, they moved all the way in and then there was a total space closure between himself and the picture. You got that?

And that’s what unconsciousness is – being totally reached. Didn’t want to be reached, but was reached. The individual’s final retreat is not away in space, but *down* in awareness. Therefore, when he totally refused to confront something, he really got a picture. See, he just wouldn’t answer up to it at all; then it’s almost totally there all the time.

Well, that’s actually all there is to the reactive mind, the unconscious, the subconscious or any other of these things.

Now, because these are all violent experiences, when they restimulate they generally cause a person to act in a violent way. And thus people like Freud make the statement that the unconscious or reconscious or something of the sort contains nothing but bestiality and man is basically an animal and he raves and screams and has these horrible impulses and so forth. You couldn’t say any such thing. You could merely say that most of his violent happenings, those things which happen to him violently, are capable of being dramatized.

Now, the funny part of it is, it isn't what happened to him that counts in therapy. It's when he reached past the picture. Well, this is a violation of his inability to confront it, so he couldn't confront it but he reached past it and did it to somebody else and it caused the picture just to really snap in; in other words, he just started to confront the picture. So all the key-ins on these things are – you might call overt acts and give us these ideas of guilt complexes and other things. You can look at this anatomy rather interestingly, but it's the same darn thing we're talking about. We're talking about the bridge between life, a massless, thinking, living thing capable of creation and so forth, and the structure which it has created. And those impartial viewers looking at this would immediately have to conclude that it was just a gradient scale between thought and structure. And where it sort of disappears out of view and the general ken, we call it the mind. And it's that part of that gradient scale that's missing in normal observation. You look at Joe, you don't see this thin little structure sort of thing, the bridge between himself and how he manages to stand on pavement, which is quite a trick. And so we say, „Well, he's – it's his mind.“

Well, there's only one thing wrong with the mind and that is the fact that a person has lived. There really isn't anything wrong with the mind. And if there's any basic postulate at the bottom of all of this series of pictures, it would be just this one: he wanted to keep a record. You can Straightwire somebody on that question – you'll get some very interesting results, you see? „Can you recall a time when you wanted to keep a record?“ „Recall another time when you wanted to keep a record.“ And „Recall another time when you wanted to keep a record.“ And all of a sudden these pictures will start peeling off and going in all different directions, because he started parking remote vision points in front of all these old scenes. You see? He'd say, „Well, you know, I don't have that battle anymore and I don't have a battle now – I wish I had that battle back. The next time I get a battle I will keep some portion of the battle so that I can look at the battle and when I don't have a battle I'll have a battle.“ See? And therefore he'd haul one up and then there'd be this battle and that battle and then he'd say, „Well, I think I'll bridge the thing over into women,“ or something like this and he'd have a picture of one woman, another one. And then he'd say, „Well, I think I'll start keeping records of financial transactions,“ or something of the sort. And he starts getting all of his pictures – pictures.

In other words, he doesn't do it by recall, he does it by pictures. And when he does it very thoroughly by pictures, then he begins to depend upon similar pictures to handle similar situations. He does what happened then. He knows what happened then, then he puts this on automatic and he says, „Well, I don't have to handle any existing situation,“ (inability to confront) „so I will use a picture to handle the situation. Pictures will now confront for me.“

There we get the mind in action. The individual doesn't have, he thinks, capability of handling structure directly. And as a matter of fact, structure is a little bit hard to handle directly with no intermediate step. And so the individual puts structure on automatic and he said all the structure will be handled on a gradient scale and here we go, and „I won't have to put out any effort and I can just sit here and not confront anything and be dead in my head and life will go on being lived.“ He does this for a few years and then he says, „You know, I'm not living.“ This occurs to him suddenly. He says, „You know, I'm not living, I don't have anything to confront, I'm not getting anywhere in life,“ lots of other things.

But the use of the mind or its disuse, the use of life or its disuse are, alike, enervating. That is to say, one totally uses and only uses mental mechanisms to remember things for him and one day he gets down to a point of where he can't remember anything unless he writes it down on a piece of a paper and then he gets to a point of where he can't remember anything unless somebody else writes it down on a piece of paper – he can't do that anymore either, he – somebody else has got to do it now – and he's just passing on out through remote stages. By stages of confrontingness, or failure to confront, he's getting more and more remote. Well, the mind naturally lends itself to this kind of thing.

Now, the mind has vacuums in it wherever it had a picture with a vacuum in it. Masses of pictures can – just as such – can evidently be influenced by other energy masses and you get all sorts of things. Energy influences energy, space influences space, energy influences space, time influences energy. You get an interconnection of matter, energy, space and time any way you want to look of it – at it, and any interconnection which is possible in the universe is also possible in the mind. It is just a study of the interrelationships of matter, energy, space and time and thought. And when these things are very thin you have the mind.

All right. Now, how does a person keep a mind in restimulation? Which is to say, how does he keep pieces and parts of it that close to him to be in present time? How does he keep whistling these things in? How does he make this thing stand in suspense on the time track?

Well, we have many processes, amongst them ARC Straightwire, which demonstrate to an individual that the time track can be unraveled. He's got it all jammed up and he starts – you start asking him to confront this and confront that about the mind and all of a sudden he begins to have space where he didn't have space anymore. So he feels better, he says it's gone into the past. Well, I don't know that it's gone into the past, but it certainly is further from him. You've asked him to confront parts of his mind and so he has been able to confront parts of his mind and all the mind would be, in essence, would be failures to confront or things we want to keep on confronting, either one. There are people who keep pictures around just because they're so nice. And after a while they wear them out, and boy, are they disgusted.

Now, here we have – here we have the mechanism of memory by pictures, and we also have along with that just the mechanism of memory. So that keynote here that threw everybody astray on the subject of the mind was this whole thing called memory. One remembered things. Now, let me show you this trick. How do we keep one of these minds in suspension? How do we keep it near and jammed up and quickly available and all that sort of thing? Well, we alter-is every picture. See, we alter-is every picture one way or the other, that keeps it in suspension. In other words, it isn't just a direct picture of the mest universe, it is a picture alter-ised in some fashion; we have changed it around. How've we done that? We've kept it forever simply by changing our minds about it. How did we change our minds about it? Well, as we looked at the wall we felt in a certain way and afterwards, why, we recalled just looking at the wall. Now, how did we feel while we looked at the wall? What did we think? We thought we were in present time, didn't we? What did we think when we looked back at the picture? We say it's in the past, don't we?

Get that? That's the basic alter-issness. Very basic. Get that? We look at the wall and we're in present time while we're looking at the wall. We say this is present time, we „look at

the wall.“ Now, when we remember having looked at the wall, we say, „I *looked* at the wall in the past.“ This would also apply to the future. We say, „That *will* happen.“ „That wall is going to come down“ and we very often will kind of mock up a picture of the wall coming down when we say this, and we say that it is in the future and we get another type of suspension that is much less generally used.

But this „past“ mechanism is the real trick one. And a person can get himself pinned on the time track like mad. Every consecutive moment of time contains in it an awareness of the present. And if we only remember it as the past, we have alter-ised it most gorgeously.

Now, here’s a rather curious thing. If we simply have somebody recall a time when he was in present time, we get a whole interesting series of pictures which are rather interesting mechanisms, I mean because we are recalling the single consecutive common denominator postulate to every picture, which is what? Present time.

Now, if we ask a person to recall a time when he was remembering something, we run out this other mechanism. And when we say – ask the person to recall a time when he was planning something, we get the future mechanism. And so we get the three things that would bring this to view. And one is recall a time when he was in present time or experience a present time in the past or something of the sort, you know? You get these consecutive present times. You see, in any instant you are in present time while you are looking at present time and your feeling is thereness, see? Your feeling is thereness. And then you say, „Well, I’m – I – “ you remember the incident and get not-thereness. See, that’s past. „I’m not there any longer,“ you say, but the postulate which the picture contains is thereness and you remember it with not-thereness, don’t you see?

And similarly with the future. You plan something to happen in the future, but you plan it with an „it will be,“ and when you hit it you see it with a „will be,“ so your picture – or pardon, you hit it with an „is.“ You say it will be and then you get there and you say, „Well, it is.“ And so you keep the future in suspense too. And these two things together tend to jam a track. Quite interesting isn’t it?

Well, you’d have to ask these three auditing questions evidently – just a cursory glance, this has never been audited on anybody, it’s just a demonstration – you’d have to ask him for a time when he considered himself in present time. That’s not the auditing command, that’s just the gist of it. You’d have to ask him for a time when he considered himself in present time in order to really strip a picture out, and then you would – we did that, by the way, with Dianetic return; that was one of its basic mechanisms – and then we would say – we would ask a person for all the times he was remembering something in the past and he would pick up all the times he was worried. Quite interesting.

And we’d ask him for all the times he was planning something or looking forward to something or dreading something – regardless of – dependent on where he was on the Tone Scale – and we would get those moments stretched out too and the three of them would perform the thought as-iness of the pictures. But wait, that’s just the thought as-iness of the pictures. All right, although thought is the creative end of the effect line, we nevertheless wouldn’t get the pictures gone because there’s mest on the other end of it. So there’d still be the mest to handle. Well, that could be handled in various ways. You could tell him to look

around and find something he wouldn't mind having created. And you get him over his allergies, one way or another, to this continuous hanging on to things or creating a universe or doing other things that he's doing.

Well, you could also do something like this: you could say to the individual, as far as the future was concerned, you would say to him, „Tell me something you aren't dreading.“ See, you could handle the immediate future. Or „Tell me something that you wouldn't mind forgetting.“ Or something of this sort.

Well, oddly enough if facsimiles are thinnies this would be the technique which would produce the structural end of the thing and occasion a reorientation. We'd ask an individual where he wouldn't mind being, as though he were right there, right now, and we would of course pick up all sorts of pleasure moments on the track. Now we ask the individual where he'd certainly hate to be, right now, and we'd pick up all these remote viewpoints that he's left parked around in various sceneries and he would view these things again. And we ask him where he would dread to be and we're liable to go on the backtrack and pick up things that he was dreading to be, way back when, forward from the time which is now past, from where he is right this minute. Very confusing, isn't it?

Well, there are a lot of ways of handling this – we have lots of processes that handle this. Then and Now Solids handles this very, very well; but the purposes of the pictures, the purposes of the pictures must be given some attention. And these pictures do have purposes.

They make, as I've already gone over – they have automatic responses, tells you how to behave in a situation where every time you see a green wall you behave in a certain way and there you have a picture of it and it runs off as a behavior pattern and it's all very well done. But you've got automaticities galore which can be used in the picture lineup.

But there are other things that you can do with pictures. You can find an area where you just don't want to be at all; you can always get a past picture of an area where you've been and be there for a little while, sort of, kind of. Yes, very fascinating. But the technique, no matter how good it is, won't overthrow the *need* of pictures, fancied or real, by a thetan. He does have a feeling that he needs pictures. He uses them for various things. Actually he handles, to a large degree, a body through a gradient scale, of which pictures are an incidental part. And he handles the wall through a gradient scale.

And now, we spoke of destruction very early and when he meets some being that he doesn't think should go on existing he's got pictures and he's got all kinds of things and destruction and bacteria and other things that he can mock up and throw at this other person to get him out of the road. He thinks that's the way to handle this person. Way not to confront again is to make somebody sick or lame or give him a bunch of pictures that'll blow up in his face or mess up his bank in some fashion. A lot of thetans, you know, still slide pictures into your bank. It's quite an interesting phenomenon. But in the final analysis it is a defense measure, and a person who is not himself, as a thetan, very confident, will use pictures for defense of one kind or another. Either give him service facsimiles so people will feel bad or so he can control other people, numerous other things – and these defense mechanisms are all very well. He uses pictures on the reverse vector – now, this is throwing pictures *at* people, see? He uses that, therefore he thinks he needs pictures.

There's the other receiving end of the situation which pays off almost equally. And that is, he keeps bodies and people from going away with the opposite vector. He also, on a higher level, holds them still and makes them more solid and does other things. But keeping the body from going away is one of the basic functions of pictures. An individual uses his mind, this thought-energy structure, in order to keep the body from going away. Therefore, he as a thetan doesn't have to be aware of the fact that he's always hanging on, himself, to a head, to a being. He doesn't have to get this idea of association with structure all the time because he's got a lot of pictures of the association, he plasters these on the structure, associates himself with a picture and sticks.

But to strip somebody totally of his mind, it would then – the harmful content of it – it would only be necessary then to get him up to a point where he didn't have to use these pictures. Now, that would be in making a record of the past. He wouldn't have to have them in order to have a record of the past – he wouldn't have to have these things in order to handle other people because he could directly. And he wouldn't have to have them to keep things from going away because he could keep them and position himself rather easily and well.

And you get him over those things, you would still have his idea that he should have some mass, and you'd have to get him to recover from his ideas about needing mass before he'd be willing to give up all sorts of pictures in all directions. But given those four things and perhaps one or two other minor ones that would turn up, special considerations he had – but given those four basic things, why, you would then be able to get a thetan to give up or disentangle this thing he is laughingly calling a mind and which in the final analysis is only an outward manifestation of his own weakness. So we get him to recover from his weakness – I could shorten it up – his feeling of weakness and inefficiency and he would of course give up pictures and he would then get out of trouble.

Thank you.

DEATH

A lecture given on 30 July 1957

I have a little announcement to make here at the beginning which isn't too happy an announcement. Most of you have heard this on the rumor line. And that is that an old-time DScn, Peggy Conway, whom many of you know, passed away in Pretoria, South Africa yesterday from a sudden stroke. She was doing a great deal for Scientology down in South Africa, was operating down there as my representative and was doing quite a bit of work with the government and was getting things set up. So it was a loss in more ways than one. But she was – don't know if many of you knew this, you might have – she was the original "Peg o' My Heart" in the stage play, and many other stage successes. And the war came along and she went out with the USO. She had a jacket that she collected all sorts of various regimental insignia on and she made lecture tours in the country. She finally came into Scientology and she did an awful lot of good work. All of her contacts were in relatively high places. Matter of fact, it was Gloria Swanson who phoned up and gave the information through here yesterday. The occasion was of some interest in another line. She will be cremated and her body will be flown home to Connecticut – cremated.

Well anyway, it brought up another point. There were two or three people who looked at me rather dazedly and I suddenly conceived that I had never given a lecture on the subject of death. Just death as such. And in view of the fact it is one of the larger interesting mechanisms that Scientology understands and what happens and what goes on, I thought it might be a very good thing if I gave you a lecture on that subject.

Audience: It's true. Yeah.

Okay, this is the twelfth lecture of the 18th ACC, July 30th 1957, and the subject of this lecture is material on death.

The whole subject of death has been one of the more mysterious subjects to man and it has only been in Scientology itself – not in Dianetics – it's only been in Scientology that the mechanisms of death and so forth have been thoroughly understood. And when I say thoroughly understood I mean of course just the mechanisms.

We know a great deal about death and we are actually the first people that do, on this planet, know a great deal about death. It is one of the larger wins of Scientology, and I rather wonder that there's been no earlier lectures on this subject except I ordinarily don't dwell on the subject very much. I investigated it, said, "Well that's all wrapped up," and dropped it in the file in the drawer and forgot about it.

It's very easy to forget about death because that's what death is, a forgettingness.

However we do have a considerable amount of information on this subject, and you actually are entitled to that information.

In the first place, man is composed (as you well know) of a body, a mind and what we refer to as a thetan. All right. The best examples of this were only recently achieved when I told people, "Now, look at your body; have you got a body there?" And people say yes they had a body there, and, "Now get a picture of a cat. Have you got a picture of a cat?. All right, you've got a picture of a cat. All right now, that picture is a mind picture and this is the mind and it's composed of pictures that interassociate and act – carry perceptions and all that sort of thing." You could get a person to get an actual picture at that time, and then while he's looking at this actual picture you can ask him this head-wringer which is "What's looking at it?" And nobody ever asked the question before Scientology.

Quite an innocent question. There are several questions that have never been asked before Scientology. One of them is "Can you be three feet back of your head?" This particular phrasing was unknown. And similarly, this particular demonstration of the parts of man, unknown.

Now, that's – actually gives a person a considerable subjective reality on the idea that he himself is a being that is independent of a mind or a body. And there is actually a separateness there. One doesn't have to be carried along to a point of where he exteriorizes in processing in order to get a reality on it. Many people grasp this rather easily without ever having been exteriorized. But there's nothing like being exteriorized to give you a rather adequate reality on this subject, and particularly to be exteriorized with good perception.

Many people get exteriorized, see the texture of their jacket or dress so vividly that it frightens them to death and they dive back in in a hurry. But they have a reality on having been out.

Now, here is actually the first evidence that man has had on the subject of the human spirit. Man thought he *had* a human spirit. No, that is totally incorrect – man *is* a human spirit which is enwrapped more or less in a mind which is in a body. And that is man, *Homo sapiens*, and he is a spirit and his usual residence is in his head and he looks at the pictures and the body carries him around.

It's quite an interesting thing since it is so easily demonstrated. And when we realize that life has been straining at this secret all these years, to come out with this simple an answer makes it look, if anything, a little ridiculous. I wouldn't say that it made the great philosophers of all time ridiculous because sometimes their poesy was excellent, sometimes their wording was good, sometimes the way they wrote things down and so on was quite fascinating in the field of aesthetics. But it certainly made their data look very silly.

Now, when we look at the fact that man is a spirit which has a mind and a body, and when we describe man in that fashion, then it becomes extremely simple to understand what his difficulties would be.

His difficulties would be basically with his body or with his mind, and we say, "Well now then, there obviously then would be difficulties with him as a being, a spiritual being." This is – but in view of the fact that he has to think that he *can* get in a trap, has to get the idea

that he can be endangered before he can be endangered, it is sort of like the United States government – the United States government can only be sued if it gives you its permission. You have to have the permission of the government in order to sue it. In other

words, you have to have permission – the thetan has to give permission to be trapped before he can be trapped. Therefore he is relatively easily untrapped. And the moment he is untrapped he gives birth to all sorts of interesting phenomena which we know as the exteriorization phenomena. And all of this phenomena is quite easily demonstrated.

I even constructed a meter once that I could make somebody be on one side of and be on the other side of and it would read differently and he'd approach it and it'd go *clang* and he'd go away from it. Made out of a little tuning tube that was manufactured in Great Britain – a very, very sensitive tube and an antenna – and a thetan actually does have an electrical field.

Most people know that living things do have an electrical field around them, but nobody had ever measured it before, independent of energy, ridges, bodies, such combinations as that. In other words, you expect that to get an electrical reading on a human being he has to walk over and put his hand on something. This is not true. You can exteriorize him, put him near a little antenna and he gets a read. Quite amazing.

Therefore, thought and electricity and other universe phenomena are quite well (you might say) entangled and confused, and we get to the fourth thing on which a man has reality, but *Homo sapiens* had no reality on this thing and we can just abandon it if we're describing *Homo sapiens*, and that's the material universe. He had no reality on the material universe. I mean just none. I mean, I couldn't say that more straightly. You get an idea of this if you just run some Locational Processing on somebody. Grab somebody off the street and run some Locational Processing on him. He all of a sudden notices there are walls and floors and ceilings. You say, "But he knew this all the time." I don't know that he did. He takes an automobile out on Sunday and kills himself dead and that's what we're talking about. All right.

What happens to him when he dies?

Well, basically all that happens is that a separation occurs between the thetan and the body. That's basically all that happens.

He, however, takes with him old tin cans and rattling chains and bric-a-brac and other energy phenomena that he feels he cannot do without and stashes this in the next body that he picks up.

Now, he does not build a body. He does not build a new body in this lazy time of manufactured items and Frigidaires and so on. He picks one up off the genetic line, and the genetic line is a series of mocked up automaticities which produce according to a certain blueprint from the earliest times of life on this planet through until now. And as everybody – even people in biology know, there is a definite succession of steps that life takes today. It's hard for us to believe that a less – a little less than a century ago a man was almost hanged for heresy for announcing the theory of natural selection and evolution. And they actually had trials after the beginning of this century on the subject of evolution and so on right here in the United States.

But this is a concept which we know today for a very good fact. We understand this rather thoroughly, that something goes through these various steps.

Well, what goes through the steps? Well, an automaticity goes through the steps. Well, where did the automaticity come from? Well, that is not the subject of death. That is totally disassociated from it.

Death is something the automaticity does. See, we don't care where it came from. I mean this idea of let's backtrack it and get earlier and earlier and earlier and earlier and earlier will finally, we hope, leave us someplace at

the beginning of things. Well, there may be a beginning of things, there may be an end of things – I don't know. But I notice all clocks go round and round and round. Anyway ...

There is such a thing as a cycle of action however, and this cycle of action in Scientology is create-survive-destroy. At the shoulder of the curve an individual is mostly interested in surviving. Early on the curve he is interested in creating. And at the end of the curve, why, he is interested in the disposition of the remains.

Now, this happens whether you're speaking of a building, a tree, anything else. We get this same cycle of action, create-survive-destroy.

Well, when we apply this cycle of action to this – these various parts I described, we get a death of the body, a partial death of the mind, and a forgettingness on the part of the spiritual being. Which is, in itself, again, a type of death. So we get this.

Now, actually bodies stay around for quite a while after death. Quite ordinarily it takes them a while to decompose. Sometimes as in Egypt they were embalmed. I had the medical examiner of the state of New York – no, it was the medical examiner (that's what they call the coroner) of New York City. He was a good pal of mine one time. He taught me a great deal about writing detective stories. He used to say, "The morgue is open to you any time, Hubbard." We were pretty good friends.

But he told me a great deal about decomposition, how various parts of the body decompose before other parts of the body, and actually the cells in the cuticle evidently live the longest, if not the cells in the hair. These little cells actually remain alive for a very long time.

Well, the decaying mechanism which is employed here is effective sooner on some parts of the body than others. On the bloodstream it's effective within about eight or ten minutes. If you stop a person's circulation then the red and white corpuscles and so forth die in eight or ten minutes. That's what people say. I've been dead for a half an hour myself and I probably haven't had my heart beating any longer.

But the first thing one learns about death is that it is not anything of which to be very frightened. If you're frightened of losing your pocketbook, if you're frightened of losing your memory, if you're frightened of losing your girl or your boyfriend, if you're frightened of losing your body, well, that's how frightened you ought to be of dying, because it's all the same order of magnitude.

Now, here we strike the first observable phenomena in death when we find out that the mind, in spite of mechanisms which seek to decay it and wipe it out, does maintain and pre-

serve mental image pictures of earlier existences. And with proper technology and an understanding of this, one can be again possessed of the mental image pictures of earlier existences in order to understand what was going on. But in view of the fact that we have not restored – get this very closely – we have not restored remembrance to the *being*, the mental image pictures usually just continue to be pictures.

So we send somebody into a past life and he looks at *a* mental image picture and you might as well have sent him to the art gallery. He himself has no connection with this. And quite rightly so, because the mental image picture may be the mind of the body.

Now, the body carries around mental image pictures and a thetan carries around mental image pictures and these two combine to form the mind. The mind then is a bridge between the spirit and the body, and the mental image pictures formed by a thetan added to the mental image – and confused with – the mental image pictures formed by the body is usually how a thetan stays in a head. It's quite an interesting mechanism. He confuses these two and so on.

Now therefore, demonstration of past existences by running somebody (quote) back down the time track (unquote) and having him look at a picture is not very convincing. Not really very convincing. Well, why isn't it convincing?

Well, the fellow always has some unreality about it. Only now and then do you strike heavily into something a person vividly recalls. So you wouldn't say this was great certainty. Because what, in essence, are you addressing with Scientology processing? You're addressing this being that we call a thetan.

Now, he, incidentally then, being mixed up with a mind, causes you to also address the mind, but also being incidentally mixed up with a body causes you to also address the body. Don't you see? So it works out this way: unless a reality has been restored to this being, he himself has no reality, no recognition of having ever been anything else before.

Now, the restoration of memory to one of these beings is of great interest to us since all that is really wrong with him is that things have happened to him which he knows all about but won't let himself in on.

Therefore the restoration of memory is done as a matter of course in almost any processing. And in view of the fact that it is part of any processing, it is impossible today to process somebody well and expertly without having them sooner or later get some sort of a recall on a past existence with some small reality. It's very hard. You process somebody after a while and then try to tell him he has not lived before and you'll have an argument on your hands. You can invalidate him, you could chew him up, you could chop him down – these things are easily invalidated. Well, why are they easily invalidated is because they are so tenuously remembered. It's very difficult to remember them so they're very easy to knock out.

Well, an individual's own will has a great deal to do with this. One should not look for outside sources as to why his memory is shut off; just as he must grant permission to be trapped, so must he grant permission to be made to remember. This is quite fascinating.

He is more or less convinced that a memory, remembering back past this subject called death, would cause him to reexperience the pain he already feels has been too much for

him. Thus he is very reluctant to face up again to this mechanism, and facing death, almost always goes into a bit of an amnesia.

I'm pointing that up again because I have no slightest intentions of having this lecture go into an amnesia. Do you understand that? It could easily do so, deleting these remarks that punch it up, and playing this lecture to some people who knew nothing about Scientology would undoubtedly demonstrate at the end of the lecture that these people, not already having such as you do, a good subjective reality already – small or great, on this subject – you would find them blank. They would be the blankest people. That would be the time to make bets with them or something of the sort or... They would be very blank because one has restimulated blankness.

Now, one says, "Well, it's all very well to take a scientific attitude toward death, and, you know – but after all, it does carry with it a little shock and upset." Yeah, that's very true, that's very true. Until you've been dead a few times you wouldn't really understand how upsetting it can be.

We are actually indebted for a considerable amount of our material to the odd fact that I have been officially dead twice. I don't think I've ever

mentioned this very much before, but I died in an operation one time back in the 30s and went outside above the street and felt sorry for myself, decided they couldn't do this to me – the heart – body's heart had stopped beating. And I went back and I grabbed the body by the several – there's a bunch of interesting mechanisms in the head that restimulate a body's heartbeats and so forth, and I just took hold of them and then said "Come on here," and snapped the body back to life.

Well I didn't vividly remember after that exactly what had happened. It's quite amusing that I would fog around on this subject as long as I did. All I knew is that I had confronted a mystery of some sort or another that I couldn't make anything out of.

Now, I'd already been studying the subject of the mind for several years since I'd been in the university and this added just a little fillip to the sauce. And I shortly after that wrote a book which has never been published called "Excalibur" and which according to the *New Yorker* anybody can have a copy of for \$1,500. That's not true. I have never permitted it to be copied, mostly because you now have most of the information in it and because it itself is rather antique and out of date. It was merely a plot of things.

But this was an immediate bout with death which I eventually remembered – one kind or another. And the only reason I mention it is because it happens to so many people and they never mention it. They just never mention it. They go and kick the bucket and come back to life again and somebody or other invalidates them slightly, says, "Well, people always have strange dreams under gas" or something stupid about this thing, and so they shut up about it and they never say anything about it again.

Well, this fact that one has lived before is so restrained that it itself is the reason why it is forgotten. The restraining of it is the reason why it is forgotten. The unpopularity of it in other ages brought about the forgetter mechanism itself which causes an occlusion on the subject of death.

In other words, that one cannot talk about it is enough all by itself to continue to cause the forgetter mechanism. Now, we would run a poor process over a short period of time if we tried to get a fellow to do enough forgetting to forget all about death and therefore get it into restimulation again.

An easier way to plot this would be to ask somebody to whom he could tell the fact that he had been dead. Now, you could just ask somebody this, whether he'd been dead in this life or not. You could simply ask somebody this, you see, as an auditing question. You could say, "To whom could you tell the fact that you have been dead?"

Well now, that's a very fascinating sort of a thing all by itself, and it works something like, "Tell me one person in the world who does not believe you are insane." It's – has a fantastically catalytic effect upon a person. A person, you know, sort of believes he's going wog and spinning and so forth and you ask him that question. I'm telling you this seriously. "Tell me one person in the world who does not believe you are insane." You've broken the agreement chain.

All right, so you could ask a similar question, "Tell me one person in the world who believes you live more than once." And you'd get a similar concatenation reaction.

Now, exactly what happens when death occurs? I say many people have experienced this. I've gone further than that – I have plumbed into this pretty deeply. What with? Oh, E-Meters, checking up with people, checking into children and so on. It's been a rather thoroughgoing research on the matter. I mean, it was a rather tremendous effort that was put out.

Now, on a lie detector or E-Meter, you can put a person on one of these things and you get a peculiar phenomenon, a peculiar behavior of the electrical needles. That's peculiar behavior observed many times, by the way, by police detectives who could never explain it but knew they ran into it every now and then, is merely talking about a time when a being was separate from a mind and body. And it's a peculiar little mechanism – it's a little hunt of the needle, and it just hunts back and forth over a very small area and quite frantically. Now, that indicates that a person is still sitting in one of these exteriorization incidents. All right.

We know a great deal about havingness, we know a lot of other things. We know how a person would suddenly run out of havingness if he died and we would expect this much loss of possession and so forth to wipe him out. Well, let me tell you something – it doesn't wipe him out.

Most people – and this, by the way, is not true to you if it's not true. You understand that, I'm not forcing on you a "Now I'm supposed to behave this way" when you kick the bucket or something. I'm not. It would be easy to do, you see, to form an agreement, "Now we do so-and-so." Couple of thousand years ago somebody got very active at this and they became eventually very, very unpopular. They had a "Now I'm supposed to go somewhere," and that place did not exist and it got a lot of people into trouble.

Now, this is what ordinarily occurs. An individual backs out thinking of his responsibilities, knowing who he is, where he's been, what he's been doing. Ordinarily this occurs. If he's in any kind of condition at all, this is what occurs. He backs out at the moment of death with full memory. Something kills the body, an automobile, too many court suits, too much

overdose of widely advertised sleep-producing agents, and the body ceases to function and the moment he conceives it to be no longer functional in any way, he backs out.

At that moment he knows who he is, where he's been and so forth. You expect a total occlusion – mind you, I'm not hanging this one on you. I'm just telling you what ordinarily happens. Usually the – a total occlusion does not occur at this point.

It is not true that a being – a thetan in excellent condition – gets some distance from the body and then doesn't care about it anymore. That is simply a phenomenon of havingness and when we first found that, we thought this was always the case. But then we were striking where thetans ordinarily were on the Tone Scale. This is not true that he gets just so far from his dead body and his last life and so forth, and then forgets all about it or cares nothing about it and so forth.

He's actually gone into the Subzero Scale. He is below apathy. In support of this, you can pick up on the track times when a fellow backed out of his head and was mad as the dickens. And just kicked the stuffings out of the fellow who killed him. Made spirits and this whole theory of spirits very unpopular. People tried to forget this, so when they run around killing people they would get no immediate kickback. Basic reason why one would want that out of the way, isn't it? When one committed a crime, why, one wouldn't have to suffer for it. I'm not saying this is the basis of Christianity but it is true that man has capitalized on this phenomena enormously – the phenomena surrounding death. He'll capitalize on it and capitalize on it. You look around in a neighborhood and if there is a building which is well kept, why, it's normally an undertaking parlor. You look at the average pay of a medico who gets paid whether the patient dies or not and you'll find that pay is very, very high. It is easy to capitalize on this. Why?

Because people, when they think of death, think of loss and grab something. Have you got this? This explains the behavior of relatives after one of their number has died. Everybody gets in there and tears apart all of the person's clothes and fight with each other over the possessions and so on.

They're still alive, but they have experienced a loss of havingness and they pour in on this particular person's effects and they're really to some degree trying to get the person back. They think if they can grab enough dresses they'll get the person back.

It actually is not quite as greedy as it looks, it's just obsessive. They don't know what they're doing. I've seen relatives, for instance – I've been around this many times – I've seen them pick up some of the weirdest things. I saw an old lady one time just screaming over the fact that they wouldn't let her have a fellow's meerschaum pipe and I pointed out to her that she didn't smoke a meerschaum pipe, and she looked at me sort of dazedly and came out of it and said, "So I don't" and handed it to somebody else. It was a token, it was a symbol of the person who had just left. Well, this exact behavior could vary from person to person.

At a certain level a person who had to have, tremendously, would get just so far from a body and he's liable to just say, "Well, I don't care, I don't care, honest, I won't care anymore, I just don't care about it. I don't want anything more to do with it, I just don't want to live anyway and I have – very unhappy during that whole life and I'm awfully glad – I don't care; I don't care." Don't you see?

And somebody else is liable to just say *h-h-a-a-a* and not even think about it, see, and just say *huhh*. But that person was so little alive when he was alive that his aliveness after he has died is also negligible.

All right. Now let's take a person who is fairly well up, who is fairly strong, who's fairly capable and somebody knocks off the body. Well, I'll give you a rather interesting reaction on that. "I'll show them they can't put me out of the game," and he did a dive halfway across the country and saw a maternity hospital and grabbed a baby just all in a *bang!* you see? *Rfffff!* Made him mad. Upset him.

Somebody higher than this would not have been in contact with bodies in the first place, so we don't know anything about that – upper reactions.

All right. We're talking about death and *Homo sapiens*. Now, we get an exteriorization here, it's a very fascinating exteriorization because it is totally cognizant. The person knows who he is. He usually has perception, pretty good perception. He knows where his friends are, and for somebody to come around and point out this fantastic spiritual phenomena that somebody appeared to them after he had died several thousand miles away is something like being terribly surprised because a waitress came to the table in a restaurant. Of course, I admit that it's unusual.

But for people to wake up during the night and so on, and realize somebody has died in battle or died a death of violence of some kind or another is only the amount of confusion which is thrown into a being when his body is killed. If he is killed with sudden violence and he's very surprised about the whole thing, he is sufficiently upset and unphilosophical about the whole thing that he is liable to go around and see his next of kin and the rest of his friends in an awful frenzied hurry, you know, trying to reassure himself that he hasn't gone to purgatory or someplace. Because he doesn't go to any purgatory. That's a total myth, total invention to make people – a very vicious lie which was invented just to make people unhappy. I don't like things that are

invented to make people unhappy. I'm peculiar, I know, but I just don't like things like that.

He has suffered the loss of mass. Now, if an – if an individual had an automobile – if you had an automobile sitting out here on the street and you came out totally expecting to find this automobile there and it's gone, it's been stolen and so forth, you'd be upset. Well, that's just about the frame of mind a thetan is usually in when he finds his body dead. It's quite interesting, but he is upset, he's disturbed about it. He's below 2.0 on the Tone Scale, and his main thought is to grasp another body. Well, this he can do finding a young child or something that he could bring back to life. Thetans are pretty good at this, by the way. People wanting to heal things are quite interesting. People who have to heal things and so forth are practicing up, I guess, in case they have to bring a body back to life.

But the ordinary entrance is sometime around what we call the assumption, and the assumption occurs within a few minutes after birth in most cases. The baby is born and *then a* thetan picks the baby up. That's the usual proceeding.

However, this thetan could have hung around for a long time. And you say, "How do people behave?" You ask the same question of how do thetans behave when they suddenly haven't got a body. They behave like people. They'll hang around people, they'll see somebody who's pregnant and they'll follow them down the street. That's right. They'll hang around the entrance to an accident ward and find some body that is all banged up and the being that had that body has taken off or is about to or is in a frame of mind to, and does so, and pick up this body and pretend to be somebody's husband or something of the sort.

They do all sorts of odd things. It isn't necessarily true that all of this is taped, measured, laid out and so on. I'm telling you what is standard about this behavior and what is not. When a new body is picked up, if a new body is picked up at all, is not standardized beyond saying it usually occurs, most of the time, unless the thetan got another idea, two or three minutes after the delivery of a child from the mother. Then about the time he first – the baby takes its first gasp, why, a thetan usually picks it up.

Now, would the body go on living without a thetan picking it up? Well, that is beside the point. That is beside the point. It's a case of how fast can you pick one up before somebody else gets it. So there's a certain anxiety connected with this.

Now, thetans often say very interesting prayers at the moment they pick up a body. They do. They dedicate themselves to its continued growing and they're so pleased with the whole thing and they dedicate themselves to the family and go through all kinds of odd rituals of one kind or another – they're so happy to get this. But the odd part of it is, they don't shut their memory off until they pick another body up. And the shut-off of memory actually occurs with the pickup of the new body.

Now, there *is a* phenomena, a series, known as the between-lives series, and people have some sort of a thing mocked up whereby somebody goes back through a between-lives area, it is called, and so on. This can be plotted. It is not unusual. The phenomena connected with it, however, is so questionable and so variable and the places people go makes one think that some thetans belong to one club and some belong to another club. But it's not that "Everybody does this" and "Now I'm supposed to," it's certainly not a constant.

Now, until 13 or 1400 the between-lives area operations weren't thriving at all. They got very few customers. That's right. And then they started to

pick it up more and more. They had to knock witchcraft totally out of Europe before the between-lives area clubs or whatever they were, started thriving. They had to knock out any idea of demons and spirits. In other words, they had to make one feel guilty for hanging around, admiring the trees with no body to look through. And they succeeded in doing this. And if you look it over carefully you'll find out that you could make a little kid sick just by talking to him about this sort of thing. You could have done it more easily a few – couple, three hundred years ago than you could do it now. But just start talking to him about ghosts and spirits and how bad they are and how fearful they are and the kid doesn't like it. He gets upset. He can be scared very easily. Why can he be scared very easily? One, you're restimulating times when he's exteriorized, and two, you are invalidating him and throwing him down tone like mad. He is a ghost, he is a spirit, he is a demon. Got it? I mean he is all these bad things they've mocked up.

Now, in view of the fact that two exteriorizations take place, this could get very complicated as one looked at it – because the *GE* exteriorizes. And I have never followed a GE where he goes to go someplace else, to do something else, to pick up something else and so forth. I don't know anything about it.

There is something that mocks up bodies that we call a genetic entity, and it skips from life to life. Incredible, but it does. It skips from life to life as neat as you please. In other words, a body doesn't even live once – just once.

Now, it's a funny thing what I'm saying to you because it is so obvious once you look at it. If a body lived only once it would never have learned how. I mean, it's just one of these sweepingly stupid things to tell people that a body just lives once. It just couldn't be. I mean... Very weird. Somebody would have to be standing around mocking them up all the time and teaching them, and they'd have to have a full college education and more than that before they were ever fit to cry and wet their diapers. That's right, isn't it? They'd have to have a terrific amount of know-how. The intricacy of a body itself is something that has developed over a long period of time. Bodies learn how.

Well now, what do you mean, "learn how"? Well they become storage places for data, and we have to assume the simplest explanation – there are several explanations for this – we have to assume one, that a body is a collection of little things called cells, each one of which is a spirit. That's kind of goofy, isn't it? Or it is something which some spirit somewhere continues to imbue with life. And if you've ever seen an army of ants on the march and seen their coordinated behavior, and then if you've ever taken a microscope and looked for anything in an ant that could ever have done any thinking or anything else, you have to assume there – they can't even communicate with each other. I have bedeviled ants in one way or the other. I have even got in their heads and tried to run them. Something gets awfully mad at you when you start monkeying around with an ant. It's quite interesting. You won't let him walk along in his machine fashion and certain way, and something gets awful mad someplace or another and it isn't the ant.

So when a body dies then whatever made the body, developed it, operated it mechanically and kept it going otherwise, evidently does it all over again.

Now, there's another explanation for this and that is that a thetan decays to a point where he becomes a body cell, and one eventually becomes a body cell and knows his place in the whole thing and has been thoroughly educated in how to perform as a body cell.

This is totally valid as an explanation. It says you sooner or later would not be able to get out of your head and you would go into the body, crunch,

and you would remain there forever carrying along from body to body and so forth with your experience and so on.

It's a very wonderful way to frighten people. And *totally* impossible. The mathematical computation involved would require as many lives back as there are cells in the body and we have so grandly exceeded the half-life of this universe (which is rather easily computable in numbers of ways) – we've gone back so many trillions of trillions of quad-trillions of quad-billions of years, that there is no such concatenation of life and there couldn't be any such op-

erating activity. We count the number of separate living cells there are in a body one after the other and we come up with the fact that if each one got trapped in the body and lived a lifetime, we just went back – it's an uncomputable thing. It doesn't even work if you picked up one every minute from here to the beginning of eternity. It's just still – they are utterly countless.

You just turn a microscope on and you look at the numbers of them and you'll find the main trick of the universe, how the universe absolutely crows us, each and every one, and that is under the whole subject of quantity. They make us look at quantity, and that in itself is a trap.

Each of us is one. And each of us looks at the many and sees that it is so many that we ourselves are rather staggered by the whole thing and feel ourselves inadequate. But when we realize that some preclears are dead in their heads and some preclears are exteriorized rather easily, we see that there's a difference amongst beings. Well, I don't know why we're so egocentric that we believe there could be only one type of thetan. I don't know why this would be the case at all. Why should we assume there's only one type of thetan? Be kind of a silly thing to assume.

The way you lick this quantity thing is very interesting, is when you look at a tree, look at one leaf. Odd things happen to you if you do that. But it is not true, as far as I can determine in any way, shape or form, that the body is composed totally of trapped thetans or that the wall over there is composed totally of trapped thetans. See, it's just not true. It's not easily established, but it certainly doesn't hold water. Doesn't make sense in view of the fact that it is so numerous and the body's cells are so numerous that we come a cropper at once. We say, "Well, there's something someplace mocking up a lot of something." And when you realize that you have the capability of endowing with life, things, why then we don't even know that the genetic entity is alive.

We don't know that it's alive at all. It might be just a machinery or a computation of one kind or another that goes on, that you continue to endow with life to some degree until you separate from it. In view of the fact it's impossible to trap you in the first place, it must be with your consent; you certainly wouldn't consent that far. All right.

However this may be, it is quite interesting to note another phenomenon of death and that is that a thetan will stay around a body until it is disposed of properly. And you can take an E-Meter and any preclear and you can find times when he's been left out on a cliff and nobody even put the lid on the coffin and there it is exposed to the wind and rain; and he'll stay around there until that body is totally dust. How very fascinating. Decomposition: phenomena connected with. Bodies left out in the open decompose. Bodies buried in the ground go to pieces in a hurry. However, there are certain parts of the body that can be preserved. But these cells that have been preserved are no longer living cells. Most hair that is expected to grow after death – you dig up a dead body, and – I don't know what other kind there is – but you dig

up a body and you'll find that the dehydration of the skin is such as to have caused an apparent growing of the fingernails and hair. In other words, the skin receded so the hair and fingernails got longer.

Now, a body – rate of decay of – is not really a point in question, except a thetan will try to accelerate it if the body isn't cared for. You leave a body in an open field or something like that and nobody takes care of it, they just say, "Well, that's an old body over there. There's a dead man over there, there's a girl dumped down there in the crick. Who cares?" you know, in some advanced society such as *1984* – and you'll find that a thetan will sort of hang around and say, "Well, let's see, can't we push this thing in the crick?" or "Can't we do something with it? Can't we get it out of sight?"

Now, a thetan doesn't much care concerning the actual disposition of the body as long as it isn't given any more indignity than it suffered in the lifetime. But he is apt to be very upset about indignities rendered to a dead body. Even while he is (quote) "in a body, alive," when the body is apparently alive and he's taking one around, he gets upset, if he's in any kind of shape at all, about bodies being abused and mistreated. See? But he gets upset about this a little bit.

But much lower on the scale, he's still upset about indignities to dead bodies and dead things. "Well, we mustn't speak harshly about him after all the fellow is dead." He has subscribed to this, very thoroughly subscribed to it.

Very well. A thetan exteriorizes rather easily from a body when it kicks off and dies. Exteriorizes with total recall, but sometimes with a great deal of confusion. He starts pulling mental image pictures apart and he doesn't know where he is and his perception won't turn on right away and he has an awful time and he struggles through it and he eventually picks up another body one way or the other, somehow or other gets himself there and gets himself going again. Some thing – kind of a condition like this is liable to continue; he's liable to live several lives in a fine state of confusion, with bad perception and so on. One day, why, he crashes into the high-tension line. You know what an airport is – it's a body of land surrounded by high-tension wires. And he crashes into some high-tension wires or gets thrown out of an airplane, and steps on the third rail, something of this sort and something happens to the energy masses that have been obscuring his sight; which is a loss of havingness again too. But it isn't havingness which makes the thetan. It's his relationship to havingness that makes him. He has certain relationships and when he gets rid of that then he gets rid of certain mass that was causing him to be blind or something of the sort, why, he takes a look around and there he is.

Sometimes a thetan's gone for several hundred years without any clear view of anything and one day wound up on an electric fence, pitched there by Farmer Brown's worst bull, you know. And he's stone-dead, the body is, and all of a sudden he's thirty-five feet behind it, looking around – it's a very bright clear day. "What am I doing here? Oh! Well, I can't get that body off the wire again." And he's liable to hang around, wait till somebody shuts the current off, gets the body off the wire, at least wraps it up in a blanket or gunnysack or something like that and dumps it in a hole in the ground.

He associates the body with his own identity to the degree that every time an indignity is rendered to the body he thinks it is to some degree being rendered to him. Therefore he hangs around a body until it's properly disposed of. When people make wills in which they

declare a certain disposition of the body, it's a very, very wise thing, if you want the fellow to go on and live a happy life

someplace else and so forth, to carry out those wishes. I don't care what they are. "Dump the ashes seven miles south of Oahu." All right. Dump them seven miles south of Oahu. So what? That's the way he wanted his ashes. That's that. Because it's his idea of what is proper care. See, that's his idea.

Now, the Egyptian had the idea of living forever. They wanted their bodies to live forever. They thought that was very complimentary so they'd wrap them up and mummify them and anoint them in oils, but don't think that a thetan hung around just because his body had been mummified.

Now, because he had gone away and gotten lost someplace, as far as he was concerned he was on some other genetic line, he never would be particularly upset about his body or something of the sort because it had been hauled out of a tomb and left to rot someplace or been put up in the Metropolitan Museum, you see. And take a mummy out of a tomb, let it rot and go to pieces in the sand or something or put it in a museum and put a tag on it – he already would have been too far away from it to worry about it.

One very worrisome case – a thetan whose skull was used by a carnival and the carnival had put a motor in the jaws and made the jaws keep operating and the thetan just couldn't take it – the fact that the jaws were moving. And then some sort of a speaking tube had been run through the back end of the skull so that all the time the jaws wiggled, why, words were coming out of it. And I actually had to unwrap a preclear from that particular skull. He still had a finger on that skull even though he had another body.

People become curators of museums just to keep a finger on a body they might have had once. This is no respecter of persons; I mean, one person isn't more interesting or peculiar than another, they're all interesting and peculiar on these lines.

Every once in a while some fellow will go into some area and go completely berserk and not know quite what's wrong with him. Well, he's gotten killed there, he's left something there or something like that. He goes into an area and he says, "I don't feel safe here. I have a terrible feeling like something awful is going to happen." Well, he very possibly has been killed in the area under similar circumstances. But usually it's in the area; it's much more accurate than that.

Now, don't confuse this with prediction. A thetan can actually predict the future. Since I, two and a half weeks ago, even before I received any word about Peggy I knew that she was going to go and about when. Told several people this. This is prediction. It doesn't have anything to do with that.

But one predicts rather easily on the subject of death because it is so all-embracing as a concern. Someday something is going to take your mock-up away from you. Well, because you've lost many bodies without knowing what took them, then it is very easy for you to mock up heavens, hells, angels, all sorts of things that are going to grab your body. You can even mock up something – the old man with the scythe, and there are many people who believe this utterly, that there is a fellow named Death who comes along and takes the body

away. Oh, undertakers take it away or other people take it away – garbage-disposal units. But there is no such being.

Now, of course a thetan could always mock himself up as such a being and be such a being and go round and whisper sweet nothings in people's ears about how he was Death, and sometimes it works. Got rid of an insurance agent that time – once.

The subject of death is never a very serious one to a Scientologist beyond the fact that he feels kind of sorry for himself sometimes. There was somebody

of such terrific elan, somebody who made him real happy to be around and so forth, and this person was thoughtless enough to dispose of a mock-up and go out of communication. And a person feels pretty unhappy about it. It's a thoughtless thing for a friend to do.

Now this, by the way, was a very early concept of death. You've no more nor less than you've progressed back to death as it was regarded very early on this particular track in this universe – a person didn't regard it very seriously. The Roman never regarded death very seriously. He probably had a very accurate idea of more or less of what happened to him, then he went into idolatry and then he kept going and he finally hit bottom. Anyway ...

Death is, in itself, a technical subject. You can, with considerable confidence, reassure some husband whose wife is dying or has just died, that she got out all right and she is going someplace and pick up a mock-up. If you got there while that person could still talk, still communicate MESTwise with you, in the last moments they usually have something spotted, something planned.

Now, the person doesn't just back out ordinarily and forget all about it. They back out of it with full identity, they hang around for quite a while, they're usually there for the funeral, certainly. They very often hang around their possessions and so forth to see that they're not abused. And they can be given considerable drops in tone and given upsets if their wishes aren't carried out with regard to certain things. I wouldn't go so far as to say that any thetans in this day and age outside of Scientology had any force or ability to punish people for not carrying out their wishes after death. But certainly it used to happen, and people then said this was superstition, and science was against superstition. Well, it's quite interesting that we have turned around the other way and we find out what's science and what's superstition and we find out that a being is capable of almost anything, providing it is within his ability to execute.

Now, sometimes a thetan gets so furious that he gets hallucinatory. He goes round killing his enemies in all directions and they don't even exist. Motto: have your reality in good condition before you die.

There are many processes which exteriorize people and give them a high level of reality on this. Amongst those processes – the key process that produces the phenomena without any great shock is old Stop, Change and Start – produces the phenomenon of exteriorization rather easily. Even on somebody who was terribly dead in his head you can ask him to keep his head from going away and he's liable to blow out. Next time you run it on him he's liable not to. But I've taken people who were terribly dead in the head – this is the clincher – thetans do not become body cells. Thetans do not become walls. Thetans can get out of any trap they're in but sometimes it's better to be in a trap than nowhere. That's true of most people.

And a thetan does back out. He very often carries with him a theta body: he's got some sort of a mocked up body on the past track which is a number of facsimiles of old bodies he has misowned and he is carrying along with him and which – control mechans [mechanisms] of which he uses to control the body he is using. That's all there is to a theta body. It's facsimiles of old bodies he's had and controlled and he uses these same sets of controls on any new body he picks up, and he eventually develops quite a heavy, thick automatic control theta body. They're quite interesting. Many times they have electronic claws and all sorts of things. Usually the theta body structure has. an electronic beam that goes down each of the fingers and he opens and closes his hand with sort of beams. This is going off into structure. But he sometimes pulls out with this theta body complete and simply takes it along.

He can also pull out of the theta body but he hasn't got a prayer of ever becoming a cell. Not a prayer. You can hope, but it won't do you very much good.

Now, I have made an actual test of this and I can assure you this is the case. I have taken people who were totally dead in the head, had no perception of any kind, could not possibly have gotten out of their heads, would have been the people, as weak as they were, that would have gotten stuck in bodies and gone on the genetic lines and had very many disastrous things happen to them, and I have fed them such things as ipecac, which is very vile material which made them so ill that they thoroughly hoped they would die. And in each and every case when they would get very, very low and very close to the borderline, why, they would go out – one fellow went out and sat on a bell buoy and just sat there for a long time feeling very sad about the whole thing, and then came back and noticed the body was getting better so he picked it up again.

This was done to him again and he did more or less the same thing, but he knew he was being fooled this time so he didn't go so far and he came back rather rapidly.

But one way or another I've managed to exteriorize anybody had anything to do with, and they have known who they were and what they were doing after they got out of their heads, and this rather demonstrates conclusively that a person does not get trapped and that death is just another phenomenon and it's about as dangerous and upsetting as losing your family or your pocketbook or some other possession. And a person loses his body and after that behaves accordingly and out of this a great mystery is made. But that is death, the phenomena of. And I hope sometime or another you may have no use for this whatsoever.

Thank you.

Surprise

The Anatomy of Sleep

A lecture given on 31 July 1957

Good evening. It's a very good thing that you've had a nice, relaxing day with nothing to do because we have some things to take up this evening which will require a great deal of your attention, run your energy down a great deal.

Therefore I think it's a very, very good thing that you've had a nice, quiet day and you've not gotten anything done and you're not tired.

I notice there are a few cases present of what they call "Upper Indoc voice." This is a malady which occurs occasionally when students go into an Upper Indoc Course and it's just a matter of course if it's a little hoarse.

Audience: Oohhhhhh!

It wasn't intended to rhyme.

Now, I'll tell you a cure for Upper Indoc voice, if you care to have one.

Audience: Yeah.

Cure number one, step number one: you get the effort necessary to restrain the student from yelling while coaching.

Audience: Huh? Go over that again.

The effort to restrain the student you are coaching from yelling. Now, you just get the effort to restrain him from yelling. Probably has nothing to do with your voice at all, see? Nothing about the yelling you did.

Then the second step is: "Whom could you reach with your voice?" And make sure it's "whom." We might have a Boston preclear on that and he wouldn't understand "Who could you reach with your voice?" You know? And this will clear it up nicely. And on the other hand, there's another way to clear it up and then that's just flatten the process.

What is this? This is lecture thirteen, isn't it? Lecture thirteen, 18th ACC, July 31, 1957. And the subject of this lecture this evening is surprise. And as soon as we get through with that, why, we will take up these questions.

Now, surprise is the modus operandi, evidently, behind aberration because the first thing that a thetan wants to have anything to do with – and as Jan Halpern once said, he mocks up a little black box and looks into the little black box to see if there's anything in it

and there's something in it, why, he's surprised. In other words, he works out surprises on himself all the time.

And what is a surprise? It's a change of pace; it's something one did not predict. Technical definition: a surprise is an occurrence which one did not predict. Got that?

Audience: Yeah. Yes.

Well, that means an awful lot because it means there's no future. You were busy predicting a future and suddenly the future that you predicted was gone. That would make a surprise. You said, "I'm going to sit here all afternoon and drink lemonade" and somebody comes, gives you a birthday present. Well, you might have gotten a birthday present, but for sure you didn't get the rest of the afternoon drinking lemonade. You follow this?

Male voice: Yes.

It's a change of pace. You don't get the havingness you bargained on.

Now, when surprises become insidious, something like a cannonball hits you in the torso and de-torsos you – and you haven't got a torso but it was an awful surprise.

Death, of which I spoke to you in the last lecture, usually has bad repercussions only when attended with surprise. Give you an example – this afternoon a fellow walking down the street in Washington, DC and he's hit with an Indian arrow between the shoulder blades, which kills him dead.

Tightrope walker – once every matinee, twice every evening he walks the tightrope hundreds of feet above the ground, thousands of feet, balances there on a hair trigger of nowhere, ready to plunge to his doom for the edification of the entire audience. He goes home, sits down in the kitchen, drinks a cup of coffee and dies of glass poisoning. It's a surprise. He didn't predict it, but there it is. Change of pace.

Now, an individual who has experienced many very arduous shocks gets to a point where he cannot change pace. He will not change pace. No matter what hits him, he will not change pace. And this is what we call "no effect."

Now, there's an experimental process that runs like this: you mock up somebody and have him experience a surprise. Go on and do it. I'm not going to flatten it; just do it. Mock up somebody and have him experience a surprise. Good. Mock up somebody else and have him experience a surprise. Good. Mock up somebody else and have him experience a surprise.

Were you able to have him experience a surprise the first time or did he just go on about his business?

Audience: No. No.

He really got a surprise.

Audience: Yeah.

Well, that means you're in pretty good shape.

Now, mock up somebody and have him experience a surprise. Do you see what's necessary to have him experience a surprise?

Audience: Yeah.

Hm?

Male voice: Surprise!

Second male voice: Change of pace.

His future has to have shifted. A fellow's walking down the street, his future is the remainder of the sidewalk. But a coconut falls on his head and he only gets just that much sidewalk that he is lying on. Do you see this?

All right. Now, to those mock-ups you made, why, okay! Right! Fine. Thank you!

Now... Come out of it. Come up to present time. Look at the front of the room. All right, end of process. Now, it's all right with you if I ended the process that abruptly, isn't it? Yes, I knew it would be. Thank you very much. I mean, nothing like running a smooth session.

This is a very important anatomy. We've known about this anatomy for a very, very, very, very, very long time. But in an effort to explain what control is, it has become absolutely necessary, vitally necessary to understand surprise, prediction and change of pace. Do you see this? Vitally necessary. Because you're looking at the anatomy of control and why it works.

Individual has been surprised, he's been surprised and been surprised and been surprised and some more surprise and some more surprise. And every time he got surprised, he resisted it one way or the other. There was a moment there that he resisted it. He tried for an instant, at least, to control it. No matter how tiny the instant was, he still tried to control what was happening if he didn't want to lose his mock-up or something of that character.

So we find people who have had too many shocks – a serious sort of surprise, that's a shock – and other such things, we find people who have experienced too many of these with large ridges and warning systems and all kinds of weird things around by which they seek to do some controlling themselves. Because those threw people out of control, didn't they? Well, wonderful thing to use those to throw people out of control. But the final result of all surprises is: out of control. You notice when you were doing the mock-ups, you had your person go out of control, right? All right. Other words for out-of-controlness are hysteria, anxiety, fear, misemotion in general. Those are all out-of-controlnesses.

Now, every time a person who has large numbers of these things stacked around finds that something is seeking to control him, he misidentifies the thing and he says, "This is the explosion that knocked my head off in 1812." See, it sought to control him, too, you see?

"Control is very bad." In other words, anything that inflows must therefore be an incipient surprise. Something is going to surprise him. If he permits himself to be controlled, if he permits his "no effect" ridge to be broken up, in other words, he is going to get a surprise and he's not going to like it.

All right. Why does Tone 40 "Give Me Your Hand" work? Why does Tone 40 8-C work? It is directly opposed to a games condition and therefore should not work at all. But it

works best on those cases which are way down south on the subject of games conditions and which have flipped. Works best on a flipped case.

Now, I talked to you about that the other evening. Every time they tried to make an effect – they are going to have a total effect on others. Then they drop below this point and when they try to – they think of terms of effect it's going to be a total effect on them. Well, you're looking at the same anatomy; you're looking at the mechanical anatomy of surprise when you're looking at effect and no-effect and so forth.

All right. Now, the individual is allergic to any effect because they are so surprising. And all these surprises add up, to him, to no havingness. Which means no future. When you start to audit him with "Give me your hand. Thank you," or some such auditing command, or Tone 40 8-C, not consulting at all with him, he becomes quite sure that he's being controlled. He gets sure of that. And all of his resistances to control, which are the resistances to the masses and surprises, rise up and smite him – pass on through, dissolve. And their common denominator is stop. And he's trying to say "Stop." Got that?

So the more he's hit with, the more he conceives he must stop it and the harder he tries to stop it. But eventually he discovers something very fantastic that he never noticed before: that you are simply asking him to extend his hand. And you've been doing it for some little time and he is still alive, he still has a body and he has a future. You in essence give him back all the future he has lost because of shocks and surprises, when you control him directly. Then he can straighten out his own sights on this. He has been terribly fixated on past bursts and controls and upsets and these past bursts and controls, upsets have thrown him. He's gotten to a point of where he says, "Nothing must come my way, nothing must control me. I know what would happen if something started to control me. It would kill me. It would finish off the future; there'd be no more future." And his immediate response to it is, "Stop. Don't do it anymore." You understand this?

So Tone 40 overtly runs out these various misconceptions by simply putting a good control along the line. Therefore the control has to be very good.

Now, I'll tell you something amusing about this. If you freeze the process – you've said, "Give me your hand. Thank you," and – whatever auditing command – and you then freeze the process and you ask the preclear how he's getting along, if you catch him just after one of these restimulations has gone through, one of these enturbulences, one of these out-of-controlnesses, he'll say yes, he should continue.

But let's say we keep on running it and he starts to scream or get upset or get agitated in some way and at a high point of agitation we freeze it and we ask him how he's getting along and whether we should continue the process or not, he will tell us, "No! No! Don't! Don't!" He isn't talking; that isn't he. That isn't his motivation at all. You continue it a few more commands and get that particular peak level so that he's merely gasping or sitting there with a glassy-eyed brace, you ask him if he should be audited any further, he'll say, "Definitely, yes." That's him talking. "You think this is doing you any good?" He'll say yes.

Now, it's very funny, you don't have to get these peaks very far down to get the person saying yes. Little Tinny-Tin, ill, processing him a second time, properly open session, processing – he started to go right on out the window. "You want to process me?" – he's going to

go right on out the window. He was quite ill and it was more or less at a peak, his restimulation. And I didn't have to argue very hard to get him to sit down and then I started the process. And at three years of age, a few minutes deep in the processing, why, he said, yes, he needed some processing, yes, it was doing him some good. Not because he was propitiating. A little further along the line, he was crying at high C and very upset and his fever fluctuating all over the place and he said no, he didn't want any processing. And on the very next command, again extended his hand – himself, all by himself without any prompting – and did this throughout the process. Came down to a very interestingly high peak; that is to say, it came down to a high peak. He was crying very hard and he slacked up just a little bit and I froze the process and I said, "How are you doing now?"

He stopped crying, he said, "I'm doing all right."

I said, "Do you think I ought to keep on with the process?"

And he said, "Yes!"

So I said "Give me your hand" and instantly he went back into the same crying, you see? After it was all over he said that did him some good.

In other words, he was perfectly aware of being controlled. And while he was in control of himself in any way, he was perfectly willing to go on with the process. But when he was totally out of control, he said "No!" In other words, he'd identified the process at such a peak with some old energy mass, some ridge, some experience. They would have called it, back several hundred years ago in the days of Freud – several thousand years ago – they would have called it "you're experiencing psychic trauma." And when he is experiencing a psychic trauma, he didn't want any processing. But when he could breathe all by himself without something strangling him, just barely breathe, you see – he could barely get one eye out from underneath whatever was attacking him, he said yes. That from a three-year-old. Older preclears are seldom this sensible.

Now, the more shock there is on the case, the more frozen the responses. Now, how do you keep from getting surprised? Well, you could probably list a half a dozen ways of not getting surprised. Common denominator of all of them is "control everything in the whole universe." And if you control everything in the whole universe, nothing is going to surprise you. There are other ways of getting sideways from control. One of them is being apathetic about everything, not caring what happens so that nothing affects you in any way. That's a method of keeping from getting controlled. Any misemotion is a method of not being controlled. There's another method of not being controlled: that's not living. Very interesting method of keeping from being controlled.

But the common denominator of it all is, under no circumstances can anything in the whole universe get out from underneath control. All right, somebody – we see a little – a ball, a kid's ball rolls across the sidewalk. Now, a person who is hypercontrol, you see, has been surprised too much. Get the same thing, you know? He's – hypercontrol, been surprised too much: same thing. This the entrance point on all of this, is the far-south case. Catatonic schiz is just rigidly "no more surprises."

All right. This ball rolls across the sidewalk, this supercontrol case says, "Nnnyaah!" Why? Why? Well, the ball is demonstrating that it is not under his control.

Little kid runs in the room and says, "Nyaaa, nyaaa, nyaaa." The super-control case says, "Dzzz, nyaaaaa, ahhhh, ruuuh, uhh, uuhhhh, uhh! I get so nervous around children!"

Well, what's this nervousness? It's one of these ridge masses which was – had an out-of-controlness in it and it's starting to throw him out of control, don't you see? So he sees something he doesn't control, he starts to go out of control. He just Q's-and-A's with it at once.

If you wanted to make a person who would not control anything control something, along the Pavlovian, Russian, Stanford University type of abuses, you could actually use this datum and advance their technology up to a point of where at least some of it worked. And that would be something on this order: you would take a fellow who was going to control an awful lot of people or who had to or something of the sort and you would get him walking along and everything he touched would explode, except some things wouldn't – except some whistled. And you just give him large numbers of unpredictednesses, all of which had some jolt and all of them connected with people in some fashion. And when you got through, he would be exhibiting what Homo sapiens call leadership. He would be obsessively controlling everybody.

Hitler – Hitler on the Western Front as a corporal, this young Austrian upstart had a few too many shells land too close, had a few too many fellows blow up in his vicinity and at the end of it he had enough of it on the track so that if there was anything in the entire world not under his control, it would have driven him berserk! Some thirty million human beings died because of Adolf Schicklgruber but he was a "great leader." Millions, eighty-five millions of people followed him practically to their deaths. There were people all over the United States saying, "Well, you can do business with Hitler; I don't know why we're going to war with Hitler. He's probably doing all right for Germany. Great leader."

This tells you how to handle a general if you ever have to handle him – he's getting uppity, getting too "generalized." When you talk to him, just keep waving your hands in front of his face, like this. Just use your hands lots. Speed it up, get it up above the motion of Italians, you know? And say, "Well general, I tell you – it's like this. Well..." and so forth. And at first he'll just seek to tear your head off. And after a while he'll just sit back in apathy. And if you were to reach over and close his eyes, they'd shut. And you said, "You're now a dog. Bark." His next general order would be, "Arf, arf, arf."

Leadership. Leadership in Homo sapiens is based upon necessity to control for one's own safety and security. Therefore we have a bunch of only-ones in charge of the show. We give them an atom bomb and say, "Go ahead and blow our heads off, that's a good big surprise. That's just the way to run governments." Go find all the has-beens that can't stand up to any more surprises and who get nervous every time a piece of paper rattles, and then put them in charge of all of us. That's the way to do it. Only you never really find any leadership until an individual is capable of taking an awful lot of surprise. I mean real, effective leadership can't exist until somebody can stand up and – to surprises.

Because the whole business of being an executive is having surprising pieces of paper shoved under your face. Always they're very surprising because people you have in organiza-

tions quite often specialize in handing out surprises; they dramatize them. Knock water coolers over, get them to leak down into the files where all the precious documents are kept and "Wonder how that happened!" Hide the keys to the doors you're trying to get into.

The fact that a president of the United States would look older at the end of his term of office demonstrates in the first place that he couldn't stand a surprise. Must be a terrible shock just to associate with the United States Senate. Be something on the order of being shot up with siege guns twenty-four hours a day. They consider as a high priority of business the appointment of the postmaster of Fairhope, Alabama, you see? That's the only thing that concerns them because he – after all, he brought in his whole family and he has thirty-two people in his family and means a lot of votes. And these people think up all sorts of things in order to get attention. They find out the only way you can get attention is to surprise hell out of somebody.

There's a lot of shock connected with leading anything, this is for sure. An individual shouldn't be stiffly proofed against this shock. He should merely be able to handle it. He should be able to be surprised and still have a future. You see that as a necessity for any such activity.

All right, you're looking at the common denominator of most of the blowup reactions that you get on the part of pcs. Now, everybody's got a few too many surprises. It's not true that everybody's gone to a point of where they have to control everybody in the whole universe before they themselves are safe. That's not true.

But it is true that individuals at any level to some degree keep a finger on loaded .45 automatics when they're in the room, you know, they're – just keep the finger away from them, push them away. I remember a federal marshal came in waving one under my nose and I pushed the muzzle away, took it away from him and put it back in his holster. I didn't like the idea of the thing being pointed at me. But my adjudication was fairly sane. The fellow was too nervous; he didn't know very much about guns. Well now, if the muzzle had been pushed away with violence, on a reactive level, he would have fired it. You see this? Well, you see a slight difference here. It would be necessary to handle the things you handle on a line that will handle them. That sounds awfully simple, doesn't it? I mean, if you're going to handle something, handle it. Don't misemotion it.

There's various ways of handling comm lines that handle things. You can extend a comm line in a certain direction or put comm lines on certain vias that handle situations for you. It's no more than tactics and strategy. It's quite another thing to be totally obsessed on control. Because you will not plan or plot a comm line at all. You will just try to get the other person to explode; they don't explode, so you explode. And that is the cycle of a rage or an upset or an apathy. See, you try to get the other person to explode and he doesn't and you do. Well, he didn't explode because you couldn't communicate an explosion very well.

If you're not allergic to surprises and not upset about surprises, you can blow his silly head off. You wouldn't get yours blown off. So it's quite the contrary – on the upper scale a person could hand out surprises without much liability as long as he could communicate. But if he couldn't communicate, why, any surprise that he tries to hand out will be a reactive one that he doesn't even know about and then this surprises him and he explodes.

So we get the usual day of such a case would be something on this order: gets up in the morning, decides he'll kill his wife, realizes he can't, cuts himself with a razor; goes in and starts to eat breakfast, decides he'll shoot the cook, realizes he can't do that, chokes on an egg. Get this? Little inverted cycle. The overt act becomes the motivator at once. Thinks he'll hand out a wonderful surprise to the office when he gets there but – that is to say, he'll drop a hand grenade on the floor. Doesn't have one. Instead of that, why, gets gas pains. This is the way it goes. This is the cycle of his day, hour by hour, minute by minute. It's enough for such a person to decide to surprise somebody some way or another and get awfully upset himself.

Now, it isn't just a thetan that gets in this frame of mind. Actually, the body has enormous numbers of retained surprises of one kind or another. And a thetan can pick up a body that has a lot of surprises in it he doesn't know anything about. And then he starts wondering what's wrong with him, and this misowns the whole works. And after that he's a complete wreck. They weren't his in the first place.

Now, Tone 40, with the extension of the hand, Tone 40 8-C alike blow up the body's antisurprise machinery, see? It blows up the body's reactions as well as a thetan's reactions. But the body probably has thousands more than a thetan. So nearly every blowup that you look at is a body blowup. Then the thetan is liable to say, "I wonder how come I blew up about this." Well, that's a misnomer. He didn't ever blow up about it. The body blew up and he went out of an ability to control the body and he had a hard time getting back into control of the body. And that's the usual cycle that occurs.

A fellow who's dead in his head of course is just thinking of himself as the body. The body reaction is his reaction, his reaction is the body's reaction and that's all there is to it and there's nothing you can do about it anyhow because we all know we're men from mud. "The men from mud" – hey, that's a – that's a – hey, that's a good science fiction... "The Men from Mud." Ah, well...

Well, okay, you got this surprise pretty well taped? Hm?

Audience: Yeah.

Now, use the phrase like "counter-control" rather than control. You're not really controlling somebody with CCH 1, CCH 2, so much as you are counter-controlling blowups. The blowup is seeking to control, you control, then boom. What blows up? An individual is convinced that he cannot be controlled because everything – anytime anything controls him, one of these blowups starts to occur; you control him and that's a counter-control, see? And he finds out the blowup didn't kill him and he's still alive and he can still function. That is, most of the time he finds it out.

The divine doubt of whether or not the process works will enter your mind, many times. You'll be processing some person that's been in an automobile accident and all of a sudden they start to moan and scream and it's obvious that the more you process them, the more they moan and scream. You say, "Well, I'm probably doing wrong; undoubtedly they're getting worse." If you were to put a thermometer in the hands of a – in the mouth of a sick man, you put a thermometer in his mouth and – so that you could watch it while you processed him – you'd see your processing taking his temperature right on down. It's quite inter-

esting. Usually a case of you knowing where to stop. Don't take it too far subnormal. Ninety-six and a half is about as far down as you want to go on something like that.

Understand more about this now?

Audience: Yes.

Well now, this is the counter-control process, see? An individual gets into this obsessed control simply because he dare not be surprised. You understand that? And his answer to never being surprised is to control everything and this is irrational and he can't have any fun if he's controlling everything because he'll never get a surprise, because he can't have any surprise and we get one of these good old $A = A = A$ equations going. Nice rat race. And the way you break up the rat race is to demonstrate to him with a control process that he can be controlled without serious consequences. Explosions run very bad 8-C and so he doesn't like them. You run good 8-C so he finds out that he can live. Okay?

Audience: Yeah.

Here I have a few questions which I will take up on this, because they're sequitur, one or two of these. Here we have: "What's the anatomy of sleep?" Restimulative subject.

Now, we've talked all about the heady essence of surprise and here we have this news about sleep. Well, actually to a large degree they're the same subject. One can be surprised at night much more easily than one can be surprised in the daytime. The best thing to do is sleep through it. Body has lots of considerations about how it ought to have so much sleep and so forth, and you'll find the use of counter-control with CCH 1, 2, actually cut down the amount of time a person has to sleep.

When a thetan cannot control or handle any part of anything, he goes anaten. Anaten and sleep are not quite the same thing. They are based on exactly the same mechanisms, however. But they are slightly different. Now, an individual originally had some other use for sleep. A thetan could put a body to sleep and go off and have a good time. Go down to Ditty-Wah-Ditty. That's ten miles on the other side of hell – that's where the people in hell go to have a good time. Harlem jive anatomy. Ditty-Wah-Ditty.

An individual then had a use for sleep. As a matter of fact, there are in the brain some little mechanisms that if you squeeze them or put a black spot of energy in them or something like that, the body shorts out. For a period of time it shorts out. Actually after a while that becomes automatic. A person puts it on automatic, the body goes to sleep. A thetan thinking he is the body, why, after a while begins to consider that he ought to go to sleep too. He's totally dependent on the body for communication so he goes to sleep too. All of this in the ratio of confidence in controlling one's environment. It's very hard to control an environment at night in the blackness and so on, and so why do anything but be totally introverted during that period?

Actually there is a cellular background to sleep which is fascinating. Plankton floating on the sea is unable to get any sunlight during the night and the sunlight storage which it thinks it has to have doesn't last all the way through the night. So you'll find people feeling pretty ghastly if you wake them up around 2,3,4 o'clock in the morning. Shake them up and say, "Come on, boy." They don't.

The body, evidently, on the genetic line, has retained all the lessons of algae, plankton, monocellular behavior. And part of that behavior is when the sun is up, one can have some sunlight, therefore one can have energy so he can move around. And when the sun is gone, one doesn't have any more energy so one shouldn't move around. And you can turn on in most preclears – you can make him find around the body horrible facsimiles of dark, dark night, little algae bobbing on the sea and horrendous waves coming up and some shore with the breakers roaring, and he doesn't like that. Obviously the plankton couldn't handle that, right? So it was just too much to handle so when one doesn't handle anything one doesn't reach out at it. And if he doesn't reach out at it, then he – it reaches in wholly at him. And if this is the case, then this thing we call sleep results.

So you'd say there's such a thing as a thetan's sleep. This is just a restimulated thing because the body's asleep and he hasn't got anything better to do. Be such a thing as a body's automatic sleep, by which it merely takes a certain portion of the dark hours and believes it has to be comatose during that because there's no food, because the sun isn't shining or something of the sort. But that is just patterned sleep. And then there's something else called anaten, which is body sleep while the thetan is still awake. And that's real anaten.

A person who is experiencing analytical attenuation is actually sitting there unable to get through the fog which has settled down on the body. And it's a funny, funny experience. If you as an auditor think your preclear is all the way gone, you've made a mistake because he's perfectly alert, usually. And he's just sitting back of all of these comatose ridges and he cannot make the body talk or move and he's just sort of looking at all of it.

Well now, once in a blue moon he will flick out for a moment. He'll have a little dream a millisecond long or something of this character. He'll invert on this sleep basis himself. But what we refer to usually as anaten is – the thetan still has some awareness. We tell somebody to mock up some blackness and push it into his body. Now, ordinarily he will go to sleep underneath this impact in some fashion, to all appearances. But actually he's merely gone anaten. He's gone duuhh. If you kept on repeating the auditing command, the thetan would keep doing it. And it's a very bad error not to continue to repeat the auditing command when it is of that type of command, when your pc is apparently anaten. You guys understand that?

By the way, you'll never really permanently turn off anybody's blackness unless you run the process that way. "Mock up some blackness and shove it in." We don't say "to the body," we don't care what. "Mock up some blackness and shove it in. Mock up some blackness and shove it in." Pc usually in that kind of a condition where he has to have this thing done will, after a while, go anaten. The funny part of it is, is he keeps right on doing it if you keep on ordering it. He might not even remember it afterwards. But I have taken a careful check of this on E-Meters and things like that and the person does go right on doing it. And they come out the other side of all of this anaten, boil-off – slight difference between anaten and boil-off too, by the way. A boil-off is a person is just fogging through an awful lot of it and it gradually sort of recedes. Boiling off is the action of anaten disappearing off the case. But a person can boil off for hours at a time. All right.

Now, an individual then, in remedying havingness – in having having-ness remedied with blackness, will usually go anaten. And if the auditor keeps giving the auditing command,

the preclear will come up on the opposite side of the anaten with clear visio and no more blackness even though he didn't remember finishing it all the way through or not.

Now, sometimes we have preclears who are chronically fogged up. We have them sit down in the auditing chair and it doesn't seem to matter what we do to them, they continue to be foggy and dopey and drift off and all of that sort of thing. This is the same mechanism. But the thetan is being very upset about this very often when the body keeps doing it and he is misowning it. And the only real difficulty he has, if you run him on CCH 1, CCH 2 and he does not respond and this doesn't come out and doesn't work off, then you can assume that he is misowning it. He thinks that he is doing something to the body, whereas the body is simply doing it. There's a misownership of the anaten there. But it will work off in any event and simply asking him to reach out toward things, talk toward things, or think of things he could say or do to various individuals, will gradually knock this anaten out. Anaten is something a thetan himself does when a thetan goes out. Only a thetan can turn off his own attention; a body really can't turn it off.

Okay. You know what sleep is? It's the same manifestation, more or less, only it has a lot of tremendous conditions and training mechanisms and automaticities mocked up with it. It's quite ordinary for people to get along on less and less sleep in Dianetics and Scientology. They don't have to sleep as much. They sometimes make an awful effort – ho-hum – they make an awful effort and they sometimes, just to hold up their reputations and so forth, don't sleep. And that's silly. That's silly.

There's another oddity: you get going along a certain pace and you've got it mocked up that you can go along under such and such a strain and you mistake the strain for energy. And then one day this strain folds up and you feel exhausted. I do this very often after a congress. Quite amusing. I've been four days in there pitching like mad, you see? I get myself wound up. I can sleep all right, but I quite often mistake my ability to keep going for this mocked-up – an automaticity, see? It's just four days' worth of it has been enough to get me wound up, see? And I have to sit down, differentiate between me doing it and using up the facsimiles of me doing it. Got the idea?

If I don't restrain the body from running on the mocked-up four days, it'll all of a sudden run those out into exhaustion. In four or five days, well, all of a sudden will feel terribly exhausted. Boom! Well, what happened is, is I just got going and I decided to burn it up on an automaticity; didn't pay any attention to it at all. I never sat down and readjusted. There is quite a change of pace in anything like that. There's changes of mass, numbers of people.

Actually the sudden loss of that many people at the end of the four days, the sudden acquisition of that many people at the beginning of the four days of a congress alike have their effects upon anybody who is handling that large a crowd.

Now, sleep is a necessity to a psycho and if somebody does not sleep and cannot sleep, he can be counted upon to get more and more and more agitated and to go up the spout further and further and further. He'll get in worse and worse condition if he can't sleep. When a psycho cannot eat and cannot sleep, he's had it. Don't process him. Don't process him. Got that?

Your processing is going in on a complete – below exhaustion – exhaustion that's probably even below degradation. And the thing for you to do is to make them get something to eat and make them sleep. Got that? Don't keep auditing them. I'm telling you, I've got experience on this and there's lots of kids around got lots of experience on this. We'd never look for a psychiatrist to give us any experience on this, that's for sure. He runs an "everybody knows," you know? But they know that. They know that people, when they get crazier and crazier, why, they at length get to a point where they cannot sleep at all and this ruins them utterly.

I'll tell you a good cure for this – for sleeplessness. This is an excellent cure for sleeplessness. Also an excellent cure for exhaustion. What's the difference? And that is, walk around the block until things start to look solid to you. Don't go on any method about it. Just walk around the block till things start to look ...

You say, "Now, wait a minute. You mean you're totally exhausted, you can't even drag yourself along and you're supposed to go out and walk around the block?" That's right. And the first two turns around the block, you know absolutely that the third turn is going to be so gruesome that nobody could possibly make it without putting one of these package trucks under his heels. He just couldn't do it. And somewhere about halfway along that line all of a sudden things start looking solid and the exhaustion goes pphhhhhh and you start coming up scale and next thing you know you feel nice and relaxed. And after a while, why, you can lie down and go to sleep. You got that? It's quite weird. I mean, an individual can get below the level of tiredness, you see? Down to exhaustion, and that's a very definitely gruesome level to be at.

The actual cure for it is walk around the block, as given in Problems of Work. It's rather terrific as a process, by the way. It's one of the better processes. But it is so simple that it's almost impossible to convince anybody that it is one of the better processes.

If you're exhausted, you have no business getting very much auditing. One, you start sticking in the session. You get introverted. You'll find you're jumping at Auditor Code breaks the like of which you never heard of. Thing that you should do is to go out and walk around the block. I know, you're tired. I know, walking around the block will make you more tired. That's all right. After you've been at it for a while, you'll run out and be able to walk around the block.

I'd say if somebody was auditing all the time or sitting at a desk all the time, aw, he'd be a fool not to walk around the block until he was no longer tired after he had finished work.

Sounds real funny. You walk around the block actually until you're no longer tired. And then you can relax. And that is the best cure I know for sleep.

Now, hypnotics, taking hypnotics – Nytol, amphibinol, snooze-all, drowse-all, those things don't work. They don't work. I don't know what it is about them but these sedatives have a kickback that – don't give you very much about sleep. There isn't anything connected with sleep. They're hypnotics and I don't care what anybody calls them, they're hypnotics.

I was wondering what people were taking – you call this "tranquilizer" so I took a couple of handfuls to find out what was happening about them, so forth, and I – instead of going

to sleep as one was supposed to do, or feel relaxed, something of this sort, why, I felt my eyes snakk and pow-w-w and the diaphragms dilated like that and I put the body in a chair and went over and sat on the molding for a while and let it get over it.

It was just an hypnotic. It's an oddity that the medicos, the drug boys – the drug boys, by the way, these – this day and age have too much money and buy too much advertising, that's for sure. Because these hypnotics and these various quote "cures," drug cures for psychosis and neurosis and all these tranquilizers and all of that sort of thing actually produce almost identical effects. They are all poisons. And any known poison can be administered in sufficiently small amount to be an hypnotic.

There's a common denominator on this thing. You can take strychnine and you can administer just enough strychnine to make somebody feel peppy. Well, that's a stimulant then, isn't it? Heh-heh! See? Stimulant, obviously. Now you can give them just enough strychnine to make them dope off. Obviously it's a depressant, isn't it? Now you can give them enough strychnine to kill them dead. Well, that's a poison, isn't it? Veronal works the same way. It, in various dosages, is a stimulant, a depressant and a poison. Opium, same thing.

So I think you could take grass and eat enough of it and you would get a stimulant, a depressant and a poison. But nobody has tried it because it's in bales. One bale would be a stimulant. But I actually did make this test on what they call rabbit pellets. They press grasses into rather large, solid pellets that they feed to rabbits and they put these in sacks and sell them to people who have rabbits. Some people have circuits and others have rabbits. Anyhow – and we had people chomping on these around and they did the same thing. They really did. You could take these pellets, which were pressed alfalfa, and you could do various weird things with these tablets. And it all amounts to how much strychnine is havingness, see?

Now, you've heard of the werewolves haven't you?

Audience: Yeah.

Close off this subject of speech. You didn't know it, you know, but a werewolf is somebody who turns into a wolf. You got that? He's a werewolf.

Now, actually they have such a thing as a weretiger described in the Encyclopaedia Britannica, which is somebody who turns into a tiger. See, during the night hours instead of going to sleep like other people do, why, they turn into a tiger and roam around the countryside. That actually is people dramatizing a fear of thetans who can put bodies to sleep and then go for a walk.

Well anyway, werewolves – werewolves are fascinating creatures because the only way a werewolf can be killed, of course (as everybody knows), is while lying in his coffin, to have a stake put through his chest and driven home. Part of the original formula was "by a virgin at midnight." [cut part]

Well, the name of this subject, by the way, is lycanthropy. That branch of psychiatry which does not treat of anything else. And this business of roaming around while asleep and drinking blood and so forth goes over into vampirism and numbers of other things. These are just the things that go boomp in the night that people keep mocked up to keep people in their heads at night. And there's quite an industry going on of things you mustn't do at night. Proba-

bly nightclubs and bars and that sort of thing are part of the same industry. They collect everybody into the nightclubs and bars so they won't roam around at night.

You can always get a church to compose some night social group just to keep people from going out at night. There's all sorts of operations then – but there's a definite fear of things that roam in the night.

Speaking of werewolves, you know, we've got a test mocked up about – the silver bullet test. And it's supposed to be that a silver bullet kills a werewolf too, you know. But the Lone Ranger's got all the silver bullets and we haven't been able to get hold of any to carry out the test. But we definitely would like to know whether or not a silver bullet would kill a werewolf. Of course, plotting this the way they plot psychological experiments, why, it isn't necessary to find out if a werewolf exists or not before one makes tests concerning one. Always observe on a big via and you got it made.

Now, the subject of sleep is simply the retreat – is the subject of how far can one retreat from being surprised. And you can actually make people very, very groggy by startling them. They get very agitated and then they get very groggy.

Now, if you can get a person sufficiently agitated, he won't sleep. So below sleep there is no-sleep and below that there is exhaustion and below that there's a hectic thing that we quite often call a manic state. And below that is degradation, which is a harmonic of exhaustion. And below that is "Oh, to hell with it, let's exteriorize and go our way." Death. Death puts in its oar down below this point.

When a body dies or when somebody is killed suddenly with a great surprise, he passes through these lines so fast on the scale that he doesn't recognize them. But you start to run out a surprise and you'll find each one of the steps I just gave you is there. First all the steps are there jammed together, then each one articulates and you bring him back on up.

It's quite interesting, the one thing you have to know about sleep definitely, that it's just the retreat from that – a person retreats and it means "can't handle." That's all it means, sleep-can't handle. And the only thing you've got to be careful of is not to audit people who cannot sleep. A person who cannot sleep at all is dynamite. Now, how do you get them to sleep if they cannot sleep? Well, don't audit them, walk them around the block. Well, how do you get to sleep if you cannot sleep? Well, walk around the block. Well, how do you take a person in good shape and get them to sleep? Well, walk them around the block. Well, how do you get somebody who's all the way north, exteriorized, in beautiful condition, how do you get him to sleep? I don't know, that's what this universe is all about. It tried to solve that problem and look where we are now.

Thank you.

Thank you.

Thinnies

A lecture given on 1 August 1957

Thank you. Thank you.

You'll be very glad to hear tonight that I'm not going to lecture on anything that would be of any use to you anywhere and that'll take the strain off.

Male voice: Good.

So don't bother to listen. And just relax, just relax.

We have here a very interesting subject for tonight's debate: the rise and fall of the Atlantean Civilization. The Rise and Fall of the Atlantean Civilization. This is a very interesting book here and it says that this country got bigger and bigger – this country called Atlantis – it got bigger and bigger and then after a while it got so big that one side of it was mad at the other side and somebody invented an H-bomb and that was the end of Atlantis.

Well, that's the end of that book. All right!

And then we have this other subject tonight – we have this other subject tonight which came in my – these books come in my office and I'm always happy to receive them but sometimes I wonder. Most books I'm very happy to see and read, but sometimes they come by, and I'm just showing you an example, and this is Atomic Suicide. It has some material in it which I'm sure that you will be very, very glad to hear. This is – "We Define God" is the name of the chapter. Page 119, section nine.

"God thinks in electric impulsations which are recorded in motion as four pairs of rings which are compressed into spheres. Each cyclic pulsation is manifested by the projection of four concentric light rings in one plane from the point of the magnetic mind-light in which the red half of the spectrum is on the outside ..."

Male voice: I don't believe it.

The whole book is like that! The whole book. You can just pick it up anyplace.

So anyway, we won't lecture about those.

What's the – this is the fourteenth lecture of the 18th ACC, Aug. 1, 1957. Tonight we're going to talk about thinnies.

Thinnies. Title of the lecture.

An electronic computer, if it did all of the recording of the human mind, would require enough tubes to burn enough light – as much light as would be generated by Niagara Falls, and another Niagara Falls would be required to cool that computer. In other words, something

that would do all the recording, filing and analyzing that is done by the mind would occupy many city blocks and it would use just billions of electronic tubes and it would require Niagara Falls to cool it. It'd use as much power as is consumed by the ordinary small town by modern electronic standards. Pretty complicated stuff, providing you suppose the human mind is a computer.

Now obviously, although you sometimes may think to the contrary, your head is not that big and it doesn't generate that much heat.

Now, a small experiment in obnosis will demonstrate this. I don't care where you make the experiment. You could make the experiment right now. The point is, viewed as a computer, as a picture-taker which files the pictures, the human mind is impossible. Now, I've known that for twenty-five years. But just how impossible it was was not the point. What it did was first the point. And you will discover a dissertation on what it did and what it does in *Dianetics: The Modern Science of Mental Health*. Fairly good coverage – that, and *The History of Man* – fairly good coverage, but how it does it actually is something I've been awfully quiet about. I sort of glossed over it.

I glossed over it so well that I don't think any of you even asked the question very hard because I dared not ask the question of how it did all this, because it wasn't possible. The human mind couldn't possibly store these pictures. The human mind couldn't possibly reanalyze by inspection and cross-inspection of pictures. The human mind couldn't possibly store fifty-three perceptions per picture and then a running fire of pictures at the rate of about twenty-five per second for many years. No machine could do these things. Therefore, it must be that there is a simpler explanation. That simple explanation would be this: supposing the physical universe itself thinned down and with you still standing there, looked like a picture. In other words, you look at the wall and the wall looks solid to us, right here and now, and then it – in that instant of time that you first looked at it an instant ago – now is thin, with a remote viewpoint still in front of it. And you're in communication with the remote viewpoint – then we'd be running a sort of change of space not-thereness, so that the physical universe itself, which we can observe, is to some degree, one way or another, moving forward in time – is evidently a very large computer all by itself.

Now, this merely puts the burden on the physical universe to be this complicated. But that makes one complication for the many of us, rather than a complication for each one of us. There's no particular reason to choose the simpler. But when we think that the human mind stores these mental image pictures with fifty-three perceptions per each and twenty-five pictures a second, on everything that is viewed – when we think of this in terms of storage, we're not going down any very probable course. In the first place there's no place to put them. All kinds of absurdities come up the moment we view the whole idea as "mental image picture." So we might as well take this as a whole and look at it on the basis that these mental image pictures which we see of yesteryear are actually the physical universe still there in another instant of time, now past, in front of which we have parked a remote view-point with which we are in communication and with which we can get into communication.

Now, there's several things in support of this theory – it is a theory. First, any wild change of environment – such as a person dies and comes into another life – leaves him con-

fused as to the past and his confusion as to the past is such that he knows nothing about his past as could be told to him by pictures. He's been displaced too widely and therefore cannot easily get in touch with these old remu – remote viewpoints he's left parked around. But when we run him on the process known as Then and Now Solids, we rather easily steer him back along these courses and have him pick up these old viewpoints. The only reason Then and Now Solids works is because we're taking over the automaticity of the physical universe making itself solid again. And the person starts picking up these old viewpoints he has left parked around.

Now, this gets to be an absurdly simple mechanism after a while. Providing you don't look at the complexity of the physical universe necessary to have it work! It means that the physical universe is a concatenation of pictures which are solid in any given instant for all of us – they're solid in any instant for all of us – and an instant afterwards that set of pictures is no longer solid but a new set of pictures is solid. It means somebody's working overtime mocking things up. But the point is we have a very wide agreement on this.

Now, the only reason we'd be studying this at all is quite an interesting one. The only thing wrong with a mind is a mind. I'll go over that again. The only thing wrong with a mind is that it is a mind. That is all that is wrong with it: it is. Because it's so rigged up that every action an individual undertakes, every action undertaken is then held in suspense. Everything he's done bad and done wrong is held in suspense to the end of time.

And somebody talks about karma. They're talking about – without knowing what they were talking about – this series of pictures retained by the mind. All the pain and agony of yesterday can be carried in this mind and can be turned on again against the individual. This mind may have use. Who knows? But for sure it has liability. It has kickback. It is a sort of a trap. An individual is never free of his acts of yesterday. Well, maybe this is desirable in the other fellow but it's not too desirable in you, is it?

Retribution, the mind, conscience, guilt, restraint. And this would be all very well, providing anybody could prove that an unrestrained being is always damaging. And yet in processing we find out that the more we do for somebody the easier he is on his fellow man and it's only those people who are totally plowed into these minds who commit crimes, are criminals, lead countries ... Only such people as are totally trapped with no hope of ever getting out are reactively engaged in the commission of crimes.

Quite amazing. The more complexity developed in the mind – it seems to us with our tests and our processing – the greater liability to the society. That sort of makes it a devil's universe, doesn't it?

An individual goes along and the more he lives, the more experience he gets, the more he knows he better not communicate and associate. And the more he refuses to communicate and associate, the less he'll find out about his fellow man and the less actual restraint there is upon his doing things. And the more restraint he gets, why, the less restrained he acts. It's a wonderful thing. This is a philosophic enigma.

An animal has one of the most complex minds you ever cared to have anything to do with. You get into a cat's head, you don't find much brain but boy do you find lots of mind. You get into a rabbit's head – the same breed of feline almost – cats and rabbits seem to have

no trouble associating with each other. But this rabbit, in great terror, sees a wolf behind every rock and takes a fixed picture of every rock. He has one of the most obsessed, mystery-infested minds that anybody ever had anything to do with. Quite interesting.

You say, "How do you know about the mind of a rabbit?"

Well, I could tell you I've put them on an E-Meter and tell you a bunch of lies. As a matter of fact I've looked at rabbits' minds. Also senators' minds. Also wolves' minds. And I find out that it is almost a scale here – that the more mind there is and the less that mind can be handled by the person who possesses it, the more craven the conduct of the individual and the less good he does his fellows.

Well, one could say then it must be the devil's universe. It isn't – and this may be news to you – the content of the mind that is bothering you. It is the fact that you have one.

That's a large bullet to chew, as a matter of fact. And we went in with Dianetics to clean up somebody's mind, we went in with Scientology to get them so they could handle one. There's a further step, and that's a mindectomy.

You could characterize somebody as a mindless saint and you could characterize somebody else of less optimum behavior as a fully minded devil. And everything that we have learned on this would seem to indicate that the mind itself, rather than prevent evil, creates it. It forms an insulating mass beyond which a thetan cannot experience and in view of the fact that it does this, he therefore cares little what he does to his fellow being because when he strikes pain into a man he feels it not. If you were in very good shape and you hit somebody on the head, you'd feel it! Not with your fist but with his head. But if you can be totally introverted about the whole thing and not feel anything more than your head, you can safely hit him on the head, can't you? So a mind acts as a restraint of feeling and it may have in it a great many things which deter one from proceeding against one's fellows on a conscience basis, but for sure it insulates someone from ever feeling what happens to his fellows.

About the most that Homo sapiens does is occasionally get a headache because somebody else has a headache. Now, he thinks this is a counter-restimulation. It is not a counter-restimulation. He's already identifying himself with that person and feels his headache. It isn't any headache anyplace else but in that person. Getting the somatic from somebody else is simply the mechanism of solving a problem. As we solve a problem over and over and over, get more and more solutions to a problem, we'll find out we get closure with the problem. And as we get more and more problems of comparable magnitude we see that space opening up between the individual and the problem. You could ask anybody – you're running problems of comparable magnitude on him and you ask, "Where is that problem now?" and oddly enough he'll always – usually – spot a location. Now you run a few more problems of comparable magnitude and you say, "Where's the problem now?" and he'll spot a location further away. Pretty soon it disappears way out there somewhere.

All right. We take the same problem we've just solved and we say, "Give us a solution." How fascinating! "Give us a solution. Give us another solution. Another solution. Another solution. Another solution. Where is the problem now?"

"There."

"Give us another solution. Where is the problem now?"

"There."

"Give us another solution. Where is the problem now?"

"Right where I am."

Now we can say, "Give us a problem of comparable magnitude to that problem. Another problem of comparable magnitude." And out the problem moves again. How fantastic! This is weird! It's an interesting phenomenon which you should be acquainted with because it's one of the major phenomena you use in auditing. You know that separation is taking place the more problems you have somebody dream up; and the more problems you solve the more closure you get. One of the reasons for this is the solution is more or less one side of an existing problem preserved and the other side gone. So the thing snaps in on the body, missing its own terminal.

The process of solution is the process of knocking out one side or the other of a problem. You can generalize to that degree. When you knock out one side of a problem of course it has to snap in on something and so it snaps in on the individual's body.

But this tells us a great deal. This gives us a lot of philosophic bait. Just exactly what is going on here? You mean we solve problems and we go snap into them? And we invent more problems and they part from us? Well, the enormity of space of this universe obviously indicates that it is an enormous problem.

Space seems to be created in this fashion.

Now, see here! Nobody could possibly believe that mental image pictures are so valuable that nobody could possibly let go of any of them. You yourself would think this was a silly idea. And yet right now at this moment your mind is still manufacturing them and storing them up. Well, that's fine. Of course you can say they're an aid to memory, like a pencil and paper. A person who takes notes on everything he hears and can't remember every – anything himself would do this.

Let's see if we can't find and examine a system on the subject of mental image pictures which might work in a more simple fashion. Let us assume this complexity: that the universe is a parade, through time, of pictures. And any given instant all those pictures at that instant are solid, and those ahead of it and those behind that instant are thin. So actually time is a parade of solidity through established pictures.

Yes, but we do have a power of choice, so therefore we have some means of altering what part of the universe we're going to take a picture of. Now, we could alter what part of the universe we were going to take a picture of by altering our position in the universe. But the forthcoming pictures of the universe, on a very gross level, would be where they are. In other words, the forthcoming pictures of Earth will be in predictable positions in the vicinity of the Sun. But your automobile, pictures of, will not be in predictable positions. You get the idea? And as we go from great to small, why, we see that we get less and less predictable positions in proportion to the mass. The greater the mass, the more predictable the position; the less the mass, the less predictable the position. So you could always move the small things of life.

And the smallest thing I could think of at the moment would be a remote viewpoint. That's pretty tiny.

Now, are they – are they facsimiles or are they actually the universe, thinned down – not pictures of the universe, but the actual universe thinned down – that we see as pictures?

This is a very vast – this is a very large datum. A vast question. How would we see these things? Well, when we stand before them, an impression of ourselves looking becomes our communication with the picture. In other words, we leave bits and pieces of us-ness on the track too, and so we can see these old pictures.

Now, if that theory were correct, a method of erasing pictures would at once become manifest and would work. All you had to do was take over the automaticity of remote viewpoints in front of the scenery. Or erase old remote viewpoints parked in front of the scenery. And if either of these two things worked I would have a tendency to believe that we were dealing with thinnies, not with pictures.

Now, you could still call them facsimiles if you said, "This, gotten thin, is a facsimile of what it was." And you could preserve the word facsimile on this dogleg piece of logic.

Now, if you were looking at that wall you would leave in that moment of time a remote viewpoint from that position in space. In other words, it's a location in space. Now, I presume that most of you had supper. Now, can you get a picture of any part of it before, during or after supper this evening?

Audience: Yes.

You can?

All right. Very well. Very well. Now, just get the idea of putting a remote viewpoint in front of that picture.

Now, what happened? It went away partially or wholly, didn't it?

Audience: Yes.

Well, those of you that didn't get it to go away fully just put it – do it again as another action.

Did it swing away?

Audience: Yes.

Well, isn't that a fascinating thing? Did it swing away or did that part of you-ness come here?

Male voice: The latter.

You think it came here, huh? Isn't this fascinating.

I want to know what you're doing leaving pieces of you scattered all over this universe! In other words, we've caught you off base haunting the past. If this is true.

Now, we have tested many things in the handling of pictures. And any one of the methods, if successful, could have been understood through the handling of the remote view-

point which was looking at the picture. We of course could go through a thoroughgoing erasure of the thing providing one was in one's own valence – which would only mean, "Let's assume your own viewpoint."

Now, Dianetics made the individual assume that viewpoint again and then look it over and look it over and look it over. Now, the oddity was, is occasionally the thing didn't erase. Occasionally it just got sticky. That perhaps is because we didn't thoroughly understand what we were doing. We were trying to erase the picture, whereas as a matter of fact, all we had to do was erase the viewpoint.

Now, Lord knows how much disturbance we have created in the past because it's totally possible that there is another wave of present time following this one. And everything's all solid for you here and now, isn't it?

Male voice: Yeah.

Maybe it's all solid for a lot of other people a little later. But they'd feel haunted, wouldn't they, if you've gone before? Maybe the universe is a number, a vast number of successive waves of viewers of the thickness. And maybe as we go by we make it just a little more solid for an instant but maybe the first wave going through is mocking it up. And then each successive wave adds to it. This building, to a wave coming ten years after us, would be also thick to the degree that we thickened it up. It might be solid concrete to them, see? They might have the wildest idea of what solid is – "a teaspoon weighs a ton" sort of thing. Well, all manner of fantastic explanations occur to one when he looks at all this phenomena. It's a wonderful philosophic jigsaw. But the only interest we have in it is the separation of the individual from the concatenation of pictures which victimize him.

Look, there is no reason, when an individual has been sick, for him to be sick again by remembering having been sick. And yet that is what the mind does for one. An individual has been si – is sick and then a little bit later, a few years later, he suddenly remembers having been sick and gets sick again. In other words, he more occupies the old viewpoint than he does the present viewpoint. He's running viewpoints and change in space and he is leaving something behind him to look at it in each new consecutive position he occupies. Him, a thetan. Now, this is evidently more or less the way it is. Certainly it is a mechanic.

Now, exactly how we go to work erasing this, how we go to work amputating this and so forth, I hope you understand is an entirely separate thing from the very lovely philosophic enigma of "What Is It?" – how you handle it.

Now, we already know lots of ways to handle it. We know most of the picture mechanisms, as a matter of fact. I'd be very surprised to run into a new picture mechanism. And I was very surprised when I ran into this thinnies deal. It was simply, though, a new idea about how one has pictures. It was a new idea of howness – how does one have pictures? Well, if you can separate them simply by expressing a willingness to occupy various view-points in front of sceneries, we could see how 8-C would work like mad. You walk a fellow around and have him look at the wall – and in other words, occupy viewpoints – and if he could knowingly and willingly occupy these various viewpoints, he of course would blow an awful lot of pictures. And when 8-C starts turning on somatics an individual is actually running out old pictures.

Now, there's no mass to you as a being. There actually is no time in you as a being, except as you consider or postulate it. Therefore you can get yourself very easily entangled with some past you. And thus you can get stuck-on-the-trackness and restimulation and so forth. There's no difference whether you're here or there. It is a remote viewpoint and you are a remote viewpoint in front of the wall. There's more of you in present time than there was in the past. There isn't just a finite quantity of you. There's a feeling on your part, however, that you are willing to look at just so many things at a time. And when you find yourself occupying too many past viewpoints and the scenery getting too jumbled up and you can't make it out completely, why, you decide to just shut it all off and you get most of these occlusions of one kind or another – for whatever reason you decided to shut it off.

Well, this makes an interesting view – the idea of thinnies.

Now, the howness of it would then have to do with either taking over an automaticity of leaving remote viewpoints parked wherever you park – you park in front of that wall, when you walk away from it you leave a remote viewpoint in front of the wall. All right, if you ever get a picture of the wall, that's what you must do, evidently, to get it. Therefore study along those lines would indicate what one had to do in order to take over this automaticity. Well, in view of the fact that you and the youness of you, parked in the past, might as well be parked in the present, we can evidently slide these pictures all over the place but the pictures never move. Pictures never go anyplace or do anything. You just slide back and forth on change of space through time. Your theory is that you can occupy any position you have occupied. And sure enough, we find only those areas of the track are stuck where a person was unwilling to have stood there. So we have somebody be willing to stand in front of things. We get a certain new condition of mind with regard to things. But supposing we made him dramatize "unwilling to stand there."

"Look at that wall and get the idea of being unwilling to be there looking at the wall." You'd sure strip off a lot of walls. Well, here'd go the mind. Therefore the mind is capable of being erased, providing one wanted to erase it.

Now, before one would erase the mind, however, he would have to be able to perform the services which the mind pretends to perform: the services of experience, the services of control, being able to take a number of bodies and stack them all together and then control our present body. We controlled a bunch of bodies in the past, therefore we could control the present body by putting things through this.

It has uses. An individual would have to discover, one way or the other, that these uses were – these favors were obtainable or doable by himself before he'd be totally willing to give up the mental image picture system.

But I think the mental image picture system is one of the sillier systems and I think probably – "Invent a system by which to retain the past," "Invent a system of incomparable magnitude to the mind" – various processes apparently open up in front of us. Then and Now Solids is the most reliable, up-to-date process we have which straightens this out. The individual does change space and does move back into the past and then moves up into the present and moves into the past and moves into the present and moves into the past and moves into the present. And he is taking over the king-sized automaticity of all, which is "make it

more solid." He must have lost track of how to make things solid if he's still making those facsimiles on the backtrack slightly solid. There's something wrong with his solidifier if he's still got pictures. So we could take over this automaticity of solidities of the past – as represented as pictures – and we would find these things doing two things: some of them, obsessively made solid, would key out. And those that weren't visible at all, we would suddenly have the facility of making them solid again.

The funny part of it is, is a preclear can make them almost totally solid. And there have been instances of preclears walking around inside these pictures of the past, doing things and looking at things which he didn't see when he was there the first time. There's an incident on record of a fellow reading the back side of a newspaper he only saw the front side of.

Now, there's – Then and Now Solids does not tack itself down to the present, you know. Then Solids you would interpret offhand as being the past, but they might as well be the future and a person doesn't hold to just the past on this. He'll go up into the future and start doing this in the future. Lord knows what the mysterious consequences of it all are. Maybe if somebody went up into the future and made it all solid from all possible viewpoints, why, we would suddenly get to the edge of the ocean and fall off into the mouths of big fish the way Columbus said. I mean, almost anything could happen.

Well now, running the process Then and Now Solids is a very interesting experience for both auditor and preclear. Where the person has experienced sudden and surprising shifts in space, he has facsimiles which will not compute. Individual went to sleep in Utah, woke up in Honduras. When he went to sleep in Utah he had no intention of going to Honduras. When he wakes up the following morning he's puzzled. A few years goes by, he meets a Scientologist, Scientologist starts running him. He's erased all this. It was just so incomprehensible to go to sleep in Utah and wake up in Honduras that he just wiped the whole thing out. He says, "Dickens with that. Nobody can live with that kind of stuff!"

Scientologist is running him and he's – "Get a picture and make it a little more solid" and, "Did you do that? Thank you. Look at that chair. Make it a little more solid. Thank you." Back and forth, and the first thing you know, the fellow falls off into this sudden shift. He stops going back to Honduras, which is where you thought he came from, and all of a sudden starts landing in Utah. And Utah to Honduras to now, to Honduras to Utah, to Honduras to now. And all of a sudden he says, "Well, look! There was a change between these two places." He picks up these two viewpoints and he understands that there was this sudden shift and the moment he understands there was a sudden shift – just that and no more; he doesn't even have to understand why there was a shift – he'll get computational data. That is to say, he'll say, "Well, well, well! This is a very strange thing, but I've often wondered why high, dry places were upsetting to me because I had never been in one! I had always been in wet, wet Honduras. But when I'd get in a place that was dry, why – like a room, you know, or something like that that was awfully dry, I'd feel upset and I never could understand that. And that's Utah. Well now, let's see. I went from Utah to Honduras and . . ."

Then he goes back on the track further than that and finds out that it was actually – just before Utah, why, it was north Alaska. Now he's going back through Honduras, through Utah to north Alaska.

"Oh well," he says, "lookie. I'm the same fellow in North Alaska, Utah, Honduras and now. Hah! Computes." And he'll tell you some sort of a computation off of this thing and all of a sudden with a whir-clack his time track straightens out. Instead of being sections of track, each section an only-one, it is just one track. He's one person on one track.

Now, individuals get these life computations, which is a fascinating subject. They get subject computations and life computations. They get person computations and so on. The life computation is the most fascinating one; a person's later life doesn't agree with his earlier life – that is, in this lifetime. This fellow has been going around, he's – owns a series of bars. And he goes around, he's rather unhappy in life and he just doesn't feel right about it. He owns this series of bars and he feels he's making money but he just can't kind of reconcile this and he doesn't – he just feels uncomfortable about the whole thing. You start running him on Then and Now Solids, he falls through. He gets into a section of his life where as a little boy he signed the pledge – his mother was a member of the WCTU and so on. And he just – this just doesn't add up with the fact that he is now an owner of bars. See, the two things will not compute. And in view of the fact that they won't compute, he abandons one or the other of them. Now, quite often he'll abandon his modern activity because it won't compute with the earlier activity.

Now, reliance on an object to preserve havingness is one of these computations – reliance on what preserves havingness. Early part of his life he depended utterly on his father to preserve his havingness. Middle of his life he depended utterly on his first wife to preserve his havingness. But the last stretch of his life has brought into his life somebody who is identical to his father who did nothing but steal from him. This just doesn't make sense and he doesn't make any sense out of it and his remark to you, an auditor, is that – "My life doesn't make sense."

I had a rather elementary one. When I was a little boy I never went anyplace without a rifle. Montana, there's just a rifle; rifle – Montana. They just go together, see? I'd go out and there'd always be a rifle stuck in a saddle boot. A saddle was not cinched unless it had a rifle in it of course, you know. A wolf jump up, something like this would happen, why, you took a rifle and you blew his silly head off. People left you alone because you had a rifle. You wanted to preserve your possessions, why, you had a rifle. You get the idea? It was a reliance on this item, see – big reliance on one item. And a little boy that doesn't like to bite wolves because of his immaturity on the subject feels safe on such a thing.

All right. All of a sudden, out of this highly wild, barbaric area was suddenly – move "over into what's laughingly called civilization, see? You go down the street in New York City carrying a rifle, you're liable to be tapped on the shoulder. You'd have to explain to somebody that a rifle was – the rifle was intended to go out to the rifle matches, not to shoot any wolves or shoot any people. This is a protection of havingness, though. What system do you use to protect havingness? A rifle!

Later life, no rifle is permitted to you, you can't have one, you'd better not shoot one in the city limits. One fine day, why, some tough kid in the teens you know, walks up, takes your car away from you and goes over the hills and far away. Where were you? You were just

standing there. What were you supposed to do to him? You're supposed to take a rifle and say, "No!" and have him put the object down and go away. See, that's the system.

But that system no longer works. It doesn't – can't do that. It's not done. How do you protect your havingness? Well, you're supposed to go to court. Heh-heh-heh! So this finally winds up into the computation that you couldn't possibly have. You got this?

So here's this dogleg, noncomputational thing. Had subjective reality on this and it's a very pat example of this. In other words, one protects having-ness in this section of life with an implement, and in this section of life the implement is not allowed. Well, one has not moved up into this section of life with something else to protect havingness, don't you see? So he feels like he can't. Then and Now Solids all of a sudden took these two areas and went clank! All of a sudden it was very obvious it was merely the lack of a rifle. Well, what's a substitute for a rifle? See? That's easy. I don't know what I was using a rifle for. Anyway ...

Protection of havingness is not terribly difficult unless you have a total investment in an implement. And this total dependency, being so great and ceasing so suddenly, will then not let you be inventive. Now, the kids of tomorrow will think of entertainment in terms of television sets. They're not – won't be inventive on the subject.

The engineer of early aeronautical times had a dependency on nothing; he didn't have anything to work with, he couldn't have built anything anyhow, he figured. It was all impossible and therefore not very serious, so he dreamed up all the forms of flying there were. There's seventeen or eighteen – I've forgotten how many now – methods of flying which have never been used! It just happened that the airfoil – stable airfoil – was buildable at that time with his equipment. Aeronautical engineer graduates from Cal Tech or some other of the people's schools, and engineer starts in and you say to him, "Build an airplane."

And he's, "All right. You take an airfoil and some kind of fuselage and you take a tractor propeller or the reactor-type motor and there's your airplane."

And you say, "Where did this thing come from?" The airfoil is not necessarily an efficient thing at all. A tractor-type propeller, particularly one run by a Wright Whirlwind engine, is taking 50 percent of its power to cancel the other 50 percent of its power, and how it flies at all Lord only knows. The lift-drag ratio of rotor planes, for instance, is so incredibly bad that how any-body keeps up with rotors – I don't know why they'd keep up with rotors, but everybody's married to these rotors! See? They get an airfoil or a certain type of airfoil – a rotor is just a rotating airfoil – and they get certain types of things. They get a – earlier people get a dependency on them. First they invent them, then they get a dependency on them. People that come after that have a tendency to pick this up as a matter of course. It's an "everybody knows." What is an airplane? Everybody knows it's something that has an airfoil. That's silly. That's silly. It's not even safe to be up in the air with an airfoil. I know. I've had a couple of them go whap. It's very uncomfortable!

How about antimagnetic devices, antigravitic? What is gravity, anyhow? Well, there's a fellow down here, Henri Coanda, that's done a considerable study on that and it's so baffling to the US Air Force at this moment that they think Coanda is a very brilliant man, but nobody else can grasp it because the things he builds fly but don't have any airfoil. You see? They're not real, then.

Well, a thetan probably comes along and he says, "Well, this thing called a mind is just part of what I need to get along with – just total dependency on it" and so forth. Now we think up a way of living; well, there's a mind and a way of living would be to take a mind and you do so-and-so.

And you say, "No, no, no, no, no. No!" You say, "Come on now. Now, dream up some kind of a method of living a life."

"Well," he says, "you take your mind and you start – and then you ..."

"Zzzrrr."

Now, that's nothing more than a whole track computation. It's a method of having. Some kind of a method of having that somebody picked up in a silly moment. But it doesn't work. And it doesn't work the way it did. And it isn't useful somehow or another and it's made a dogleg and so he can't understand it. And although he's still got it he places no real dependency on it and he's trying to live anyhow and you get noncomputational. Well, that's why the mind is noncomputational, because everybody starts out to think with first the mind, and then he – and it's not necessarily a mechanism that's useful in that category at all. As a matter of fact, I think it's quite the contrary. A mechanism that stops you from thinking every time you start to think is hardly a mechanism with which you should think!

So you could pass to a whole race's computation from this first little life computation, see? The thing doesn't equate. You've had something that you depended on, then you didn't have it or didn't need it or couldn't use it or it's against the law or something of the sort and you had to live thereafter, so that left you without any method to what? To do something you could do before you got the item that you first were doing with. This is very fascinating.

About the only thing I know that would be allowable in that category would be Scientology. It solves itself. You are aware of the fact that Scientology does rub itself out. This is a rather interesting thing. It is a self-solving science.

There are two processes that run themselves out, for instance, today, which is quite interesting. All the Axioms run themselves out. "Give me that hand. Thank you," and Tone 40 8-C, if run long enough, run out all the times they were run, regardless of who ran them or how poorly or how well. As a matter of fact, if a person doesn't need it very much, he runs it out in the first hour. He runs out in the first hour the first half-hour of it being run on him. This is quite remarkable. It just runs out, that's all. Same way with Tone 40 8-C.

Now, Scientology as a whole runs itself out, too. It won't leave you stuck with it because it is its own solvent. But that isn't true of any other science or item that's been on the track so far, if you can remember it and if it's still around.

For sure aeronautics don't run themselves out – they run themselves in. Automobiling is getting more and more complicated. I imagine if you were to take somebody today as an automotive engineer and tell him to build you an automobile, he'd build you an automobile and it'd be an automobile just like any other automobile. And he'd say, "Well, this is the safe thing to do." Funny part of it was, shipbuilding went almost the same route. Now, they got dependent on an iron hull. And you say, "Well, iron hulls are quite recent – Monitor and Merrimac. Oh no, they're much earlier than that. But they got dependent on an iron hull and

today you go down and try to build a sailing ship that sails and you get something built by Alden and you fall off of it and get drowned and the masts come out of it. (That's libel because there are a lot of Alden ships that will sail across a calm sound on a calm day.) You say, "What are these ... ? The old boys building them and so forth probably have some memory of something or other." And you say, "Well, why not, instead of that funny spoon bow, why not put something up here that'll throw the spray off not on the deck?" They wouldn't know why.

So arts even get lost to a point of where they don't even remember what they knew. You got the idea? Probably Christianity had an awful lot of technology connected with it when it first came out which is no longer present, because it was the principal method of healing for about twelve or fourteen hundred years. Medical science leaving in the laws of the country that healing can still be done by the churches, is quite amusing; very, very amusing because the only healing they had after they wiped out the witchcraft was Christianity and ministers. Ministers apologizing today for healing is something like they – the same thing as their apologizing for Christ's crucifixion, see? They're apologizing for their own religious skill. If they themselves can't heal, well, they certainly skidded someplace because the early missionaries that were sent to here and there and across the world to heathenize the barbarians for sure depended almost totally on healing. They used to bring along religious relics. And Lord knows what they did with them. They did accomplish some results.

But regardless of this, the whole subject is still there; but evidently there's a little something missing. There's no unity of thought on the subject, certainly. There are tremendous schisms on it. Well, there's still a tremendous dependency on it. So somebody in the United States says "religion" and immediately everybody says "Christianity." This doesn't even follow. Let me assure you that there are dozens and dozens of religions in the United States that have nothing to do with Christianity and they are nevertheless religions. Buddhism is one of them. There are quite a good many Buddhist churches in the country and they have nothing to do with Christianity. But evidently, according to the government, religion is Christianity, which I think is quite interesting. You get this narrowing down of what a thing is, until it isn't anything else and then no ability to view that anything else could exist. Don't you see?

All right. Quite amusing. The US Navy – the US Navy admits that Buddhism exists and there are other religions than Christian religions.

There was a very hard-boiled commander on a South Pacific island and he didn't like chaplains, and chaplains had come and gone and come and gone off of his particular post. And one day, why, he got a new chaplain and he said, "Now, be sure," he says to the new chaplain, "and preach all of the services for the men here and I'll dismiss you if you don't."

And chaplain came back and fellow says, "Well, have you preached all the services?"

And the chaplain says, "Oh, yes. Yes I have."

And he says, "Well," he says, "you're fired. Return back to your base." He says, "Because I'm a Buddhist and you haven't preached any Buddhist ceremony."

Now anyway, a breadth of view and an inventiveness is the only safe thing a thetan could have, if we want to speak of safety and security. An ability to view something broadly,

an ability to see something new, an ability to invent and an ability to shed dependencies which are no longer service-able; and the mind won't let a thetan do any of these things. Therefore it must be some kind of an antique mechanism.

Now, how did the mind get into that condition? It's because life to life, and parts of lives to parts of lives, you get noncomputables. An individual knows how to live. The way to live is to be a hotel keeper in Boston. You own a big hotel, you are very snooty with the rich, you are very mean to the people who come in and don't pay their bills. You get the idea? You run this hotel right down the groove and that is the way you live.

And then one day he falls downstairs or kicks the bucket in some fashion or another, eats too much Boston baked beans, goes into a Boston restaurant and dies. Next life, why, he's got a father that has a successful rock quarry and the old man says, "Now, you want to learn how to run this rock quarry" and the kid can't get interested in the rock quarry and he can't do anything about the rock quarry and he doesn't know anything about the rock quarry. And the old man dies and the kid can't even run the rock quarry, and it all goes to pieces and so forth. Well, why? You say, "Well, he just had an allergy to rocks. That's – must be it." No, that wasn't it at all! He knew how you made a living! You made a living by managing a hotel in Boston! And sometime during his early life I am sure that he would have told his father to buy him a hotel so he could live. Got the idea?

Now, after that he knows what happens if you get mixed up with rock quarries. You kick the bucket! You starve to death. This is the sort of things that the mind teaches one. Non-computables, you see? How to have. How to live. But from one lifetime to another, one carries the mind along with him and lets it teach him, sub rosa, on a 1.1, sub-1.1 basis what it's all about – only that doesn't compute with anything he's doing now. And in disgust he forgets everything he was doing before, but it now influences everything he's doing. Therefore it is some interest to us to have processes such as Then and Now Solids and know how to run them well. But it's much greater interest to know what the entire mechanism is all about. If we knew what the mechanism was, very precisely, we could knock it out or reequate it or make it more usable very easily, and I'm sure all of us would agree this needs to be done.

Thank you.

Thank you.

Ability - Laughter

A lecture given on 2 August 1957

How are you this evening?

Audience: Fine!

You're apparently still alive.

Male voice: Yep!

I've been busy all day. My office is very often used – when all other parts of the country have no place to put certain pieces of confusion they get into my office, and various confusions have been happening, one kind or another.

Now, I have been a very bad boy here the last few lectures and I haven't answered all of your questions. But I've got them all here in a pile and I'm just going to run them off with the greatest of rapidity, and we hope not stupidity.

This is lecture number fifteen, 18th ACC, July ...

Male voice: August.

August – what's the idea of sticking me on the track? August the second, 1957. And we have some questions here which have been asked and we will take these up in very rapid-fire order.

First one: "Have you now accomplished a sufficiently high training procedure so that you would be willing to recommend a gold or red wafer auditor? I have been given the datum that in the past it was the policy of the FC staff to recommend only auditor processing under your supervision."

This is correct. The last is correct. The fact of the matter is, you are about to see an entirely new policy on the part of the FC with regard to referrals – we call this referrals. People write in and say, "Is there an auditor in my area?" To understand this completely you would have to realize that the basis of war comes about through the fact that a third dynamic isn't a terminal. The government in Finland isn't a he or a her. It just isn't. The government of France isn't a he or a her. It just obviously isn't. So the government of Finland and the government of France, in trying to communicate, snap terminals with two "isn'ts" and this results in war.

It takes an individual to communicate. It takes a being to communicate. It takes something that can understand and bleed and understand suffering and problems and so on. It takes, in other words, something which is accustomed to living in order to handle the living. Right?

Well, the FC staff was first a little bit shocked and then quite exhilarated, several staff meetings ago when I suddenly told them they weren't an organization. I told them they were individuals doing certain jobs. But after that we saw things brightening up on all fronts. You see, an organization is just a huge irresponsibility. Any government is the composite irresponsibility of any people. Definition of government: the compounded irresponsibility of the population. Nobody's willing to take the responsibility for crime so they send it over to the government. Nobody can take the responsibility for educating any single child so they form a department of education which does very little educating. And they have to put more and more people in and more and more materials and more and more this and more and more that, and it's just like pouring it down a hole. The bigger department of education you've got, the less education you're going to get.

Now, they used to tell me that the US Navy was too big and that was why we had all these flops – battle lost and they'd say, "Well, the Navy's too big. Ha-ha-ha." And I was mad one day – I was real mad. And the CO of a ship that had been present told me, "Well, the Navy's too big, and they..." and I said, "What are you saying? That you are too small?" He said, "Nyaaaa ...". He says, "This is peacetime. We court-martial officers like you." They did, too. But in the war it was all too big.

Now, you might say then that the composite irresponsibility of staff would become the organization. That's for true. In defense of this, a theatrical company, ceasing to be a company, will all of a sudden realize that they are a bunch of individuals who are doing work in the theater. And they work together to the degree that they can communicate. It isn't whether the company is good or bad. It's whether the individuals in it can do their job and communicate with one another, and this communicating with one another does make a semblance of what then becomes an organization. But it never is an organization! It is just a combined ability to communicate amongst us terminals, any one of which is able to communicate.

Now, when we look on it that way, we will see a brand-new form and shape to organizations, at least that I have anything to do – this is no news to you, that the organizations and I are inveterate foes. I think organizations get so big that they forget that the individual can bleed. And now and then you have to make a decision for the good of several people at the expense of one or two people. Now, that's just about as far as you would go toward deciding on an organizational basis, and you can go too far in this direction, let me assure you. You normally shake the thing out and talk to the person involved and you find out you didn't have to fire or shoot anybody.

Now, looking this over we find out that the main difficulty with the Foundations, in enfranchising field organizations to do anything, was the same difficulty I have just outlined between Finland and France. Neither the organization in the field or the Central Organization was actually there. People realized this so they wrote me.

Now, we have found that those auditors who have been consistently successful have operated as individuals. They need, because the law requires it – the law tries to foster this whole error of organization – the law requires that you have some corporate name or something of the sort.

I gave a talk here in, I think middle of '55, at the congress in Washing-ton. The last talk in the congress was on the subject of how organizations were something that we could easily get along without – if we could get along without them perfectly.

There would be nothing wrong then with somebody in the field having something he called the such and such Scientology group or such and such Scientology Society or the such and such Church of Scientology. Do you understand that? There'd be nothing wrong with this at all. The law requires this. But if he continues to do business only as that, and if he expects that then to be him, he is making a gross and serious error and this is the kind of an error we can get into with a referral. There was a good auditor, let us say, in Kokokomo. And this auditor was doing very well and he had an organization called the Kokokomo Church of Scientology, see? So we knew this and we refer a preclear to the Kokokomo Church of Scientology.

And then we get an awful heart-rending squawk and we say, "What's wrong here?" Well, we find this auditor has moved on. The pc and other things, they were turned over to people nobody knew anything about. Do you understand that? Now, even somebody processing under the supervision of this auditor we knew about would have come off all right. But this auditor has moved to some other area and this thing is left sitting there, which has – it's like a pie with no filling. Do you see that?

Now, I'm not invalidating any organization which any of you have thrown together. But all of you know this to be true: that it is only your sweat and your investment of understanding that keeps that organization going, regard-less of its name. You know that.

All right. Then why should the FC, calling that as an organization, refer anyone to the Kokokomo church? That would be a very silly thing to do. And so by policy, which is now changing, we're going to take a list of all auditors validated, as they go down the line, with their names and addresses – and as individuals be very happy to refer people to them – as individuals. You understand that? We're going to be very happy to encourage individuals to run PE Courses and all sorts of things. Let me tell you something about a PE Course. A PE Course run by a good auditor is a highly successful thing, and run by his assistants is usually a dismal flop. It's not just it's not quite so good, it's just that it isn't! It isn't at all! Ireland almost folded up here in the last many weeks. They were letting anybody teach the free course. Fortunately I caught them at it, and an auditor is now on deck. Their income trebled and that was that.

Now then, myself or those people who have this in charge here – that's their hat, you see – be very happy in the future to recommend individual auditors throughout the length and breadth of the country and be very happy to publish rosters as to their whereabouts and be very happy to grant them some beingness, something that has been lacking a bit in the past. And that is the current policy of the organization, and I hope it works out. Okay?

All right. So much for that question.

Here's another question – highly technical: "When doing Book Mimicry and pc does command wrong but does not want you to repeat it or do it again, how would you handle it?"

That's quite a question, isn't it? You got that? You reach over for his little paws and you put them on the book and you make his little paws go through the motion and then you

take the book back and thank him for it. That is exactly how that is done. That's the proper way to do that. Got that?

Now, that looks evaluative, huh? Looks very, very evaluative.

Now, he's done it very, very wrong or has refused to do it at all, you would do something like that. That is necessary to keep him from going out of session. And in view of the fact you're going to be running this on low-toned people quite often, you're going to have to learn that that is part and parcel of it. The fellow says, "Well, I just couldn't do anything like that. It's just impossible," something like that. Put his hands on the book, make him go through the motion, thank him for it. Now he says, "Oh ... there."

You say, "Did you do it right?"

"Well, no."

"Well, do you want me to do it again?"

"No. No."

Put his hands on the book, make him go through the motion. It's a mistake but it is not as bad a mistake as letting it go.

All right. Somebody says here, "What study, if any, would you recommend outside Scientology for a Scientologist?"

Male voice: That's good!

Poor Rosina! She used to beat this into heads of auditors in London. She used to beat this into the Comm Course and so forth, and I feel like I'm exposing a secret weapon that she had, to give you the answer to this. But the secret answer to it is life.

Female voice: Good.

Okay. Now, here we have another question: "What are the mechanics of restimulation in terms of thinnies?"

I love this word "thinnies." Actually you can go right on calling them facsimiles, pictures. It doesn't matter what you call them. Mechanics of restimulation are very, very simple. It is an identification of one remote viewpoint with another. Got that? Got a remote viewpoint sitting out here in front of that wall – then you get another green wall someplace, and this remote view-point's looking at a green wall, this other one looks at a green wall, and a person is too easily identifying things anyway and he snaps these two together and they both occupy the same point and that's restimulation. You might say restimulation is lost location – you lose the location of an anchor point or where it is.

All right. Here's another one. Got that one?

Audience: Yeah.

All right. Oh, this is an embarrassing one. I don't think – I don't even think it needs answering or that I should answer it or anything of the sort, but it says: "How does 'handle' relate to 'have,' 'permit to remain,' and 'dispense with'? How does handle relate to this?"

Well, it takes that part of "possessiveness" which is right up close – have, possess – a person has to be that close to it in order to have it or handle it, has to be right in it or be it. And when it's in that close you could say that's "have."

"Permit to" would be communicate at it or permit it to communicate – out or in. Now, just be able to look at it, to flow out toward it, is to handle it: permit. In other words, I can flow toward that thing without changing it in any way. You ask the preclear, "Look around here and tell me what you would permit to remain." And he says, "That air conditioner," and this means then that he can have the air conditioner be there with all alteration. In other words, he'd just as soon it was there and he would feel competent to have it there, or in some fashion to handle it. It's an inference that handling is possible without change.

Now we get "dispense with" and of course that becomes very easy. The way you would dispense with – why, to handle it that's obvious. That's just throw it away. To kick it out the window. To push it over the cliff. You would have to outflow against it again. That answer it?

All right. We have here: "How many hours should be given to teaching a validation course in the field?"

We have not been able to teach one under three weeks full time at the Academy.

And here's another one: "TR 0 and TR 1 do not leave much two-way comm between the coach and student. Could this be changed and should it be changed?"

Now, the truth of the matter is that there is as much two-way communication between the coach and the preclear in any TR as is necessary to get him to do the process. And most coaches are far too reticent and talk far too little, and if they talk too much it's too little point. There is two-way comm between the coach and the student. If you have felt that there is not, then you have excessively curbed yourself while coaching or curbed yourself while being an auditor. There is nothing in the book says that an auditor can't cut loose and say to the coach, "Boy, you're really giving me a hard time!" There is nothing that says that the coach cannot say, "Well, we've been going over this and over this and over this and you still stink."

There is nothing in the book that says these remarks could not be made or any other similar remarks. But a coach who sits there – and I think this is where the mistake that "there isn't much" is made – is we do try to prevent too much how to do it. The coach shouldn't sit there and go on and on and on and on about how this is done and never give the student a chance to do it. You got that? That's the only thing you're trying to prevent.

You can give somebody the steps which have to be done in order to achieve something, if these are known. You can use an idea you have about what he is doing and you can correct these things. There actually are no brakes put on it. Not really. But the Instructors in this ACC have been very, very strongly against too much "how to do it" with too little point, which confused the student. And if they felt a student was getting confused by a coach they were liable to chop it. That's what that's all about, okay?

Now, somebody says here: "Is there such a thing as disability? Is it a gradient scale, gradient level of ability?"

Well, it's odd that this question would be asked, but I realize that the person that asked it couldn't have heard the 17th ACC, and neither have any of you – many of you.

But listen! There is no such thing as disability. The government pays money for it. Insurance companies are always paying off on it. People are always using it as an excuse. As a matter of fact, it's the one thing that prevented me from asking embarrassing questions of certain people that came up to me in the street and asked for a dime. They were obviously unable to do things. You don't say, "Why don't you go out and get a job?" Obviously he's "unable" to hold a job.

And this is so obvious that everybody has overlooked it. If we can turn on a full-scale mock-up on that wall in complete, solid 3-D on anybody, including a black eighteen, in about ten to fifteen minutes of auditing, which he will then take five days, sometimes, to get rid of, we can realize that there's nothing wrong with his ability to mock up. There is everything wrong with his willingness to do so. Willingness is the monitor of ability. Everybody can do everything he could ever do.

Now, if anybody here has been a member of the planet builders, they can undoubtedly still build planets. Mock up a bunch of stuff whizzing around in space, chunk it all together, throw it into a ball and kick it into an orbit. He could probably take Earth and swing it around his head like one of these hammer-throw gadgets. But he's not willing to do so!

Now, as I said, you could throw Earth around your head. You immediately said, "Well, no – think of all the people that would suffer." You didn't say, "That's impossible!" See, all of the people that would suffer if somebody disturbed Earth in its orbit.

Willingness to do is the monitor of ability and is the only thing that monitors ability. But this is so condemning that very few people like to have anything to do with it. It is on this premise alone that the 18th ACC is being taught. If you see somebody doing a job very, very badly, you are perfectly willing to assume that he is unable – but that's charity. The point of the matter is, he is not willing to do a better job.

Now, auditing in this direction we can straighten up job difficulties with considerable ease. We find out what part of the job it would be all right for the fellow to do. Then he finally finds some part and then we can increase this part and all of a sudden, he's "It'd be perfectly all right to do this job – I just don't want to," or something of the sort. We could go over it and flatten this out and he would then be able to do the job. But he was able to do the job all the time anyway.

Now, your preclear can do anything he could ever do – but he's not willing to. To a large degree, it is up to you to improve his willingness. When you do a bad auditing job on it, you deteriorate his willingness. But a good auditing job will increase his willingness. Therefore, that whole line of techniques: "What wouldn't you mind (blank)?" Those techniques that went, "What wouldn't you mind ...?" "Is there anything in the room you wouldn't mind having?" – had considerable bite.

Well, it's quite interesting, though, to occasionally run into somebody who tells you rather triumphantly, "Well, the auditor was only running 'What wouldn't I mind having?' – I didn't have to have anything." This is so much hidden that it's hidden from most people. And

they say, "If only I had the ability to paint, to write, to act, to sing – if I only had these abilities." Aaah!

Let's say, well, a fellow with a broken leg is not able to dance a jig. Well, that is certainly pulling a long bow! The truth of the matter is, he wasn't willing to have a sound leg and we come closer to home. This whole subject of willingness versus ability is so condemning that people do not like it very well.

Now, in cracking through, we actually need only to disclose to an individual at his own rate of advance that he can recover. We disclose to him at his own rate of advance that he can recover. If we make him recover too fast, it is beyond his rate of advance. This tells you there is nothing really wrong with the preclear except his unwillingness to be right.

But of course, if you look it over you find that it's impossible to be right and be human. That is not possible. It is not possible to be human and be right. One goes down the street being wrong, wrong, wrong, wrong, and that's called manners – called politeness – called all sorts of things. Want to look that over someday. It'll give you a lot of laughs just arguing that out in a bull session, you know. Can you be right and be human? Becomes very amusing.

But if you turn on ability faster than the preclear is willing to have it turned on – in other words, if you exceed his willingness – he'll be in the horrible condition of not remembering or being completely willing to turn it off, and yet he'll manage it in a short time. Day, two days, three days, five days; he'll get it off again.

If you had that one button – this is what's wrong with the one-button process, don't you see – and you had just one button and you just pushed that one button on the case, bing, and the individual at once stood forth like Jupiter or something – Apollo, no less! It would be true; the individual would stand forth like Apollo. And he'd be walking down the street complete and ready to make the sun rise. But you see him two then three days later and he would have fallen in the tar or something and then made pretty sure that he cut this ability to be Apollo back. You got the idea? He would have – he would have worked!

And to see people work on this – I have watched several people work on this because we have several processes that do this – and to see somebody working to get off an ability is really one of the more amusing things. They argue – and they've lost the route; they've lost their way, they can't deteriorate it fast and it's just terrible. It's an awful strain. Terrible thing to do to somebody.

This we sometimes see as a manic. We run somebody; all of a sudden they feel tremendously good! Of course they could feel tremendously good all the time anyway – they're not willing to feel that good. It's liable to do some-thing terrible to them, they say – another thing. They're just not willing to feel that good and they will go two, three days and then all of a sudden thud. And boy, when they thud, they usually over- or underestimate the landing field. Quite amusing.

The process, by the way, which turns on the mock-ups might interest you. It's "Get the idea of putting a clear mock-up there as big as the wall." "Now get the idea that that would spoil the game and not do it." And you just get them to think that cycle. In most cases – those

that will think the thoughts you tell them to – all of a sudden it doesn't matter what the visio field is. All of a sudden there will be this tremendous mock-up up there, totally solid, you know, and they'll be looking at the horses champing in it, and everything going on beautifully, zzzzzzz. They just sit there and sweat trying to get the mock-up down, see?

You can run that usually ten or fifteen minutes. The auditing commands are, "Get the idea of putting up a mock-up as big as that wall." "Now get the idea that would spoil the game and not do it." That similarly works this way: you say, "Decide" – decide can be also used – "Decide to create a man in full form in the middle of the room that everybody could see. Then decide that would ruin the game and not do it." And the next thing you know you'll get a shimmer in the middle of the room. That takes a little longer than the subjective mock-up but not too much longer.

Of course the way to ruin anybody is to get – tell them, "Now decide to mock up a pile of money here that everybody would recognize as money. Now get the idea that would spoil the game and not do it." The individual, just really – that really would spoil the game, you see? And he's suddenly realized he could shoot the works just in no time at all, and he's carrying on this game he's got very tenuously. So we have to admit that too great an ability spoils all games.

The willingness is monitored by the games he could have, by the way. That's the – what the willingness is monitored by. What game can he have? Well, if he doesn't think he can have any games then he's not willing to get good enough to – if he doesn't think he can have any other game than "sick man" (that's a game, by the way – "invalid" or "sick man"), if he can only have that game then he must keep his willingnesses down on all other levels of progress.

"Invent a game," or "Now, come on. Tell me a game you could really play," as a very persuasive question, actually does more for a case, as crude as it is as a process, than this: "Mock it up and then decide not to," you know, "because it would spoil the game." Got that?

I think I've wogged a few of you. What's the matter here? Don't you believe this? Well, you don't have to believe it. Just after the lecture, try it! There are aud – – there's some auditors present that'd run it on you.

All right. Here's a question – got that one now, huh?

Audience: Yeah.

All right. "Does confront mean confront with something, like a body, or can a little old thetan confront all by his lonesome?"

I hate to have to answer that question, but it turned up here – for this reason: when you confront with something you're in a no-game condition. Now, let's get this – let's get this. I tested this very carefully: "Mock up your mother and make her confront that wall." Boy, does that sound good. Now, we'll find out that isn't a game – making Mother confront that wall. "Mock up Mother and refuse to let her confront the wall," and boy is that a games condition!

So if you use something to confront other things with, you'll spin in after a while. You've no choice. If you always use a body to confront things with, your body will deteriorate.

Now, you can stand a body there and confront somebody yourself, and that's what you'd better do.

I notice people running confrontingness with eyeballs. They sit down in front of this – front of the coach and start confronting with the two eyeballs – turn the eyeballs out and confront the coach with the eyeballs. And after a while their eyeballs get sort of glassy, you know, and they start to smart. They'll cave in after a while.

It's very easy to confront. All you have to do is put your body in a chair and then confront the preclear and don't pay any attention to your body. Of course, if you look at the preclear as a thetan, you're then conceiving a static – so you better be able to.

But, it's an interesting thing that the process, "Mock up your mother and make her confront that wall," or "Mock up your body and make it con-front that wall," and so forth, is highly limited, and on any wide test at all, just spins the fellow right in. You're giving them wins! See? You're giving Mama wins! See, if Mama could confront utterly, why, she could ruin you. You've got to cut her confrontingness down. You've got to say, "Mama, it isn't really true that you're willing to confront me, is it? Mama, here's a couple of things that are pretty horrible and the schoolteacher couldn't confront them, the minister couldn't confront them, Daddy couldn't confront them, nobody could confront them, I haven't been able to confront them and I'm sure you can't confront them, Mama. Isn't that true?"

She says, "Yes dear. That's pretty horrible."

That's the whole game of "how bad it is over there," see? This doesn't meet the eye at first at all. In order to get any reality on this you really ought to get the process run or run the process, "Mock up your mother and make her confront that wall" and then you'd see where you'd get making your body confront everything. People that take their bodies out and make them con-front racing cars and things like that – make the body confront racing cars; just don't let the body ride, see – after a while, get all exhausted and nervous. The body gets all exhausted and nervous. They're making the body confront. Well, a body can't confront all that. I don't know why people are using bodies to drive racing cars except to give the crowd a thrill anyhow.

Anyway, here's another one: "What considerations and disabilities chiefly stand in the way of exteriorization and stable exterior and OT?"

Operating Thetan. First mention we've had of OT this year. What stands in the road of it? I've just told you. Unwillingness. You ask a person, "All right now, what game could you play as an Operating Thetan?"

Funny part of it is, if he flattened the process he might become one. See? What game could you play as an Operating Thetan? If he finally found for sure and positively that he could play one, why, he'd have some willing-ness to become one.

Now, as far as exteriorization is concerned, an individual who goes around losing bodies all the time – every few years he loses a body. It's getting a longer period of time – he has one that's half dead for half a lifetime now. But he used to lose a body about every twenty or thirty years and it's gotten longer, but not much body.

Yeah, you go down to these cemeteries and so on, it's quite remarkable to read the tombstones. This girl – this girl is a mother of seven children, departed and dearly beloved. And read the dates of demise on the thing and you say, "Seven children!" It was an old woman of twenty-two, see? You look over these tombstones here in the East and it's quite wild. This fellow was an old man of thirty and so on. Why, you read these characters that signed the Declaration of Independence and so forth. The schoolbooks teach you that they were all old men. I don't know what their average age was but it was pretty young.

As a matter of fact, in some effort to cut down the number of candidates for various offices they put some ages in the constitution. Remember? Well, that sure cut down candidates like mad because there were very few at that time that old. They'd die off before they got that old, on an average. But they lived very short but happy ones, as the saying goes.

Well, an individual keeps losing mock-ups one way or the other and he begins to get superstitious and he starts to hang on to them harder and harder and closer and closer. You got the idea? Less and less trust in the fact that it will stay around. So he develops various mechanisms to keep mock-ups in close – and that's exterior – interiorization. See? Keep losing mock-ups, you'll say somebody's stealing them and you start keeping them in closer and closer and closer and playing it up closer and closer and closer, and the next thing you know, why, you're in the middle of one.

Now, you have to get a fellow over the idea of the scarcity of bodies before he will exteriorize with comfort. If – actually if you just had him waste bodies – waste healthy bodies for a while, like I told you way back when – PAB 1, I think it is – why, he'll exteriorize and stay exteriorized. We have so many exteriorization processes today, I haven't even bothered to keep a catalog of them. I just keep telling people this: that there's lots of exteriorization processes. But I don't give them any list of them.

And every time I start to write a list of them I know exactly why people don't exteriorize and so I say to hell with it. I stopped worrying about exteriorization when I found out that a fellow couldn't stick in his head after he kicked the mock-up off, and when I also found out that the thetan loves pain. He protests against it like mad because he can't have it, but he actually is unhappy without it. You give a guy a steel mock-up that won't give him any pain back, and he'll invent a machine in it that'll give him some pain.

He'll invent some ridges. He'll invent a mind. He'll do something. So it's a rather snide attitude I have regarding this particular manifestation. There isn't any particular reason to exteriorize anybody. We've found out in Scientology that an engram is a moment (in Scientology) – engram in Dianetics is a moment of pain and unconsciousness, recorded with full perception. You understand?

That's a Dianetic engram. A Scientology engram is a moment of pain, unconsciousness and exteriorization. You start running something on – I'll tell you a honey of a process! You want to hear a real honey of a process? This is a killer! This is a killer on the subject of

exteriorization. I say there are thou-sands of them. There really are. But this, amongst all others, is an easier one for the preclear to swallow and carry along with and it's quite interesting. Is, "Recall a time you were in a body." Oh! You're just recording on this one, huh?

"Recall a time you were in a body."

"Good."

"Recall another time you were in a body."

"Good. Fine."

"Recall another time" – or "Recall a time you were in a body," more correctly.

"Good."

Next thing you know, wham, wham, zoom, zing, zoom, brrp, facsimiles, zuh, rrup!

And you say, "What happened?"

"I don't know! (sniff, sniff) I was a perfectly happy shoemaker sticking to my last, and a nail flew off the shoe and went in my right eye and killed me dead!"

And you say, "What are you talking about?"

You're running out his last exteriorization and that recall process goes right down the line and hits it just as neat as could be.

By the way, a postpartum psychosis probably is a moment of exteriorization. A accident – an accident which doesn't contain a moment of exteriorization probably wasn't very severe. Individual went way off and said, "Well, shall I go any further, or did it live?"

That's a tricky process, "Recall a time you were in a body." There's a direct process which doesn't necessarily work a half-a-dozen times and – that is, if it works once. Somebody gives you a real – this isn't therapeutic – somebody gives you a real bad argument, you know, they say, "Well, you're talking about thetans. All us psychologists, we all know..." I know, I'm sorry to have to rant and rave about the psychologists again. I try to give them a break. I pretend they're not skunks. And I – somebody's ranting and raving at you and saying, "What is this exteriorization? The idea! You're a cult because you have a bunch of thetans and you know nobody's a soul or a spirit. It's all been disproved by modern communitomy!"

And you say, "Well, that may be and that may not be. But what I'd like you to do right now – having nothing to do with that subject – is just take hold of your head and keep it from going away." It's hardly anybody can do that for ten minutes without yo-yoing.

All of a sudden he'll be out there looking at the back of the body and he'll say, "Eek!"

How many of you have tried that on people, by the way?

There's almost any process that'll exteriorize these days. Old Start-C-S, just run that way, interspersed with Connectedness – by the way, that makes a good intensive, just old Start-C-S and "Find something you wouldn't mind connecting with you." Those two make a fine intensive. They give very good results but they quite ordinarily result in exteriorization. In the course of twenty-five hours you'll have somebody out.

Okay. Somebody says here, "Can an auditor who is rather severely near-sighted greatly increase a pc's willingness to confront the environment?"

Ha! I'll say so! I'd hate to give you any examples. Actually, it takes a near-sighted auditor to be a complete beast on the subject. He's usually obsessed on it.

Aw, case doesn't have much to do with it these days. Somebody who has a terribly low trust level, who is in perpetual doubt or something like this, who can't really say yes or no to a circumstance or situation, would probably have an awful time trying to coach anybody to do anything. You know, I mean he couldn't say, "Well, the auditor in this case, in the training drill, is supposed to do so-and-so" – and this individual would be so doubtful about everything under the sun, moon or stars that he could not say that the auditor had done it. Supposed to sit there quietly in the chair – the auditor sits there quietly in the chair. The coach couldn't make up his mind whether or not the auditor had sat quietly in the chair and he'd sound doubtful all the time and so on. And this would be very bad in the final aggregate because it would stack up, apparently, an enormous number of loses for the auditor, so he couldn't do it. Beyond that, I'd say that was about its only real limitation.

This person also wants to know – this person thinks I'm a walking encyclopedia: "What tape is PAB 111, on eyesight and glasses, taken from?"

Heh! I'll bet you thought I couldn't tell you, huh? Well, it's not from a tape at all. It's from a question and answer period of the 15th, 16th, or 17th ACC, and probably the 17th.

Male voice: Sixteenth.

Sixteenth?

Male voice: Yes.

It is. The sixteenth. But it's a Q and A period after an ACC lecture and it's not a lecture at all. And I don't think it's even available in tape form as far as I know.

"Any more news on pressures?"

Well now, this seems to be requiring a last-minute bulletin here as though we were putting out bulletins on this subject. Well, as a matter of fact, there are very few hurricanes gathering in the Gulf at the present moment. The president has, as usual, played a couple of good rounds of golf, and the news on pressures is that they're building up.

You saw pretty close to the ultimate in pressures, at the congress, as far as the processes are concerned – as far as knowing what to do with these processes and so on. Pressures can be added to any process. We have some-body touch the wall with the right hand. We could then say, "Now adjust it to an acceptable pressure." You could throw it in there. You could have some-body touching his body or confronting a body part or something like that and then make him do it with an acceptable pressure. You could throw this in almost any-place. It's quite workable.

It's a thetan's experience of havingness. Of course there are other things connected with havingness than pressure, but it's an experience of having-ness and an important one. And therefore is quite important in auditing. Very much – a lot of work has been done on this but there isn't any particular news. You saw the two processes – actually two hours of tape in

the congress just past, the Freedom Congress – contain about the hottest processes developed out of pressures. There've been no hotter processes than those. That I would suddenly cut loose and without warning and with malice aforethought, run this on a whole congress at Tone 40, most of whom had never heard of it before, you can just assign to my cussedness. It's an adventurous thing to do. The truth of the matter is, we were blowing people out of their heads around there like popcorn coming out of a shallow pan.

I simply determined to give these people some reality on what we were talking about. And people found the floor and found faces and found that ground was ground, more than they ever had before. You see? But it's actually an individual process and I wouldn't essay to run it on a group if I were you. It's something you do on a wholly individual basis. There were only four hundred people at the congress – you can get away with that.

Boy, were there casualties!

Of course, part of the insouciance was just having the ACC staff monitor it, having everybody else sit down and do it. That was actually in the interest of putting the people under control. You realize that? Truth of the matter was, I should have had four times as many seminar leaders, but it obviously was not anything that was going to be that destructive because we had so few. Don't you see? But if you'll listen to that tape again – by the way, that tape is available all by itself.

Hm?

Audience: Reel three.

Mm-hm. It's reel three. It's available all by itself. Its commands are as they are. It's just a good Tone 40 individual process, is all it is. That, by the way, was a piece of high adventure which maybe some of you missed. It's an individual process. It's not tailor-made to run on groups at all.

"Please give the current definition of the sense of humor."

Any of you seen the most recent Ability?

Audience: Yep. Yeah. No.

It contains the reviews contained in Newsweek magazine about a book called Beyond Laughter by Professor Goofwoofle, a psychiatrist from Woofwaffle, Beverly Hills, California. Published by McGraw-Hill. Six dollars ill spent.

"Laughter is a manifestation of severe neuroses and anybody should be watched carefully who does any laughing." After years of study he's come to the conclusion that it means a deep-seated psychosis has been setting in.

Now, you think I'm kidding you. But there is a great, big, thick book of about 296 pages on the subject of why you shouldn't laugh, and in view of the fact that the only psychotherapy known by the Italians, as a cure of melancholy (or any psychosis) was laughter – for some modern witch doctor to fumble-dumble along and put something off on the public and then to get a serious review in Newsweek magazine, tells me it's darker than I thought. It is the wildest book you ever wanted anything to do with.

Laughter is normally considered to be rejection. It actually is that mechanism which handles and as-ises surprise. Now, I talked to you about surprise the other day. And an individual who can take a surprise with a laugh is in good shape, and an individual who takes a surprise with shock and great seriousness is not in very good shape. And an individual who resents every-body laughing (that he tries to give a shock to), is psychotic. I say that with seriousness, not just as a quip. It's a serious subject.

No, laughter is a mechanism by which one as-ises surprise. If you'll notice, nearly all humor is based on a change of pace and it's based on the zigs when they should zag. And comics, for instance, come out and do something that should be done quite another way, and people simply reject or register their surprise, you might say, with laughter. The fellow's going to step on the tight wire. He steps over it and goes down with a crash. Well, this is perfectly silly because they didn't expect him to do that.

Now, if it gets very serious – such as a fellow on a high wire and he purposely has the wire suddenly slacken so that he can catch it eight or ten feet down, you'll hear people in the crowd scream. It is serious to them to the degree that somebody's liable to lose his life over this situation. And this sudden change of pace elicits a scream. So you could say that laughter, to some degree, follows the gradient of seriousness, according to the individual.

Now, if a person laughs for the whole gamut and laughs at anything that happens, regardless of what it is, he probably isn't laughing at anything. And this is possibly the laughter that this psychiatrist was talking about. He probably is around insane asylums and so forth. And he heard people laughing (not at or about anything, they just went on laughing) and he decided this was very serious. If he'd gotten out of an insane asylum, (if they'd let him) they would have – they would have discovered in no uncertain terms that there are very few such cases on the loose – very few. As a matter of fact, it's rather a rare case.

Now, you'll see somebody laughing at a moment that everybody else should consider very, very serious. Now, let's say his girl just jilted him. I can tell you how serious this is, see? An individual, actually, had a girl jilt him – that is to say, she just threw him over. When he came to call – everything was all arranged, they were going to have wedding bells and et ceteras – and when he came to call there was another man there, in bed. So the fellow who was going to get married went out and got a pistol and came back in and sat down on the porch, waiting for the other guy to come out. He'd been sitting there for about five minutes and all of a sudden began to laugh like hell and he just laughed and laughed and laughed. And finally this other guy did come out, and he looked at him and he laughed hysterically and could practically not walk down the road. Got home, threw the pistol in a drawer. And I audited the incident out of this individual several years later and there was nothing on it!

It was the love of his life! He'd gotten rid of the whole works. He just blew it! It was supremely funny to him. He suddenly found himself sitting there in the dark of night, an assassin, with a pistol in his hand. And he couldn't take it!

I saw a fellow one night in a cafe reach into his pocket, pull out his wallet to pay a very fancy bill – this was a New York night club bill, when I was a writer up there – and his wallet was totally empty! And he sat there and he looked at it, and the waiter came over, and

the headwaiter came over, and the manager came over, and he looked at them and he looked at the empty wallet and he looked at his girl that he was trying to impress, and all of a sudden he just broke out into howls of laughter! And they couldn't get him to stop laughing! And practically collapsing and weakly – the last I saw of him he was staggering out the door, howling like mad. I'm sure nobody had to run that out of him.

No, laughter is not just a release. Laughter is a definite type of response, physiological and mental, to a situation which contains a zag when it ought to contain a zig. And people who are in pretty good shape, sooner or later, in any situation, will find that it has just gotten just too serious. And you'll find oddly enough that only those circumstances where laughter is socially forbid-den produce aberration.

So much for Beyond Laughter and the subject of laughter. It is quite a mechanism. When you can no longer laugh at something, watch out. Get it audited out.

The mechanism of line charges is quite interesting. It's never been discovered exactly how to trigger a line charge. I normally can trigger a line charge and get a release of a whole bunch of locks – just get a guy laughing all the locks off. But it is so unreliable, we have never said anything about the technique at all. It is so seldom done. But the basic mechanism is, is just keep it making more and more and more serious until it becomes too serious, and the fellow all of a sudden revolts from this being too serious and springs into a line charge. Like the girl who was nervous on the stage, and Lyle told her, "But isn't it your fear that as you walk away from the mike you'll knock down all the scenery? Isn't that your fear?" And all of a sudden she line charged and it wiped out her stage fright.

The mechanism is, is make it more and more and more serious until it becomes utterly and completely ridiculous and the person will explode the whole thing off in laughter. Man, if sane, is a child of laughter and only when he begins to look very gloomy and glum – watch out.

Thank you.

Factors Behind The Handling of IQ

A lecture given on 5 August 1957

Thank you. Thank you.

How are you tonight?

Audience: Fine!

I want to compliment you on almost everyone having survived into and including the fourth week of the 18th ACC. And this was not looked for. I am very surprised. Very surprised.

Male voice: Fire the Instructors.

You're not going to have to fire the Instructors on the 18th ACC. They're expended probably at the end of the unit.

Okay. This is the sixteenth lecture of the 18th ACC, Aug. 5, 1957. AD 7.

Male voice: Amen.

We are covering here – going to cover here intelligence. IQ, the handling of.

Male voice: Good.

This past week has been an eventful one in research. It has culminated a four-year search for the factors which lay behind what is called IQ or intelligence quotient.

We have been taking pc tests here for many years. And these tests were used mainly to establish change. We care nothing about the significance of a test. We do care about the fact that these tests mirror change.

Now, someone can say that a test taken twice will of course get a better answer than one taken once. I don't know why this is true since everybody in the MEST universe is on "it mustn't happen again." You automatically figure that a test taken twice would get a worse grade the second time. That's beside the point.

They have tests which have different questions, and they call the B section and the A section and so forth. And you give two different tests, really, which are supposed to give identical results.

Now, I have been waiting for people who did this testing originally and so forth to come up and say, "Well, they don't – these tests that you're doing, you can throw the result in

any direction that you want to." And I've just been waiting with this one right behind the gun, see. I've been waiting with this one in a holster, tied down low. "You mean your tests are no damn good? Huh-huh!"

But we have given a considerable amount of testing to a considerable number of people. And we do find that a test will hold constant on a given person in the absence of processing. If a person is not processed, the variability in the profile and variability in the IQ is very slight. Over a period of years this is true.

Somebody who is getting no results whatsoever from any treatment or processing will register the same, test after test after test, which is quite unusual.

Now therefore, our failures have been of some benefit, and naturally there have been failures since experimental processes have been run. And the process was not intended to do anything but to find out what the process would do. And those processes that don't do anything of course didn't do any-thing and you got the same test back again on the A or B type.

Quite interesting, the whole subject of testing. Particularly interesting since it is a very old subject. It is not a subject developed in modern times. Testing is so aged, so ancient that it probably has longer hair than the long-hairs. It's – one of the first examples of testing that we find is in the early Chaldean times. Testing of all kinds and sorts and descriptions as to honesty, intent, reliability, ability and so forth have been with man almost as long as man has been around. It is not a new subject at all.

In modern times these tests have been reduced to writing. I'll give you a guilt test I heard about from the eighteenth century down in Georgia. It's pronounced "Jawjia." This test, throughout its use, was always very successful. It was a guilt test; and somebody had stolen something, they would have all the Negroes on the plantation line up and they would put a rooster underneath a big black kettle. And he was a witch rooster or something of the sort, you know, and they'd say, "Now, the man who stole it – the man who stole it, when he touches the black kettle will make the rooster crow."

And all the line of Negroes on the plantation would go by the kettle, you know? And then the overseer would merely have to go by and look at their hands, and the Negro who didn't have any soot on his hands was of course guilty.

There have been tests by fire even earlier than that. All you had to do to prove yourself innocent was to put your hand in the flame.

All tests, however, have had an end goal, and they are, of modern times, more or less covert. They're as covert as this rooster under the black kettle. You're supposed to answer a certain number of questions and as you answer them you get a certain grade. If you answer more questions in a given period of time, why, you're supposed to be better off than fewer questions in a given period of time. This is a very interestingly complex subject, modern testing, for this reason only, is: it was originally devised in the total belief that man could not be changed.

From year to year people would get changes of one kind or another from childhood on, which would demonstrate the year IQ, you might say.

And it could be higher and lower than other year IQs. They thought that people advanced in IQ because of age and so forth, and yet they maintained at the same time that IQ or intelligence quotient could not change, would never change, and could not be influenced by any particular factor.

I am rather astounded to discover that when a person is happy and takes the test and when the same person is unhappy and takes the test, he gets practically the same curve and practically the same IQ. Quite interesting.

He can get up with a horrible hangover and he will get only slightly less. Not a significant amount less than when he got up after a good 48-hour, round-the-clock sleep. It is quite amazing. That is what is peculiar about testing, is it does have a constancy.

It was this constancy in testing and an inability to understand the mind prior to 1950 which made people say that it was not possible to change man and he could not change. His IQ couldn't change. If he – a stupid man was a stupid man, a bright man was a bright man and that was it. And of course all men were stupid and there were no bright men except the testers, so this sort of made it unanimous.

Well anyway, we come down now to definitions. The history of testing is fascinating, but what's more fascinating is that anyone would have come along and have said, "Now look, there is such a thing as personality, and this is distinct and independent of intelligence. Intelligence is one thing, personality is another thing. And people actually had this idea, and although they had dozens of other categories which are less factual, these two categories are distinctly different.

A person – intelligence is not his personality. And so tests exist to measure personality, and tests exist to measure intelligence.

Now, this is one of the easier things to observe. One of the ways one would observe this, quite elementary, he would take three or four fellows who had more or less an equal personality. These people were all bond salesmen, they were more or less charming and hail fellows or whatever bond salesmen have to be, and they would test these fellows and they'd find their personalities were the same, but their IQs were different.

Then they'd find several people of the same IQ and they would find that they had different personalities one from another.

This could not have failed to be observed. It's one of the more elementary things.

Now, imagine our original interest in Phoenix, Arizona, when we were really going all out on testing – very early times we were in Phoenix – to discover that we process somebody with Scientology, and we gave him before that a personality test and IQ test. And after we had processed him we'd give him another personality, another IQ test, and we were not so amazed that change had taken place. We'd known that ever since 1950 when the first testing was done. But we were amazed that these things – for a while it sort of looked like they went either this way or that way. In other words, we either changed their personality or we changed their intelligence. Very often, in a very successful case, we changed both. Improved both. But these factors were changing independent of each other.

Well, this created a mystery, and I'm a sucker for mysteries. And this mystery invited my eye, and I gazed upon it with some astonishment because I said, "Why is it that we run an intensive on Joe and change his IQ, and run an intensive on Bill and change his personality but not his IQ?" Very mysterious.

In view of the fact that all of our processes were to a large degree mixed – they'd include Havingness and they'd include 8-C and they'd include thinkingness processes and significances and so forth – in view of the fact that auditors were different from one auditor to another, we had a sufficient number of factors in each one of these test representations to make it impossible to sort out which was which. What process or attitude changed IQ? What process or attitude changed personality? It's just bthaaah.

And every time I'd spread a lot of these tests out and start to go over them statistically in any way, and I'd try to do it by symbolic logic and by woman's intuition and other mathematics and I could not certainly isolate this. As – a time or two actually asked people to just process one sort of process. And this would radically alter. In other words, we'd process a certain type of process on one preclear and change his personality; another – same type process on another preclear and change his IQ. Well, in view of a brash statement I made the other day to the government of the United States (that's a place down here at – well, it exists, I suppose) anyway, I wrote a letter and it got somewhere, I think. And in this letter I was offering to change the IQ of defense scientists by a lot of points per scientist. And – this was part of the rendition, anyway. But – there's been a lot of chatter back and forth about this project's going on. Anyway, I stuck my neck out and I said, well, we could change the IQ of scientists anywhere from 15 to 75 points. Of course – and could absolutely count on changing them 10 or 15 points. Well, we could. Our averages show that. But, I don't know why – it may be that my left medulla oblongata does not know what my right orbit is doing – but I started out an entirely different project with the HGC auditors last week and wound up with the answer to this thing I'm talking about. With no intention of winding up with the answer at all – it's one of those things. Accidentals.

Now, what happened was this. We wanted a process that we could write up in a book and send to ministers so that they could counsel easily and well. Ministers of any denomination. And they, in counseling this way, would get a certain release and result amongst the congregation since the minister is doing a tremendous amount of personal counseling anyway. And if he could just sit down and according to these rules, as he would read them (which would be rather sloppily), get some sort of a result, we'd be very happy. And we were simply trying to tailor up the question. What was the best question on this one process? That was all we were trying to do.

And we call this Process July. Now, we knew one thing about Process July, and that was that it was slanted in the direction of getting people to unburden their souls. That was all it was. That was the only direction it was slanted. We wanted to get the overt act-motivator sequence off the case. Smart, huh? So we'd have the minister sit there and write down the names and – of everybody that the person knew. We'd hardly dignify this person by saying "preclear." Probably a lot of these cases it'd be pre-butchery. But he'd write down all the names of the people he knew, endlessly, you see? And then pick out the most likely candi-

dates and then just ask this one question about each one of those until we got this person straightened out and cleaned up.

Now, there's a communication process which would put these people into better communication. The communication process would be "something you could do or say to so-and-so." We'd ask that as sort of a Straightwire or present time basis. "Tell me something you could do or say to (valence)." You know, Grandpa or somebody like that. That was about all this process was going to consist of, but we did know this: that an overt act-motivator sequence is a reach-withdraw situation. See, I knew that. All right.

Therefore, we had to test "withhold." Obviously we had this withhold thing. Now, earlier processes already had given us this one. It's Recall a Secret, and that's from two years ago right here in Washington. "Recall a secret." And "Recall a secret. Recall another secret. Recall another secret." But don't get that process too confused with this process because they're not the same process at all. We just wanted the fellow to open up and talk to the auditor when we were recalling secrets. And if we did anything with Recall a Secret, it was totally by accident, we learn here on "withhold."

All right. So the first auditing question which was asked in this particular project, written here, "Think of something you could withhold from." Now, it was – all we did was take the preclears ... And we knew this would do them a lot of good and that we were not doing anything – as a matter of fact, the results are – well, they got tremendously good results. But we just took a list of people and then started down this list. We found that was too arduous right from scratch.

But we asked them then this auditing question, "Something you could withhold from." And then we turned around and ran "Recall something you've said or done to (that valence)." Made it a Recall Process, and "Invent some-thing you could say or do to," and ran those processes. In other words, make an inventiveness one, or "Think of something you could say or do to."

Now, one of the discoveries that led to this – it might fascinate you – and that is that divulgence and confession, we'd already learned, had nothing to do with raising anybody's IQ or improving his case. It wasn't the fact that he confessed it. It wasn't the fact that he divulged it. It was the fact that he'd erased it. See? I mean, big difference. Big difference.

For instance, there's an organization over in some foreign country – I've forgotten what it is – and they have little boxes, and they put a man in a box and members of the congregation come up and whisper something through the curtains of the box and they think that this is the stuff, you know? Now actually, they must have cut their therapy down because their early record demonstrates that they did a great deal for people, and their later records don't demonstrate they're doing very much for people.

As a matter of fact, they lost one of their leaders recently. He also wore glasses. They couldn't possibly be producing too much in the way of result with this. And I learned some time ago that to confess something or to divulge it in some fashion had nothing to do with psychotherapy. But this was borne out in this Process July, like mad. Because you understand, the auditor was not saying, "Tell me something you could withhold from Grandpa." He was saying, "Think of something you could withhold from Grandpa." You got the idea? And the

auditor would just sit there and acknowledge it and the pc would think of something else he could withhold from Grandpa and the auditor would acknowledge that. You got the idea.

All right. We started in on this on the "withhold" side of it for a couple of days, and then we went over to the "do or say something" and we varied that question around for a couple of days, and then came back to "Think of some-thing you could withhold from (valence)."

And when we got back to that, why, we knew we were in the chips on that question. That was the question that was producing the results. "Think of something you could do or say." "Think of something you could do or say" might unburden it, might rehabilitate something and very possibly (yet to be discovered) may have some workability when crossed over with this withhold question.

But the truth of the matter is, as one of the HGC auditors pointed out, this withhold is a games condition on communication and is a partner to this process: "Mock up somebody and deny him communication." Now, that's a games condition process, don't you see?

And people who are in a games condition – obsessive games condition, got to play a game with everybody they meet and don't even know it – on the subject of communication, are naturally going to be obsessively withholding. Well, you'd think that this was the thing we were trying to break. But the entire framework of research here, aimed as it was originally in giving ministers a nice little process, wound up with these rather astonishing results. This was run on five preclears. One of these preclears is incomplete. Actually, two of them were considered incomplete but one of them particularly was incomplete because we walked right up to him in the case, trod all over his toes and were all set to break his case, and there was the end of the intensive. So some more work had to be done on that by another auditor.

So his results here are invalid. We did, however, walk right up to the point where he became terribly agitated about answering the question, and then it couldn't be flattened because the twenty-five hours were up. That test, therefore, is invalid. Another test at the end of this week will complete this one. In other words, this was a more-hours case.

But let us take the remaining four on which this was run, and let us read, completely aside from the personality changes (which, by the way, were minimal – minimal APA changes; they're very, very small – they're all beneficial but very tiny) read these IQs. The original here, well, we'll just read the final last week on which this was run – 159 to 184. This is a lady so old that everybody knew that everybody's brains atrophied, and I imagine their brains don't – do atrophy, but this has nothing to do with a thetan. And her IQ went from 84 to 105.

Male voice: Wow.

Now, this is an impossible jump of IQ for this age which is – I don't know which one this is. One of these girls is 50-some which is not very old, but the other one is about 70-odd years. And they're not supposed to change at that level. Eighty-four to 105 running that process that I've just described to you.

Here we have the other case, very – this person very well advanced in years – 109 to 133. The 84 to 105 is a startling one though because the 70s and 80s are the impossible shift-

ers. We've shifted them that way before, but we seldom with – suddenly say, as we could now, well, we're going to change this person. We change him, change his IQ.

All right, now we have this one, and this is 121 to 143.

And this one, as we say, is invalid. The person became awfully stupid the moment that he ran right straight in. As a matter of fact, dropped his IQ practically out the bottom – 134 to 118. Now, he had, as you'll read here on the end of this intensive, the last of the auditor's report, "Think of something you might withhold from valence (blank)." And that was run for an hour. And the auditor says, "No big change, occasional comm lags; pc not facing problem of (blank), and having told him (blank), process above pc's reality level unless our case diagnosis inaccurate. Mentioned more control mechanisms he uses on (blank). Protested some about running this after he had been on it for a while." This was disclosing a present time overt act on the part of this person.

Now, the auditor adds here – I'm not sure why – "I did not want to make this pc an opponent." Oh, he has a good game going with auditors as opponents and no effect. This is a terrific no-effect pc. All right. We'll see that one at the end of this week. That was not flat, so it couldn't be included in the series. But look at those terrific gains on IQ.

Well, we figure it this way. This theory behind it seems to be this. The individual gets his mind so involved with the problems of some game with some valence or some person, you see? He's doing this and he's doing that and he gets his mind so involved and his computers are all tied up on that particular subject, that when you restore self-determinism on this particular level, you free an individual's ability to think. Got that?

An obsessive games condition is to withhold communication from some-body. Now, when we take that off automatic and put it under the control of the pc so that he is doing it and he can do it, then all of the involved mechanisms start working out. Well, that isn't all we discovered about this particular line. We found out that psychotherapy has never worked, couldn't work, and the basic theory of psychotherapy is something somebody ought to be shot for. And I say that all the time just because I want a good game going. That's the only reason, of course. I don't feel anything for my fellow man or any-thing like that. I raise the devil with the brain surgeons and so forth simply because I just need something to raise the devil with. Actually, it doesn't matter. Like hell.

Anyway, found out these characters were total frauds. And had never – I'd had some evidence that this was the case and it seemed to me this was the case, that Freudian analysis and other things was the case. But I know now why you've never seen a set of figures on Freudian analysis. Why you've never seen a before or after IQ on a Freudian analysis. And that would be the first thing that Freudian analysis would have tried and would have produced if they thought they were doing anything to anybody. Did it do anything for anybody's IQ? And I'll tell you why they never released a set of figures. Because it must depress the IQ out through the bottom. They must be able to take somebody with an IQ of about 150 and shove it down to about 70 in the course of a couple of years of psychoanalysis.

Now, I have many cases of record on this. I keep neat little files on the subject in case someday I find that somebody's got a knife in my back and I think that it ought to be in his

back. Knife transfers. And I look through the little files, and there are a lot of supportive evidence on this.

For instance, an advertising executive in New York City who was very, very successful, one of the most brilliant men in his firm, was yet a little quaked in the traahk, you know? He was wound up the wrong way. He'd take swigs out of his inkwell at regular intervals, you know? That sort of thing. Always marrying somebody else's wife on weekends, couldn't get to work on Monday because he was in the divorce court. Anyway, this guy was a brilliant man. Very brilliant.

And after some years of psychoanalysis, during which he took a total vacation from his job, he was returned to his firm as the janitor. No longer able to do any advertising executive work. Furthermore, there was no evidence that his psychosis had been cured. But it certainly couldn't manifest, because that required some brilliance.

Now, I didn't understand what had happened to this man, but the Freudian analyst believes and teaches this: that individuals who are brilliant must be neurotic. You got that?

Audience: Yeah.

Well, here we've got them in a box! Because it must be that every time they run Freudian analysis on somebody they decrease his IQ out through the bottom. Well, how fascinating! Because we find it isn't the case at all. What we did in this particular line is we moved those people who were below the line severely and so forth, up away from it and up above the line on personality. In other words, we took care of, to some degree, some of these worst incidents here.

For instance, we had a minus 55, depressed and unhappy, which was about the same, maybe, as this advertising executive in New York. And that changed, on this process only, to 79 plus, happy. We ran nothing but this process. And this person's IQ, understand, went from 121 to 143. In other words, we made him more sane and brighter at the same time, which gives us the clue on Freudian analysis. They have never at any time dared release an IQ pattern taken before or after an analysis because I'll guarantee you that it has always dropped. Why? Because they're on the wrong kick. Now, get this. This is the only thing that makes this work, and this is the only thing that makes it exciting news. The ability to withhold a communication is an ability which is restored by auditing. And it is the ability to withhold a communication which advances IQ and makes a person feel better, not the ability to divulge it.

Now, that's a switch, isn't it? This is wild. You've been told all your lives that all you had to do was go to somebody and confess! If you just would confess to your mother and father that you did those dirty, nasty, little things, you'd feel so much better. And that is nothing but a control operation from beginning to end and isn't true.

You probably felt better to the end of getting your pants tanned. This is an enforced communication. And as an enforced communication, would break through a games condition in which a person found himself and would demand that he communicate with the enemy. And would depress him accordingly. And obviously it isn't true that divulging it or confessing it did anything for anybody because the only improvement he got would be if he regained the ability to withhold that information without being upset about withholding it.

All right. So you took your old man's car. That's how it got that wobbly wheel. And you put it back in the garage just as nice ... And he came out the next day and he looked at that wobbly wheel, and he says, "What – what – what – I wonder how that happened!" And you stood there innocently and said nothing at all. But you felt guilt. And at length you kind of felt like you went out of communication with him when these things got too many.

And psychotherapy's answer to this whole problem was all you had to do was throw yourself upon the breast of truth and you were all set. And that wouldn't have done a thing for you. Not a single thing for you.

What the bent wheel did was overcome your ability to withhold communication by making you feel you ought to communicate. And so interrupted your self-determinism on the subject of communication.

Now, we have tested and we have in our testing files many, many intensives run on this one: "Mock up your father and say something to him." You remember that old process? It didn't do any great shakes for pcs. "Think of something you could withhold from Father," however, would have cracked it to smithereens. The process is flat when the ability to withhold is regained. The ability to withhold on a self-determined basis is regained, the process is flat.

Now, this is the reach and withdraw mechanism. You all know this little oddity about reach and withdraw. Must reach-can't reach, must withdraw-can't withdraw are two pairs which create the sensation of insanity. You can take a preclear and just have him get the idea that he must reach the wall, that he can't reach the wall, and if you can get him to hold that sensation, he will feel what insanity is. That's dreams: you must run away from the bogeyman that's chasing you through the treacle. And he is coming at a mad, express-train speed. And there you are, stuck. That's a nightmare, you see? You must withdraw, can't withdraw.

The glee of insanity is only composed of this. People in the asylum are only stuck in this, that they must withdraw, can't withdraw or must reach, can't reach. I imagine electric shock turns on more psychoses than are in the heads of psychiatrists. And that is some fantastic amount. And that would be on this basis: you take somebody who must get away from the electric shock machine and you make him approach the electric shock machine, and you've done it. You've laid in another insanity ridge, you got it? And you lay in enough of those, boy, do you stay solvent and boy, can you take dough away from the government and boy, can you maintain things in big style. Yeah. We're not much crazy.

And then people can come around, you know, and they can say "Well, one out of every fifteen Americans is crazy." I could have told them that. Fifteen out of fifteen. Well, that's true. It must be the diagnosis of it if they haven't shot psychiatrists yet – they're all nuts.

Now let's get back on this because this is up to my favorite rant. My very, very favorite rant is just this: that psychotherapy was a swindle. That it didn't intend to make anybody better. That was not its goal. And all of these psychotherapies are aimed at getting somebody to outflow. And what do we find here? We find that intelligence increases and neurotic personality traits better if we run "withhold communication from (valences)." What a fantastic reversal.

We have just found out somebody, and we have found them out a long way from base. Their idea was to get somebody to sit down and talk for two years, see? Tsk. No. Now, you see what background this is, why this is upsetting.

Actually, to some degree, we have always given credence and the benefit of the doubt. We – I have never said to myself, "All past researchers in the field of the mind have been absolutely stupid." I couldn't have said such a thing. It would have been a completely insane statement because it couldn't possibly have been true.

As a matter of fact, look at the dedication of Science of Survival, things like this. But as years go on and I find out more and more things like this, I begin to wonder why I haven't said so. Because it's actually impeded our work tremendously.

The whole concept that the pattern of the child is the perfect pattern on which adult behavior is formed, you see, and it's the natural, normal development of the child which gives us our pattern for barbaric behavior. And that's the basic standard of human behavior is the barbaric pattern of behavior as a child. Therefore we have to have jails. It follows, doesn't it? See how well that follows?

We say, well, we have to improve people beyond children because, you see, they would all be like children, and children are very lawless. And if you really did do anything for people, if you let people look into the mind, why, of course they'd all become as lawless as children and we'd have to put them all in jail.

And you still say this is no control operation? I think it's a knowing control operation. I don't think I could be around – if I were as stupid as a – somebody down here at GW in the psychology department – I don't think I could be around their rat mazes more than two or three weeks without finding there was some curve in it. See, it would have been something. Any one of you, walking back and forth and inspecting this sort of thing, would sooner or later have come to realize that something like this was going on.

Now, the idea of confession is very, very old. It's as old as witch doctors. Don't let any church claim it as a monopoly because it's not. It's one of the oldest witch doctor tricks there is: confession. If you could just confess it to somebody, you'd be all right. Listen: that's an operation. The answer to it is, if you could just withhold information from somebody voluntarily, you would be all right. See, it's the exact opposite side of the vector.

Now, let's get factual, huh? Let's get off of my favorite hobbyhorses here and get some usable processing information since this week we're covering processes.

We found this to be the case: that those people from whom one felt he could hold nothing were the aberrative valences on the case. So we have a new definition for aberrative valence: a person from whom the preclear could have withheld nothing. Most aberrative valence on the case. Got that?

And as you run it, you'll see – you'll say "Think of something now that you could withhold from Aunt Grace."

And the pc will say, "Well, unreality, unreality, unreality. Unreality, unreality, unreality. Gee, it seems like I could just – I could withhold a dollar in my billfold or – or

mmmmmm, an old broken tooth or a pile of dirt or a book or something from Aunt Grace, but I don't seem to be able to withhold anything from Aunt Grace at all."

You got your quarry. Tallyho.

Now, here's a test of this. You ask a criminal, "What could you withhold from jail?" He'll do the same thing.

"Unreality, unreality, nothing. Nothing. Jail?"

And just the mention of the thing, he will see sort of the facsimiles and so forth and pictures of himself and so on go sweeping toward some spot he considers the jail. He is unable to withhold anything from jail.

So what are we looking at here, kiddies? We're looking at the basic anatomy of the trap and the basic process by which one would run a trap.

And boy, if you don't think that's valuable, you ain't been in no traps lately.

In other words, you could be sitting in the middle of the trap and just dream it up for a while and say, "How did I get in here? I don't know." The only way anybody could keep you in a trap would – give you the idea that you had to surrender to the trap. Ha! That won't work. All you'd have to do is run this kind of a Straightwire process. Not Straightwire, but just thinkingness process. You could run a Straightwire process on this, too.

"Let's see. What could I withhold from this trap?" And finally get one with complete certainty. Just one, no matter how small and crummy and insignificant. You'll be amazed how long it takes to get them when you really strike an aberrative valence or a trap that's really – you really think is a trap.

"What could I withhold from?" You think of another one.

"What could I withhold from this trap?" Another one.

"What could I withhold from this trap?" By that time you'd start to yo-yo in and out of the trap. Don't give it up because it takes quite a few more to free you. Got it?

If you get outside of the trap and find yourself too avidly playing the game of, "Boy, that was a tight squeak" (that's quite a game, you know), why, just find something else that you could withhold from the trap and that would be that. Got it?

Now, what do you do about the other side of it? Takes care of itself. I don't know how a thetan can keep from communicating with everything unless he feels he should withhold everything from everything.

Now, what are you trying to do? Are you trying to erase a lot of things? No. No, no. Get off of that. It is the regaining of the ability to withhold. So on some gradient scale, you lead the fellow up. The process is flat when he has regained his ability to withhold something from Papa. Something from Mama. Something from school. Something from – I don't know, maybe he was a drill press operator – something from a drill press. You got the idea? He was a painter – something from a canvas. Got it?

He could, with certainty, selectively withhold things from canvas or aberrative valences, you've got it licked. You don't have to go the other way at all. Why? Because an individual has been in a games condition with the canvas or the typewriter or the drill press or the valence. And he's been in a games condition that absorbed all of his ideas and thinkingness and everything else. And they're all stuck and bunched up on the track. But he's trying to think, "How can I communicate? How can I communicate?"

Let's take a boxer. We had a boxer in our midst here and I asked him to think this question over. And he gave me a report on it today, and he says, "Uuuuh, that's quite a question! What could you withhold from another boxer?"

He said it's easy to withhold those things which a person would normally have withheld from him in training. "But the other things," he said, "I don't know." What would the other things be? A blow!

All right. So the individual's been in some kind of a high games condition requiring a lot of effort such as boxing, you would find the same rules applying. Overt act-motivator sequence is what you're studying now, folks. After all these years, man and boy, we've been looking at this overt act-motivator sequence and ways of wrapping it up, and we saw them – suddenly look at it. Because the individual who cannot withhold, cannot communicate, since communication is composed of selective withholding.

Now, it's not a break-communication process because it is running out things. Now, there are many other fascinating factors involved in this particular process, but none of them are – should be bypassed. I should tip my hat to each one of the side effects here. And so I will.

You've got this kind of an activity, then. You have individuals in a game condition, with their highest common denominator of a games condition. And that action is communicate, and they are trying to withhold communication from their opponents. Wherever they have considered an opponent to exist, they have withheld communication from the opponent.

Now, having decided to withhold communication from the opponent, they now decide to communicate with the opponent because they have to. And you get a denial of self, which is of course your basic aberrative pattern. Basis of all aberration is the denial of self. You say it is black and then tomorrow you are forced to say that it is white. This is quite aberrative.

All right. We take this circumstance, we look over the picture and we discover that the individual has been made to break his own postulate. "I am withholding it," he said, because he considered this person an opponent, and then he said, "Now I have to talk. My crimes are so great. My misery is so tremendous, the harm I have done is so sweepingly horrible." People love to set themselves up as God, you know, with the idea that they caused the whole flood. It's really wonderful. I mean, the conceit with which some people will take upon themselves authorship of consequences far beyond their power to create.

Yes, yes, I imagine some ex-thetan of a major general be sitting up in cloud ninety-nine after the next atomic war or something like that saying, "Well, it serves me right. I caused it all." Brother, he never had brains enough to cause all that. He never had brains enough.

Now, the ability to withhold a communication, then, is an ability. And when one starts withholding automatically or as a pattern, or when the with-holding, more importantly, is broken down by the feeling that one must confess, divulge or communicate, one loses, then, out, and closes valences and takes on the other valence. So there are many criminals walking around who are nothing but ambulant jails.

When you can no longer withhold from a valence, you become it. And we have the basic mechanism of valence closure. Because what is the one thing that you don't withhold from something you have become? Yourself. So you have to go up a gradient scale of withholding in order to stay apart or out of a trap or out of a valence. Lead-pipe cinch. So all you would do is run a process of this type.

Now, how would you run this process? One, you would take an inventory of valences. And if I were doing it, I would take an inventory of valences and professions and habitats. A habitat is a place where a preclear has lived and couldn't pay the rent. In other words, I would find the old homestead, the old apartment house in Harlem, the hole in the hill in California. Childhood home, in other words. Got that? I'd take a list of these familiar places. Then I would take the professional list, and I'd certainly have this valence list. You got it?

Now, there are numbers of tricks by which one can isolate these without asking the direct question. And he can isolate these on the basis of comm lag, the fact that he didn't mention them at all. In five of these people, the two – in two of the cases out of five, the most aberrative people or valences on the case were never mentioned by the preclear but were dug up by the auditor on an oblique questioning angle. In other words, they were completely out of sight. They were never mentioned. The two, see? Two out of five, in other words. That's an awfully heavy percentage. It means you never would have gotten the aberrative person on the case.

And I would then take the most likely suspects, totally convinced that other suspects were probably much more likely and would turn up. And then I would run it in this wise. I would establish a session with thoroughness. And with questioning I would find out if there was a present time valence with which the person was very deeply involved which was a horrible problem to him, and I would just run that as a problem of comparable magnitude and get it out of the road. And then put it down very carefully in my notes to knock hell out of it with a process. Got it?

I'd move into session and I would sandwich valences in this fashion: I would take some valence that was easy to run and get him used to the idea of withholding communication.

My auditing question would be "Think of something you might withhold from (blank)." "Think of something" – not "Tell me something," not "Recall something." It'd be "Think of something you might withhold from (blank)." And he'll think. And when he has think, why, he tells you so and you say okay and give him an acknowledgment and carry on. You got that?

In other words, you aren't asking him to divulge a thing. But after a while, he's getting a broad smile upon his face and his tone is coming up and he is doing wonderful indeed, and you say, "Are you able to think ..."

"Oh," he says, "I can think of lots of things."

Now, beware of an automaticity. He might strike a games condition automaticity that says, "Oh, I could withhold something from (blank). Yes – very, withhold this stage, this thh, mmmm-mm, ho, mmm, mmmm, thhhm, mmmth, oh, there's just too many things. I just couldn't say all the things I could withhold from (blank)." That's an automaticity. That has to be flattened. Get it finally to where he can withhold rather ordinary and routine things at his own discretion, one at a time. And that is the ability regained. The only thing you're interested in. And he finally decides that he could withhold things from (blank). Shift gears.

Go into Locational Processing. Orient your pc in the environment with Locational: "Notice that wall. Notice the ceiling. Notice the floor," to command his attention. No more. No less. And then turn around and pick the next valence you care to run. Now, this valence you should consider a little stiffer. And run it until he has regained his ability to withhold things from. Go into Locational again and then pick a little stiffer valence. Got it?

Until you get one that you just know he can't withhold anything from at all. You know by the way he bogs on it, how he never mentioned it, how he told you that it wasn't important. And run that one. And then I would pick up his professional tools. You know, spaceships and other working tools. And I would run those on a similar gradient scale until he could withhold any-thing from them.

And then I would pick items like the childhood home until he could withhold anything from the childhood home. And you would have this individual just coming out of various stuck spots of his life just pop, pop, pop, pop. Got that?

By that time you've regained enough ability to withhold that he could withhold himself from this universe and there he goes, and you got an OT.

Well anyhow, it's interesting theory. The question is, does it work? Well, it would only work on those preclears whose thinkingness could be controlled. There is no use running a preclear whose thinkingness cannot be controlled. You got that? Don't run him on a thinking process if his thinkingness can't be controlled.

So this tells you that if you were going to do this, the very least you would have to do is probably flatten CCH 0, 1, 2, 3 and 4 fairly well with the pc before you cut loose with this, and then use ample quantities of Locational Processing for the remainder of the intensive. And you would find, then, that you had your preclear pretty well straightened out. Lord knows what his IQ would be if you went for broke to this degree.

Once you have regained the ability to withhold from a valence with a preclear, you could also ask him this auditing question: "Something you could do or say to that person." But this would be more in the line of showing him that he now had the ability to speak at will; that he could communicate with the person. That apparently restores itself more or less just if left alone. But he would feel very free to talk to people. Communication level of pcs definitely comes up, as so reported in most of these cases.

Now, what special guard would you use on this? I'll just repeat this again. The person – that is to say, the body of the pc would have to be under the auditor's control. The atten-

tion of the pc would have to continue to be under the auditor's control. Hence, the use of Locational between valences.

But the attention, of course, would be brought under control with the first early CCHs. And then I would move forward into these various valences, and if I felt that he was very badly slipping or he was getting no reality on it at all, I would consider that I had given the preclear a great many loses and that the things were not particularly real to the preclear.

I would then coax him into a higher level of reality. I wouldn't let him keep muffing it, keep missing. I wouldn't let him miss once.

Now, there is another way of running this and diagnosing that, and that is with the use of an E-Meter, providing you can use one and providing you would only use it for diagnosis. Of course, an E-Meter could also tell you if the thing is flat, but an E-Meter will never speak up, even if it's got a beeper on it, and tell you that the ability has been regained. And that is what you are looking for. You're looking for a regaining ability.

This runs as fast as you are trying to get to the preclear to regain an ability to withhold. And it runs as slowly as you expect the process to sort of rub out this or that and do a job on it. The process won't do anything unless you have some goal as to where the process is going. And that is to restore to the preclear the ability to withhold. That is completely important. That is then to bring the preclear out of all traps.

Now, quite incidentally, this is evidently IQ. And it changes valences only to the degree that it totally snaps the preclear out of the valences. Why didn't we get large valence changes here? We didn't get large valence changes, evidently, for the reason that nobody ran a valence flat. We were experimenting. We were spending a lot of time on useless characters in the case. We were wasting time like mad. The amount of effective processing done during this research thing was about ten hours out of the twenty-five.

Now, if we had actually decided to find the aberrative valence and polish it off until we could inspect it with white gloves, we undoubtedly would have got a terrific valence shift because in the final analysis all an APA, if bad, is, is the preclear's idea of the personality of the valence in which he is interiorized. The APA or personality profile is a picture of a valence the preclear has known, much more than a picture of the preclear's idea of an optimum. Do you understand that?

Audience: Mmmm.

So right here while the ACC has been going on, another milestone has been added. I want to thank the HGC auditors who took part in this test and all those who have had part in testing programs because it's finally culminated to where even we know something about it.

Thank you.

The Scale of Withhold

A lecture given on 6 August 1957

Thank you.

Well, how are you making out?

Audience: Fine. Okay.

This is the seventeenth lecture of the 18th ACC, August the sixth, 1957.

Well, your questions tonight absolutely inundate me. I don't know whether I can answer them or not. For this very, very, very good reason, that they aren't here!

Female voice: Right.

And I understand that your difficulties in one of the units today with the definition of "nothing" ... Every time anybody would try to define nothing, he got himself into a fine state of restimulated loss, of course, you see? So nobody could agree on "nothing." Well, I think that's probably what's the matter with thetans, they can't agree on nothing; they've always got to have something.

Well, there's a high degree of probability that tonight's lecture could concern itself with various processes. So, I think I'd better tell you something about the processes you're doing.

And last night I talked to you about what rose IQ. You understand that that was the news. IQ was the news. Because I could point out to you, over here on your – CCH 9, Tone 40 "Keep It From Going Away," is withhold. Now, we already knew that that had a considerable workability. The road to solids, tolerance of solids, lies through withhold. Only we'd never had a Straightwire version on this before or anything that clipped it directly and immediately. But we for sure have it here on Tone 40 "Keep It From Going Away." And just to be in sequence here if you don't mind, I'll talk to you a little bit about solids and these processes that concern them.

Well, we'll take hold of CCH 9 here, "Keep It From Going Away," and we'll discover that there we are dealing with the automaticity which goes as follows – fascinating automaticity, the most fascinating automaticity there is. In fact, you couldn't do without it (you think). Everything that comes along is used by a thetan to keep things from going away. He gets a cannonball in the stomach, he says, "Ah, look – at that moment of impact, it kept the body from going forward, ha-ha! So I'll make a lovely picture of the impact (hence the necessity for pictures) and have it keep the body from going away from here on out!" That it gives us a cannonball in the stomach all the time is some-body else's lookout.

Sounds pretty wild, doesn't it? And yet that's why people hold on to impact engrams: fear of loss; fear they will lose a body. They do other things. They fill the atmosphere around the body with machinery and that sort of thing, so other thetans will be afraid to come into it and take it over and take it away. But keeping things from going away is a basic mechanism which guards against loss.

Well, of course, as I told you about the mind, it runs on a gradient scale from thought, through efforts, to solids. Actually, the mind has been graphed already on the Tone Scale. That is the gradient scale of approach between something that is nothing and total solids at the other end. It isn't that a person himself becomes a total solid but his approach to solids is on a gradient scale through less solids and misemotions and plain emotions and little energies like aesthetics, and then just thought, and we have this band at work. Well, when the individual gets hold of something like a cannonball in the stomach, he says, "Oh, boy!" He says, "That certainly ... We got there in a hurry. That I can directly handle, obviously, because it handled me so well!" Well, he keeps things from going away. He guards against loss with impacts.

Now, he does other things with impacts. Quite fascinating things. He uses them as control mechanisms. I would not put it beyond a thetan to take a cannonball engram on the right to move his body to the left, a cannonball engram on the left to move his body to the right. Handy, isn't it, you know? Requires no effort. He just puts a slight thought into the line and he says, "Move to the right." You know? And the cannonball goes into restimulation and he moves over to the right. You could see how this would be a good system.

Well, he's using these "keep its from goings away" as control, then, isn't he? In other words, he lets the body be shoved around by things and he keeps those things there and thus he can control the body rather easily. Right? He thinks! Deteriorates at the same time. Well, could he control anything else with the same mechanism? Yes, an individual very easily takes a cannonball engram, hangs it on somebody else's head to make him bow.

That it's a cannonball in the stomach put on somebody's head does not keep it from working. You just get somebody to think his head is in his stomach and something of this sort. So very often you start to audit a preclear and you find out that you're auditing a stomach out of his right arm, a head off of his left foot. Well, this is the interchange of facsimiles, and thetans use these facsimiles on others. They throw it at other people, throw pictures at other people.

Way back on the track there's a thing called the engram police. Just as there have been police in every other line of human activity, so there have been police in thetan activities. And it's quite amusing to get this thing into some kind of a condition where it can be policed. So there's "thirty days in a space opera trap," you see, "for using a cannonball facsimile on female thetans," and other ordinances of one kind or another.

But in the main, facsimiles have use. And then they have the lovely attraction of also being themselves mass.

Now, a fellow who keeps money for its own sake is the sort of a fellow who would keep facsimiles for their own sake. Got the idea? There are characters up on – oh, I don't know, they regularly get elected to be secretary of the treasury. But money is itself, it is a thing. It's not a communication particle. It exists totally for itself. And so a thetan gets into

this frame of mind every now and then and says, "Well, engrams for their own sake!" You know?

Has no idea of anything else but just keeping one. You start to look, as an auditor, for the significance of why this fellow has this thing stuck in front of his face and you may find that he's merely keeping it for its own sake. Be prepared to have that happen. That's the only violation of this "keep it from going away." All other engrams are used to that level, "keep it from going away." All right. They either keep you where you are or the body where it is or something. They're control mechanisms.

Then sometimes a fellow will get a series of engrams all hooked together, beautifully aligned, you know: a shoulder with an arquebus shot in it, a stomach with a crossbow through it, a leg with a spear in it and a few slinging stones just back of the left eye. This is a nice combination, and moves the body quite rapidly. You start to shift the engram a little bit and the body really jumps and you move this at somebody else and he really jumps, too. You take this particular string of facsimiles and somebody sees that much agony and perception and so forth, and the somatics begin to somatic and somebody moves. All right. That's fine. Or he stands still and doesn't move anymore.

What's the gist of this? When that finally peels off totally to a thought level, you are looking at somebody who has a service facsimile. (That's all a service facsimile is, is a series of facsimiles which you can call a facsimile, which can be applied to the control of others very nicely.) But after an individual's been on the track for a few billion years using one of these nice combos of one kind or another, why, sooner or later he flops. You're coming along in a robot and doing very well, thank you – no somatics, no effect on self at all, robot totally run by extraneous and exterior machinery and couldn't feel pain if it had to, couldn't be stopped possibly because it was wound up two or three years ago and hasn't run down yet. And you're wheeling along in this robot and you just feel wonderful about the whole thing and this other person slings this service facsimile at the robot and it rattles off of it quite easily. He gets a lose.

Well, the intention was for it to control something. So it controls the nearest thing to hand, which is himself. Now he's got it. But he'll still use it for control because that's the basic postulate behind it. You got that?

Now, if an individual is going to have any real – anything to do with fac-similes at all, he's going to rattle somewhere between solids and thought. There's that extreme band, don't you see? And by gradient scales and concatenation and by lots of postulates about association – you know, one thing is another thing which gets into identification – finally this scale itself can become relatively solid. He can think a thought and turn on the solid at the other end of the scale. Get the idea? The president of General Motors can think a thought that all the wives of stockholders should get roses, and the roses appear. You see, nothing to it. Of course, he doesn't think that kind of thought. He actually thinks the thought that all stockholders should stay away from the next board meeting. That's "keeping them from going away from home," is the way he would use this.

Well, we look this over and we see that the movement and the motionlessnesses of people and so on can easily be handled by facsimile patterns.

In this decadent time, facsimiles as themselves aren't used anymore. It's been a long time since anybody walked up to you on the street and said, "Look," and showed you a facsimile. I mean, they just don't do it. The engram police were very, very effective way back when. And fellows think it'd spoil the game if they mocked up perfect Illinois Western bonds, redeemable at face value at any bank, US Saving Certificates of one kind or another, just mocked them up and piled them. They think it'd spoil the game, the silly fellows! They don't realize that game is a no-game condition. Well, anyway ...

As we move along the line and get down to these times, why, we're not seeing a facsimile being used as such. We're seeing the results only at the top end of the band. Thetans are less willing to move around solids as them-selves, less willing to move around facsimiles, but they will use the thought end of the spectrum. And they use the thought end of the spectrum and then they get these things going into action and they say, "What was that?" Which is very silly. I mean, they once upon a time knew very well what "that" was. But now they've lost track. People trying obsessively to locate things and so forth are simply trying to find out what facsimile is on the other end of that thought chain. What is this that wiggles when I think, "Wug"? See? He thinks, "Wug," and all of a sudden something wiggles. What is that? It's a big mystery.

Well, that's just because facsimiles have gone out of style. They're made these days in Hollywood. And there's a big monopoly on them. And they're shown on every television screen in the country, and there's just tremendous numbers of facsimiles being purveyed and they all have copyright notices on them. And you couldn't copyright one of your facsimiles if you tried. You could go down here, mock up a beautiful facsimile down here at the US copyright office and they'd give you "no sale." They wouldn't stamp any circle with a "c" in it on it, that's for sure. They're going to say, "That's all made in Hollywood, son; you better quit," or "carried in Life magazine." Facsimiles-preparation of.

Well, there's a terrific breadth of scale between a printed picture of a car and the car, isn't there? There's quite a breadth of scale between a picture of a car and a car. Well, there's just as much breadth of scale between the picture of this car and a thought about the car. Only it's the other way: less and less solids. You could easily see the more and more solids when it was applied to the physical universe, but the less and less solids we don't see very often. Yet these get in the road of our auditing all the time. An individual has a certain auditing command, he starts to perform the auditing command and all of a sudden something wigs when he went wog, and he wonders why he is crying! Well, he's crying because he pushed the button which on the scale down the line resulted in tears; a lachrymose somatic of, sometimes, some bucketish magnitude. And he's very often very surprised. He doesn't quite know what turned on these tears. Well, don't be – as an auditor, don't be in a big puzzle about this because it's simply a scale which had tears on it. That scale was stuck in grief, was intended to trigger at grief, don't you see? Well, others are intended to trigger at solids. For instance, thoughts about pretty girls or good-looking young men very often end in solids. Just go down to any maternity ward and you'll see where those thoughts go.

Now, if we look over the basic phenomena of all this, we discover a great oddity. And that is that throwing things away or dispensing with them is much inferior to holding on to them. Now, this is a great phenomenon we have here. Just call it a phenomenon. You can ra-

tionalize it any way you please. But it required an enormous amount of work on my part to get this thrashed out. I damn near killed more preclears trying to find this out.

Which side of the reach and withdraw mechanism is the one which can be audited? Which side is true? Which side holds good? Well, we find out that we – the reach one is good, high-toned, not-games-condition activity. That's communication, isn't it? Well now, unless you have an opponent situation, you'd certainly better run reach. Got the idea? Reach. But in view of the fact that everybody has some games condition on almost everything, we can run some withdraw, can't we? And we find out that withdraw is the side that can be run rather endlessly. And by withdraw, we mean "withdraw something from," because this builds up and increases havingness and this is the entrance to most cases.

Of course, we're talking about Homo sapiens even at his worser states. We're talking about anything from psychotic, neurotic to normal, or up to acceptable. And as we look over this scale of people, we find out that this holds good, this scale, up to maybe – this idea that withdraw or hold to your-self, you know, withdraw it from or hold to yourself the object, holds good anywhere up to a couple of hundred hours of processing. I mean, it's all the way from the bottom, clear on up there. An individual has to get almost entirely over the idea of acquisition, have, possession, mass, need-of and so on before he's in any kind of a state where he can accept very much "Pitch it away from you, give it the yo-heave."

Well, a man will communicate outward to the degree that he can hold inward, and the monitoring thing is the hold inward. (Lump that if you like it. And if you don't like it, it's still true.)

Now, I'll tell you the first clue that came up on this line is every time a psycho would come into the Foundation, we'd find out that you couldn't separate anything from them. I used to try to process them on getting them to throw away a single scrap of paper. Anything, see? We've done a lot of experiments in this line. But a psycho would come in and sit down, why – try to get her to let go of a purse. (Particular one I remember.) She could be audited all right as long as she could hold on to her purse; and her purse couldn't be set on the floor or on the bed or anyplace else, it had to be clutched to her bosom. Right here. I notice two or three of you laying down your purses right at the minute. Anyway... Had to be clutched right square to the bosom. But although one or two of you are doing that, I assure you that if I ask you to see your purse, you would undoubtedly turn it over. You see, one of them just – Audrey's just given up her purse there.

Well now, a psycho never would have done that regardless of who the other person was – just never would have separated from the purse. You would have just had a knock-down-drag-out clawfest; it just would have been a tug-of-war to end all tug-of-wars, with an enormous amount of power being put into it and a terrific amount of caterwaul. Maybe all the auditor was trying to do was not hold – she wasn't supposed to hold it to her chest, just put it in her lap, just to get the purse put in the person's lap, see. It was just more than she could do. That's an extreme case of "hold," see, "pull in." You might say, "withdraw it from others." Extreme case. And you'll find out as a person heads on down the scale, it gets down that bad. But what complicates it is it has inversions. And right above this "clutch it to the chest this tight" would be an inversion of "throw it away – throw it away madly; get rid of it."

Well, all right. Which one solved it, the "throw it away" or the "clutch"? Now, that was a technical research problem for years. And I beat that one around, as I say, made a lot of preclears unhappy with that one. Just throw things away; just have somebody throwing things away and doing nothing but throwing them away. And give them a test, find out what happened to them, find out how long it took them to get better or to faint. The funny part of it is, they can do something ad infinitum, which they can't do the other ad infinitum. They cannot throw away ad infinitum, not even vaguely. They run out of havingness. You realize now, we're talking right on the center line of havingness and of anything explaining it. But they can clutch it to their chest forever.

"Well," you say, "that's impossible." I mean – you mean this fellow's going to walk around with all the debris and bric-a-brac and battleships he's sunk and airplanes he's – and all the facsimiles of all the coins he ever had when he was a little kid? (Every once in a while somebody gets broke, you know, and they think of all the money they wasted on candy when they were a kid or something.)

Now, here's a wild one – here's a wild one: we are really only concerned with a person's holdingness to himself. Aren't we? That gives us an engram bank, puts the bank in res-timulation, upsets things endlessly, messes up things terribly. Everything is being pulled in to the individual. Right? All right. After a while, if everything is being pulled in to the individual, we get some kind of a silly condition where a person is himself a lump. And every once in a while you're asked to solve one of these lumps. That's a psycho – he's a lump. You're asked to exteriorize somebody. He's dead in his head – he's a lump.

What causes the lump? Well, you could say the fact that things can be thrown away causes him to hold them in. There are only two things to run there. One is "throw it out," and the other is "pull it in." There's just two. Which one do you run? Or which one can be run nearly forever? The one a thetan is running, of course, nearly forever, and that's "hold it in." Now, "hold it in" solves both "hold it in" and "throw it away." An individual's communication is raised by holding things in.

Well, this is a fantastic thing, isn't it? If you think this over – here's a nothingness that couldn't duplicate any mass anyhow, busy holding mass into himself. He comes to harm because of it, his abilities go to pieces, his penalties and that sort of thing are – all accumulate on him, everything he's done wrong he's carrying around in a little picture to remind himself how guilty he is so he'll shed three drops on the altar of Gog or whatever religion he happens to be in. But this is a great peculiarity. It should be looked upon as a peculiarity since it is simply the result of a number of considerations, probably peculiar only to this universe.

Now, this individual will have, maybe, a psychiatric psychosis. There is one – there is one. I'm speaking seriously now. Psychiatry is a whole track phenomenon. You'll run into psychiatrists in all sorts of past periods in a preclear's life, if you care to go into an E-Meter. He says he's never been near an asylum – he sure looks like he has. Well, who knows how long he was in an asylum a few thousand years ago?

Whole track phenomena, space opera and so forth, placed a heavy reliance on psychiatry. No more and no less than psychiatry, which is a brutal miscontrol of an individual under

the guise that people are insane. (That's a definition of.) And you'll find this rather repeatedly employed – various things of this character.

Well, they kept people under control by shipping them someplace else. They'd ship them elsewhere. And they would get them to move as a particle. In other words, they'd treat a thetan as a particle and shoot the thetan some-place else. Now, for a thetan to have to go someplace else is the ne plus ultra. This is seven times as bad as him having to ship all of his possessions some-place else. Get that?

Supposing somebody told you tonight that you had to ship everything you own to the Germans because they weren't getting enough out of losing the war. Supposing somebody told you that.

And you said, "Well, I have to ship everything I own?"

And, "Yeah. Including your wife or your boyfriend. They all have to be shipped. That's the way it is. That's the way it is. We've got to be noble victors."

Well, that – a fellow would feel pretty bad if he'd had something like that happen to him and it was enforced. Well, how much more so would he feel if he himself had to be shipped? And all of his possessions stayed here? In other words, he is shipped away with no slightest chance of ever possessing again or having any of his environment again. Well, you realize that would be a rather upsetting thing.

Yet this was the trick on the whole track that was pulled by what we can call facetiously – they were – psychiatrists. They would take a thetan – there're all kinds of gags on the track. You'll run into these things every once in a while. There's a great big floating stone, for instance, on a nearby planet and they expect soldiers on leave and space opera people and so forth to volunteer. It's called the Emanator, this thing, and they're expected to volunteer.

And they walk in and the second they walked in they see this great big stone floating in space. (By the way, we had this on Earth, which was a dramatization of the Emanator: it's the Mohammedan lodestone that was at Mecca. That's a dramatization of the Emanator.) It's suspended in space, and it was radioactive as they came. And it knocked a fellow into a pretty grogged condition and he'd be dragged off into a side room by the boys in the temple. And he'd be shot off to some other planet at some mocked-up story of what tremendous good deeds he had to do there. But nevertheless, this was a dispossession of a body and everything he owned, wasn't it? Well, it'd throw him so far down scale that he'd never even remember this.

Well, how do you throw somebody up scale, then, so he will remember something? Well, don't have him throw things away. Don't run his havingness down, in other words. Have him – we thought for a long time – simply increase his havingness. Well, we know more about it now. We have to increase his ability to hold. And when his ability to hold is emphatically good and he himself can do it, he will abandon all these cannonballs in the stomach. Got that? In other words, he abandons all this lower-scale automaticity of having things held for him.

For instance, the citizenry very often depends on the courts to hold things for them – they do until they put it up to a court! Somebody's suing them for their shirt and they say,

"Well, that's all illegal and illogical, and I wasn't there, didn't even know the girl's name, never took a drop of liquor in my life!" Go down to court and defend the suit and that's what is awarded: not only your shirt, but your suit too! And they immediately go terrifically down scale. In other words, you can consider this a third dynamic automaticity of holding on.

The court is supposed to secure to you your possessions. And dependence on the court, not on yourself, to have the possessions secure can then be upsetting to you. Do you follow me? Because an individual can no longer do it himself.

I suppose one of the definitions of a civilization would be an organization whereby nobody ever did anything himself. It'd be a definition for it. Another one would be, that organization most calculated to keep people from ever owning anything. Collective ownership is the final refinement on something like this. Then we all hold for everybody. You're a member of a twelve-man cell, so you expect eleven men will hold on to the goods of the state – not even yours, you see. You don't bother. And then one day, much to your consternation, you look around and find out the nation isn't succeeding very well. And of course if you were looking very closely you would discover that the other eleven members of the cell weren't holding on either. And neither was any other cell in the country holding on to anything. And of course you would just have chaos. Do you follow me here?

Now, "holding on to," when it becomes automatic, goes out and beyond one's power of choice. Automaticity can start by power of choice but after that it has to violate it all the way to be automatic. In other words, one doesn't stop an automaticity. An automaticity, if it ever stops, it wears out or something of the sort. All right. Now, if we have everything holding on to things for us such as gravity, body holding on to you, all kinds of things holding on for us – belt holding up the pants and that sort of thing – we get eventually to a frame of mind where we feel we're being totally cared for. But at the same time we don't dare reject anything because it might be some of our hold-on-to mechanisms, and a thetan doesn't reject.

Now, it's actually only necessary to put all of this back into the abilities of a thetan. For a thetan to reacquire the ability to hold on to things is not necessarily the same as a thetan having to destroy all automaticities. The automaticities quite incidentally fold up when the thetan starts to reacquire the powers and abilities contained in an automaticity. But the end goal of this should be better understood by Scientologists. We do not take over automaticities to destroy automaticities. Do you understand? We take over automaticities only to rehabilitate the ability of a thetan. That's something a few people have missed along the line. I'll say it again: we just take them over because they, in many instances, are robbing a thetan of his ability to perform.

Now, these "hold on to it" automaticities can utterly destroy a thetan as far as his willingness to go on and do and be. Any accident he has, he presses it close to his bosom thereafter. Any time he gets into trouble, he presses it close to his bosom. Any time any man in a crowd came along and gave him a shove in the chest, he pressed that in from there on to his bosom. In other words, the inflow principle of the universe is being used to hold on to things rather than a thetan's ability to hold on to them.

Now, power is contained in the ability to maintain a position in space. You know the base of the motor that I used to talk about that's still talked about in 8-80? If you can't main-

tain a position in space, you'll never have any power. Well, if everything is holding things in to you, they will eventually start moving you around. And the second this happens, you no further have power. That's all there is to that. I mean, you start moving around.

Now, the psychiatric principle which I just mentioned – you just thought I was just lying about psychiatry, didn't you? Fooled you. Because I'm not – it's "move him around," is what they operated on, on the whole track. They knew that was a total loss. If they could just get somebody to move himself, and lay no further claim to being able to move things, they knew he would become a thing in his own eyes. And the second that this happened, then he could be controlled utterly. One had a slave then. Got that? All right.

If we understand this, we will see why it is necessary to rehabilitate the ability of a thetan to hold something else than himself. In other words, his ability to withhold, his ability to hold, his ability to keep something from going away is part and parcel of his ability to maintain his own position, situation or location.

Now, I'll give you an example of this, shall I? Now, take this front wall and without your moving at all, pull the front wall to you. Did you get any feeling of weakness? Hm? Hm? You get any sensation at all?

Audience: Mm-hm.

What kind of a sensation was it?

Audience: Felt like the wall started moving. Shaky.

Well now, do you realize that it's your ability to hold your position which would make you capable of pulling the front wall over? Do you see there's a coordination between those two facts? It's a weirdie. Somebody way back when, who invented the lever in order to torture physics students thereafter, said he could move the world if he could get a long enough lever. I think that was very, very cute. Because there was no possible place to rest the lever. One of these wonderful theoretical abstractions with which professors drive students into distractions and a completely silly postulate.

As a matter of fact, the size of the lever and its weight and mass, in order to have any tensile strength, also would have overthrown this. But here we have a situation which is much more demonstrable, and that is to say, it is a thetan's ability to hold his location which delivers to him power. Thus we have confronting. Now, some people start confronting and immediately fly out of their heads and they're last seen going past Arkansas. Eventually they get so that they can sit there and confront and hold their position. Do you see this as a necessary point in confronting? You have to be able to hold a position in the face of something.

Well, all right. Now let's go up a little higher than this – or down lower, since it goes either way – and realize that to keep something from going away is a sort of confrontingness. But keeping things from going away is an ability which gradually cultivates the ability of the thetan to remain where he is. Now, there's a process that goes along with this. You can actually say to somebody: "Get the idea," and I'll say it to you now: Get the idea of moving the front wall to where you are.

Get the idea of moving the ceiling to where you are.

Get the idea of moving the floor to where you are.

Get the idea of moving the back of the room to where you are.

You noticing something as you do that? Hm?

Well now, this keep-it-from-going-awayness is only part of the phenomena involved, but it all by itself will promote the other phenomena. To understand this process is to be able to run it. To be able to run it is to understand it. I wouldn't try to run this process on anybody unless I had some idea of what I was doing.

"Keep it from going away" – by the way, this was evolved empirically. I evolved this empirically at first and it didn't gel – I didn't know why these three things were one, two, three. I had no idea. I merely took all available elements and found out that the three together worked and used it in that fashion and later on came across the explanation. And I don't believe I've ever told anybody the explanation until this minute – it's not been in a PAB or anything else. If you can keep the front wall from going away – just that – the ability to hold still in general is regained. One is then able to confront things, isn't he? And so of course he can recognize solids. He dares recognize a solid is the final step of this. You got that?

First he's got this ability to keep things from going away, which also gives him the ability of, you know – well, that's power. Then he finally discovers that he himself can be stationary or other things could be motionless, and then he finally – that gives him the idea of confronting. And as soon as he's willing to confront, why, then he can make things more solid, and you've got it made. And that's why these three processes, CCH 9, 10 and 11, are where they are and are run in this fashion. The amount of actual thetan power generated by a good flattening of these processes cannot properly be estimated. Because we figured out one time about the only way you could kick the world off its orbit was not with a lever invented by some Greek, but would be by a thetan thinking the smallest thought possible. You'd have to think a small enough thought to throw the world off of its orbit; it'd have to be probably that tiny an impulse to overcome that much mass. This was just theorizing, but there was a high probability that this was the case.

If you could keep the world from going away, you could eventually hold it still. If you could hold it still, then you'd probably be able to confront the idea of that much solid mass having that much gravitic pull and you'd probably be able to confront it all at one fell swoop.

Now, how much of the world are you confronting right this moment? You're not confronting very much of it. You're confronting a little bit of it. See, at the most probably you're confronting a few square blocks. Got that? Just a few square blocks.

Well, the horizon goes out in both directions from those few square blocks and we get to considering the mass of it and normally, unless we really tackle this problem head-on and get it flat and change our ideas concerning it, it's rather overpowering. The idea of that much space and that much mass and that much weight as composed in a small, rather insignificant sphere only eight thousand miles in diameter, but it's apparently to us quite a lot of mass. Well, it ceases to be so doggone much mass the moment that we can get the idea of keeping it from going away.

But what's keeping it from going away for us? We're being kept from going away by it. You talk about an automaticity, that's a royal one. Not only are we not keeping Earth from going away, but Earth is keeping us from going away. Now, that's what I mean by an inversion of a royal order. That's quite an inversion, you think it over. The only person that could keep you on Earth, in the final analysis, would be you. But what concatenation of thought have you think that finally got it down to a point of where you've got a total inversion? That's pretty wild, isn't it? Total inversion. And that total inversion of "keep it from going away" is gravity. Gravity is not mass V squared by the pi root of yak.

Now, the solids that you're willing to confront and the solidity which you're willing to confront has an awful lot to do with your ability to hold still or hold things still. And your ability to hold things still or hold still has an awful lot to do with your ability to keep things from going away. And we have the entering wedge. Without that entering wedge the rest of this would be mere vaporings. There would be no ladder to climb. There would be no bottom rung. We would be rewarded with the beautiful scene of a ladder reaching up to the top of the hanging gardens of Babylon, all first hundred rungs missing.

Well now, the first thing on this rung is a secret. An individual can make and keep a secret, he's really done something. That is an ability. Of course it's an ability, too, to worm secrets out of people. But here is a basic ability: the keeping of a secret. Being able to withhold things from other things selectively, various odds and ends of items, graduates at length up into more solid things like keeping a mock-up from going away. And that goes into more solid things like keeping MEST objects from going away. So we have a whole span here of keeping things from going away, all of which begin simply with a withheld thought, which is what a secret is. And it scales on upstairs to a withheld object. Got it?

Now, if one ran the whole gamut of this from the withheld thought to the object, and won all the way and regained his ability all the way, and was willing to keep certain things – many things from going away, he of course could then start in on the basis of "hold things still." But, he'd never hold himself still for the excellent reason that he isn't there to be held still. A thetan isn't hold-stillable. He is think-hereable. He can suppose he is in a place, and this depends on his ability to hold other things still.

So "hold it still" is the next rung up. But now, "keep it from going away" solves both outflow and inflow. It's quite remarkable. That's the side that solves both outflow and inflow. "Hold still" solves motion and no-motion. Hah! That's quite remarkable, isn't it? We've got both of these things and we solve them there with just one of them. We got motion and no-motion. So you really don't solve motion with motion, you solve motion with hold-stillness. And the ability to confront and confound solids solves, alike, something and nothing. To be able to confront a solid then makes a person capable of confronting nothing. So we've got nothing and something contained in solids.

Now, here we have six items and they're a gradient scale, and the first of these items are a pair called "reach and withdraw" or "throw away and hold to you." Got that? That's two. And that bracket is solved by running only "keep it from going away." And the next one up is "motion and no-motion, action and stillness," that pair. And those are solved by running "stillness."

You'll just get everywhere you want to go if you just have a person (a thetan, I was going to say) going around – I'm going to teach you to audit thetans probably next year, but not now – you just have him go around and hold tables still and that sort of thing. Now, it's quite remarkable as a case cracker. Don't think that you have to run always only a gradient scale.

We've asked – a psycho who was spinning like one of these white mice that's been around a psychology department – and we've asked him to just look around the room and find something that was still. And all of a sudden he's found something finally that he considered still and he himself stopped spinning.

He says, "Uh-huh-uh-huh-ahhhhh."

You say, "What's the matter?"

"Oh, it's just been going on for years."

"What's been going on for years?"

"All this sea of motion." He's liable to tell you all sorts of weird things.

We audited somebody one time over in the London clinic. For twenty-five hours nothing much had been happening and the last two hours to go (this "hold it still" was in a very experimental stage, this was a couple of years ago) and the auditor came out and said, "What do I do now?" And I said, "I don't know. Why don't you have him find something in the room that is still." (Been working on this.) She went back in and he found four or five things that were still, with great relief, and said, "Do you know, the drop of blood that was taken at the national medical center that they have under the lamp so they can see what I'm doing and saying doesn't bother me now; I'm not there."

Well, that's the way cases go. Anyway, they actually had taken a blood specimen and told him something like this. We checked up on it. It sounded too mad for us, but it sounded like it might be reasonable. And we found out it was reasonable. Now, there's that one taken all about.

The preclear is troubled by obsessive motion: the environment seems to be in motion, in motion, in motion. Now, you have a choice: you have motion, you can run motion or no-motion. Now, it's a fact that you actually can get someplace by running the motion, which is quite interesting. You can actually get somewhere running the motion. But the fastest way to get someplace and the most stable someplace to get is to run the "still." He says, "Oh, the room is just going round and round and round and round." You could say, "Well, make it go round and round and round. Make it go round a little faster." You'd get someplace with this, you understand. But you'll get some-place faster by saying, "Find one point in the room that is not going around and around." And it might take him a half an hour to do it, but all of a sudden he'd say, "Uh-ha-ha. Oh, that cup – that cup is right in the middle of the maelstrom; it isn't moving at all; it's dead still." You could say, "That's good. That's fine. Now find something else." And he would gradually have the whole room settle down. You run the still side of it, see – that's the smart auditing.

All right. And we get up to this last bracket and we have somebody who is terribly fascinated with vaporous nothingnesses. He has been studying in the field of oh, economics or

some other nothingness, and he's been studying around in, oh, something. He's been reading books on electronics. You know? How the little particles wiggle-waggle as they go through the wuggles. Or he's been down panting over hot brains in the AEC, trying to find out all about why he shouldn't stop exploding atomic bombs or something. And when we've gotten to this level, we no longer have a choice. To solve nothingnesses, we run solids. He'll graduate rather rapidly up to being able to confront nothing if we run solids. But we don't run nothings, any more than we can get a definition on it by agreement.

So we've got the first four of these pairs, "throw it away" or "hold it to your chest," "reach" or "withdraw." We can run either side of those, but had better run "hold it to your chest." You know, it's – we're in favor of that one: the case runs faster and better. And a case can actually deteriorate by running the other side, but can never deteriorate by holding things to his chest, which is probably why he does it obsessively.

And the next pair of "motion and no-motion," we can run "motion" and get away with it. You understand we can run "throw it away" much more easily and with less consequence than we can run "motion." See, the other side of the pair is deteriorating here. We can still run "motion" or "no-motion," but we'd better run – and here the majority is well up – "still," see, the no-motion.

And there on this next pair you haven't got any choice. There's no choice left. To run nothing or something, you run solids. The most solid something that you can run and that will get him up to a state where he can look at nothings. Got it? Actually what you do is pick him out of those places where he's totally convinced of solids and you walk him back to the world of thought on the little gradient scale I was talking to you about before that goes from nothing, through emotions, through effort, through facsimiles, into solids. And you get him back up to where he can handle it on the effort – up above the effort band, up above into thought. Now do you understand that little setup? It's very, very cute. And you audit on that side of the picture and you won't miss very badly. You'll win.

Now, there aren't cases that violate these conditions. I can assure you of that. But there are cases which appear to. There are cases on which "only motion could be run because they have no concept of stillness." Aaaah! You mean you're going to run motion from a motion point, the thetan? The thetan is so much in motion he can only confront motion, and he is motion, so you're going to run more motion. Oh, no you're not! You're going to find something that's still if it takes you all day. And if in one whole day's auditing you just found one item that he could hold still, that puts him on the cause end of it – much lower down, "was still" – you'd have won more than motion run on him all day long. Got it?

Now, when we get down to the bottom of the thing, we don't ask him what he could communicate, we could ask him what he could withhold. But we still could ask him what he could communicate and get someplace. Do you understand? We could still run "dispense with" on the Trio side and get some-place, if he could run it. See, you got a little more latitude there, but it is much more favorable – the auguries and auspices are – if you run "withhold." "Clutch it to your bosom."

I actually have run tests on objects in the room of the idea of getting rid of it. "Get the idea of pushing on it." See? And the idea of holding it in. And have found that it's tremen-

dously more effective for the person to hold it in. This actual test could be made by you at any time.

Now, you could go around all around the room and have him do nothing, no matter what he wanted to do with the object, but hold it to him. "Keep it from going away" is the phrase. And he would wind up in very good shape. But you still could have him get the idea of throwing it away.

Now, do you understand CCH 9, CCH 10, CCH 11 a little better?

Audience: Yeah.

One final remark. These things can be run by Formal Auditing and are not necessarily Tone 40. If you've got a very figure-figure case and he wants to discuss a lot of things about it and the ARC would break down rather easily with it, but he still can – you can control his thoughts to the degree of running this because it's a thinkingness process, you understand, why, you better run it Formal. It'll run more easily Formal.

Now, these are bearcats. That particular three are bearcats. And you could jump from the first four CCH processes to this group of three, directly, and win like mad. That's a terrific battery. It could also be done subjectively, but it's much more effective objectively. Got it?

Audience: Yeah.

Okay. You're welcome.

Thank you.

CCH

A lecture given on 7 August 1957

Thank you, thank you. How are you this evening?

Audience: Fine.

Well, this evening we have come along here to the eighteenth lecture, and there are only a few of you now who aren't getting it from time to time, accidentally. And I want the rest of you to get up to a point of where you can do it accidentally now and then, because the truth of the matter is it comes in handy occasionally. In an auditing session it's handy, you know, to occasion-ally in an offhanded sort of way, just as though you intended it, to throw an intention out, something like that, I mean. It does work a little bit better; you don't need many of them, you know. And every once in a while sit up briskly, you know, and put your feet on the floor, your hands in your laps and look squarely at the preclear; it wakes him up when you do this. And when he makes an origin, why, scratch your head; at least that shows some sympathy for the situation. And when you get – when you get to the end of the session, why, if you happen to think of it, tell him so. That's really about all you need to know about auditing, you know.

When you compare 1950 auditing with the auditing that we are doing today, it is not even in the same universe.

Male voice: But it worked.

That's what's amazing about it, it worked. I suppose many of you really don't know – I've just insulted all of you and invalidated you. Excuse me. Apologies and so forth. I understand that I have insulted you. Thank you!

Female voice: Whoo-hoo! We didn't feel invalidated. We thought we'd been acknowledged.

Oh, dear. I wonder if you realize entirely how various mechanisms of auditing today are themselves therapeutic. That is to say, they get things on the road and do things with a case.

A duplicative question all by itself will get the case progressed. Acknowledgments all by themselves will progress a case. And we take these other things and detract – delete, rather, from the session the element of surprise. You know, starting him into session, comm bridging him from process to process and taking him out of session smoothly and so on. The discovery that they can sit there that long without being amazed, surprised or upset by a sudden boo-boo by the auditor is in itself very, very therapeutic.

Furthermore your altitude actually depends on the excellence with which you can do what you are doing. You want to know what altitude is, you ought to see some of the awe that I get every now and then. Somebody said they saw a professional auditor working on somebody. And they write in and say, "Ahh," you know, "gee-whiz, I didn't know that anybody could do anything like that," you know? And it was amazing at the congress when professional auditors got up on the stage, well trained, you know, and went through this. We're very used to this and we didn't get, really, any audience reaction unless we looked for it. But the audience sat there and went – they didn't know what to make of this at all, this was above any imagined perfection that they had entertained at all.

Well, if you don't think this sort of thing registers on a preclear – it registers tremendously that somebody can sit there and turn out a good job of auditing on them and so on. And that all by itself says, "Well, there's somebody in the world that can help me and knows what he's doing." All a preclear needs to find that out – somebody is willing to help him, and he does much better by it.

Well now, this evening we have arrived at the 18th lecture of the 18th ACC, August 7, 19-5-7. And the title of tonight's lecture is CCH. (It's a good title for any lecture.)

Once upon a time we had something called ARC: affinity, reality and communication. ARC is with us today and we have the understood level of it: control, communication, havingness or control, havingness and communication, if you want to get the comparable parts. Affinity – control; he just steered me down the street; he must like me. Havingness – reality; solids. Ability to own or possess solids. It's reality on its lower levels. And then we have, of course, communication is communication, and it is nothing but communication. But communication is a very precise thing.

Now, the aspect of communication alone is the one thing which has remained unchanged here for seven years. Communication in Dianetics 1955! was better delineated. And we understood a lot more about it and we began to use it as itself and understood its great importance.

Now we have come up against another great importance and that is reality. And first we had – that was very good on reality – was this thing called havingness. And at that time we thought havingness was one thing and reality was something else. But the truth of the matter is they were the same item. The ability to have a reality is merely the ability to possess, in most cases. Now, what is the ability to possess – and you'll laugh when you look this over because it's entirely too simple – and that is simply the ability to withhold. And that's what havingness is. It's the ability to withhold. Of course you run it with only that in mind and all of your other considerations on havingness will have a tendency to stick.

You shouldn't explain this to a preclear. He will stumble into it sooner or later. He said, "Well now, let's see, I can have that." At first he says, "I can have that only if I could withhold it from everything under the sun, keep it close to my chest, pull it in to me and never let it go forth from now till the end of the universe. That would be a proper havingness. That's good reality; that's a good reality, that's right, it'll never disappear – good reality. Always mine, no other thetan could touch it, no other person could ever have anything to do with it, nobody could look at it, and I've – we've got it made, see, and that's why we could – it's real."

What's real then? Well, we look at a person and we start to run Having-ness on him and he will find first only those things very close to him and very intimate are possessible by him. He'll just say – he says, "It's – if it's within a quarter of an inch of me I could have it." What does he mean? He means, "If I could have it within a quarter of an inch of me and keep it there forever, then it would be real." It is not real unless it has this much persistence.

Now, persistence is the one thing that is comparable to a thetan who can do nothing but survive. It is a quality that enduring objects hold in common with thetans. Now, when thetans wish to associate bodies very, very closely with themselves then they make bodies endure. Havingness shouldn't have to endure at all, to be. An object, a solid object could be conceived to exist for an hour, for a day, and it would still be a solid object, but a thetan doesn't feel this is the case. He doesn't feel that he would have any communication, duplication ability on a solid object unless he at least had endurance in it. Got that?

So we want suits that will last, watches that will run forever. The only violation of this is the American automobile industry. American automobile industry violates this and they do not know to what degree actually they damage themselves with this. We see new cars all over the place all the time with new styles and new improvements, but the funny part of it is, they are understood to be, each time a model comes out, a more enduring car than the last models. And the truth of the matter is they are becoming much less enduring.

Somebody was talking to me the other day about this convertible I drive around and casting snide remarks on the subject. I ought to get rid of the thing, you know, it's really de-classe.

And I did a comm lag on it myself. It took me a couple of days to think up the answer and I just happened to think of it this afternoon. The answer was, I'll get rid of that convertible when I find new cars out-dragging it. When we start up from stoplights and I no longer am passing this year's Oldsmobile, this year's Cadillac, this year's thisa – and we won't even call it Fords and Chevrolets. And when I cease to out-drag those things rather easily, I'll turn it in.

Well now, there isn't any real consideration of endurance, it's a consideration of changing styles. And people go on the bent of changing styles all the time and that changing style is in itself supposed to be an improvement.

General Electric has some lightning that they group together into the symbols "GE" on the television screen and say, "Our most important product is progress." I'm glad of that, I'm very glad of that. That's all they've got to sell, they say. Well that's fine, but there's undoubtedly a great deal that could come out of the scientific world to the possible benefit of man. But I want to show you just exactly where it goes.

They used to say, "Well, peacetimes are made so much better, you know, because of the war developments. You say that wars are all for nothing. Well, as a matter of fact, look at all the scientific encouragement which took place during the war. Look at these tremendous developments which are now of use in peacetime." As a matter of fact I can't find anything that was ever invented in a war, in complete reversal to this. War, however, would use and develop some of these ideas on some sort of a necessity level, about which we are going to speak in about two seconds max. Most misunderstood thing in the whole of this science is necessity level.

But here we have – here we have this consideration that progress has led to what? Let me point out to you that progress is always slanted at a higher endurance. Eat more Wheaties, run more blocks. You get the idea? "We're progressing toward an electric light bulb" they would have you understand, "which will burn longer, for less." Of course the modern electric light bulb, you screw it in, you take it out and throw it in the wastepaper basket, you get another one, you screw it in, you take it out and you can – they last three or four pages before they go. But that's an exaggeration; I had one last six pages.

But there's no tungsten in them because this is all being taken up for critical war material, I understand, or something like that. Their war has now not only given us the total progress that we have, but now it's taking away from us all the progress that we have and it's going to go on this cycle very easily and smoothly up to the point of boom! And that of course is the progress that GE is aiming its lightning bolts at, I suppose. They're busy building atomic thisas and atomic thatas and they're having a great time with it.

But this thing called progress understands that we're going to get a greater endurance. Now, you as a preclear also have a little bit of an understood thing here. You understand that if you get enough processing your body will go on longer. Well, that is to say you probably understood it once. Just having taken a glance at your minds I find you don't understand this. Now, some of you say, "Well, if I get enough processing I won't have one at all, and I will be able to endure without one." Now, that's all very well, but the point is that havingness is cut down to the degree that one has to insist upon this Q-and-A with his own survival, with every havingness, see?

We've got a piece of MEST that lasts forever. Piece of MEST that lasts forever – therefore this has some comparable duplicative value for a thetan. He said, "Look, I have something in common with that piece of MEST – it lasts forever." The Egyptian making a mummy tried to make the mummy last forever. Some-body said in a story one time, I think The Mummy's Hand, the name of the story is, or The Mummy's Foot, said the dream of Egypt was eternity. Well that's for sure, they tried to make everything last forever. And there's ... But these masses which they erected, on a forever basis, aren't doing very many of those Egyptians any good. They're off someplace else, probably, long since.

Now, let's take a look at this duplicative factor in communication. An individual finds something in common, in other words, an agreement, which brings us back to reality. He finds something in common with the things he can communicate with. He conceives that there must be something in common between the two points of a communication line and this isn't true at all and isn't a necessary adjunct. When you start running duplication at a thetan, ask yourself, "Why does he improve?" You're running out duplication. You're showing him he doesn't have to avoid it, that he can tolerate it, and as soon as toleration of duplication becomes possible, then he loses the idea that both ends of the communication line, of which he is one, must have an agreement. Then you can get something in the order of postulate communication, which you're doing with Tone 40 on an Object. Postulate communication.

But the greater agreement a thetan believes necessary between the two ends of the communication line, the lower down the scale he goes until he even gets down to – well, I don't know – AEC engineer. Yeah, I imagine these AEC engineers go home and explode. I

imagine they get their thoughts on a sort of a radioactive scale and do their mathematics and so on at the rate of consumption of so many millicuries. Get the idea, they're communicating on some sort of a communication line and they think to stay on the line that they have to duplicate something that is on the other end of the line for a communication to take place. Do you understand this?

And you get the idea that the way to talk to a woman (and this is true) is to – and we had this for years, we knew all about this – we would have to talk to her about womanly things. In other words, we'd have to put some womanishness into the communication in order to talk to a woman. Or to talk to a man you'd have to put some mannishness into the communication line to talk to the man. You get the idea? Well, that's just Q&Aing with the universe. No wonder you get stuck in it. It isn't true at all that a woman has to talk to a man mannishly. There's many a girl has failed to get her man – the Northwest Mounted Police and women have the same motto. And that's very true – they've gone completely on the rocks because they insisted on talking to the fellow about guns and camping and duck shooting and pipe smoking and that sort of thing. As a matter of fact, she didn't know enough about the subject to talk about it and he kind of thought she was silly. And he went off and married some girl that was always talking about the delicious cream pies that she could get down at the – down at the local restaurant. That's about all she ever talked about – and it just misfired. And the number of girlish men who marry women are very few. Now you know, that's for true. Women are always marrying somebody with hair all over his chest.

It's the workability of the situation – the work – general workability of the situation as far as a thetan is concerned is overstressed. You get the idea? Well, they start going downhill on this and they think, "Well, let's see. That wall, for me to look at that wall, the wall would at least have to have some expectancy of endurance in order to match my potential of survival." You get the idea? And then they find out the wall doesn't endure so they feel they must be wrong about their survival and they themselves invent death for themselves. Get this?

In other words, they set up an agreement line. They agree with this thing over here to get a duplication so we get a proper communication with it and then they find out that their original postulate on the thing was for the birds – it's denied, the thought on the agreement snaps back on them and they have to perish. You see that? And there's where perishing comes from. It comes from tearing down things which were to endure forever.

You could probably cause a great many deaths in a city, just to take one of its principal landmarks and one day in a sort of a careless frame of mind go down and take some bulldozers and knock the thing flat. Lot of people measured the fact of their communication, their own endurance and so forth by it. They've already done a flop on it see? A flip-flop on the line. Somebody knocks the monument down, they kick the bucket. Get the idea?

In other words, they originally went into agreement, by choice, with that and assigned survival to that wall so they could communicate with it easily. Well, that's fine, they assigned survival to it and then one day somebody knocked down the wall and this was the first death the thetan suffered. Only he didn't die at all, but to make a liar out of himself he turns on a forgetter mechanism so that he won't remember. Well, that's as good as death as far as he's concerned.

Now, it isn't necessary actually to duplicate anything on a communication line, or have any agreement at all on the line. There's no necessity of doing this. No need for it at all. Communication can occur, and there's where Tone 40 Auditing comes in. You assume no duplication on the line. You assume that this – you don't have to be crazy to process the lunatic. You got the idea?

You don't assume any necessity for a duplication and yet you can communicate, can't you? Well, I'm just showing you that other considerations about communication are possible than the ones Homo sapiens had. Communication is essentially the act of transmitting an idea, or withholding one. Receiving one, or refusing to. And you have your interchanges, all interchanges possible. Got that? I mean, it's just as simple as that.

All right now, if we lard this thing up with a tremendous number of extra evaluations, lots of conditions: "I can't talk to you when you look at me like that, George." I don't know why, he – see? That's just an oddity. "I can't read a book when the temperature is over 95 degrees." Here's the – here's just an oddity. What does that have to do with reading a book? You say, "Well, I can't talk to that man until he has given his consent." I don't know why not. You see? You say, "Well, you'd violate attention." Yes, Homo sapiens has these considerations. Why abide by them? There's no reason to abide by them at all. You're lying within too many restrictive barriers for communication to take place.

So when we look at havingness, we are looking at the bottom rung of a series of considerations concerning communication. And we get to the bottom of CCH, we find that control is anytime I touch it, it touches me. Anytime I start it, it starts me. Anytime I stop it, it stops me. Anytime I change it, it changes me. Instantaneous reaction. And that is reactivity. That's the basis of the reactive mind. Reaction. Total reaction. In other words, we try to control it, it controls me. We have a society of mutual instantaneous control every time a control is effected. Every time it seeks to control me I seek to control it. Now, on the communication line, with which and what do we control it? Exactly what it is controls it. Well, with what and which does it control us? Exactly what we are controls us. You get the idea?

So we get a communication, an agreement, you might say, without space. We get reactivity. We start to process preclear, we're in the valence of the preclear at once. We change the preclear's mind about cats, we change our own mind about cats. We don't change his mind about cats, afterwards we can't change our minds about cats. See how silly this thing is? There isn't any rational inspection, no choice involved with it and so forth. It is anything that happens, why, that is what happens to me. You see? Or that is what happens to it. Reaction. You put up a red flag in the bank and somebody else puts up a red flag in the bank. This is a stupid sort of reactivity.

Now, you don't even have association there. You have two conditions, one where you get rather good equality. That is to say, you put up a red flag, you only get a red flag. And then you get an identification beyond that point which is when you put up a blue flag, that is as good as a red flag which is as good as a green flag which is as good as flagpoles and which are of course all the same as blondes. Now, when it skips over to blondes and it's "all the same as," then we say the fellow is disassociating. No, he's totally identifying. All right, we get reactivity, then, at this bottom rung of CCH.

Now, the road out of this circumstance where every – one has to agree with everything which he faces, in everything it is, on every agreement it has – we get into an interesting condition then, where reality is a total, total, total, total solid which endures forever and will never disperse or disappear. And control which is counter-control as fast as it is control. We control it, it controls us. It controls us, we control it. It's sort of dancing together in a very tight schottische.

These three factors merge together and give us thinkingness as she ain't done. Or as she is done automatically. It's automatic thinking. What's the best thing to do in the situation? Well, the answers to all problems are the problems themselves. When you think that a solution is the answer to a problem you have already started on the road downward. You keep kicking in cures then. Therefore nothing is ever as-is-ed and we get this agreement across the line interrupted, changed, altered and we get alter-iveness occurring on either end of a comm line. How do we do that? Something presents itself bright blue. We say, "Ah-ha! It should not be bright blue, it should be purple."

And we get something or other and shoot it along the line which makes the thing purple. Then we're very surprised when somebody runs us on the back-track and we find a blue object sitting there. Why'd we find a blue object sitting there? Well, the only way the blue object would disappear at all was to notice that there was a blue object there. So a nonrecognition is an unfinished communication cycle.

So the whole of the dwindling spiral depends upon unfinished comm cycles. You follow this? But to get a comm cycle that won't finish it is necessary to mock up this idea that we have to duplicate everything across a line, see? We're on this terminal and we have to duplicate things on that terminal. In other words, we have a concern then with every terminal we confront in any way. And in that way an unfinished cycle of communication does occur. And I don't know how many people are in this universe and in the state they are in simply because nothing was said yes to on the early part of this line. But look, the consideration of duplication must occur. Now, if one makes the consideration of duplication and then says he cannot duplicate, he sticks the consideration of duplication, doesn't he? So all he has to find out how to do is knowingly duplicate and these cycles start to run out like mad. And a duplicative auditing question – making an individual confront a duplicative auditing question all by itself starts to strip apart this mechanism. And he'll finish tremendous numbers of cycles of action that the auditor never inspects.

His acknowledgment, furthermore, sweeps – the acknowledgment on the line sweeps away and finishes a tremendous number of suspended and incomplete communications. And you're doing something with auditing without inspection. Why? Why can you do this without inspection? Simply because you're taking the elements of how one got into the trap and undoing those elements. Those elements have to do with obsessive agreement on either end of the line, which we call duplication; with finishing off communication cycles which were never before finished and with not solving problems, but by just recognizing the existence of problems. And you just do these things in auditing and you could practically wind up a case with just those things. Do you understand?

So that auditing tools today aren't just a method of addressing a preclear so that he will think we're experts. It's actually – starts to rub the case out the moment that the auditor starts to handle it. He uses a duplicative question. Well, the preclear starts to go nuts on this question after a little while. I don't know if you've watched somebody when you just sit down there and you calmly say, "Notice that wall. Thank you. Notice that wall. Thank you. Notice that wall. Thank you. Notice that wall. Thank you." And he'd say, "Batter bap brp." Well, the reason you don't get straight protests on it is it is beneath his recognition. He does not recognize a duplicative question until a lot of time passes in auditing, and by that time he's in good enough shape to tolerate it.

But you're actually cutting his bank to pieces just by saying, "Do fishes swim?" or "Notice that wall." And every time you make a boo-boo on an auditing command and don't duplicate, you actually hang up that cycle of communication. Every time an acknowledgment does not go through, you have left one more thing that has not been finished.

So it is tremendously amusing to watch somebody learning to be an auditor go right down the groove on the right question, without recognizing that the right handling of the question is more important than the question. You should follow that. I mean, just good auditing procedure, the early TRs strung together, are themselves the session.

All right now, you come along and you put some significance into it, you know, you make it interesting one way or the other and you say, "Well now, get the idea that all the lamps in the room are at the other end of the room. Fine. Now get the idea that all the lamps in the room are at the other end of the room. Fine. Now get the idea that all the lamps in the room are at the other end of the room. Fine." And you say, "Boy, I've really got a button here, this preclear's unwinding." I don't care whether you got a button or not, doesn't make any difference whether you got a button. You're just willing to sit there and audit him. Why, I don't care what question you ask, or what command you give, if you're handling these elements properly, this case is starting to come apart.

Now, it's true that there must be some recognition of the elements, that they are occurring. And sometimes a preclear is so armor-plated that he doesn't notice any part of it, including the auditor. Well, so it's kind of necessary then to get through to him rather positively, definitely and succinctly. It's all over his head, 't isn't real, there's nothing there and so on. All right, you tie in with something like the Reality Scale and you give him a reality on a comm line, you give him a reality then on terminals at the other end of the comm line and he finds the auditor. Then he gets up to a point where agreement will take place and he starts to get out of the woods.

Now, this has to do with how close together and how positive must the manipulation of the preclear be and so we get into manual auditing. We get in right close, vis-a-vis. Now you start saying, "Give me your hand," making somebody sit that close to you and repeat the action over and over, is – also makes him confront, doesn't it, rather positively; and wild things may happen just because of this. Doesn't matter much what you were doing, you would still get results if you'd pat him on the shoulder and put your hand back in your lap and pat him on the shoulder and put your hand back in your lap. You got it?

What I'm trying to show you is that auditing is itself a resolver of cases. Now, the three elements of auditing that auditing must embrace are communication, havingness and control. And because these three things are being used deliberately, they tend to pull out of the unknown band into the known band. In other words, they come to view.

Communication – communication takes place – the Reality Scale gives us the havingness level of the communication, and control gives us the positive-ness of the affinity on the line. We must be fond of the guy – we just knocked his head off.

Now, when you look this over, you will see then that an argument about auditing commands must end with "Is it doable?" Not much, "Is it therapeutic?" but "Can it be executed?" And as we have pushed people up scale with CCH we found rather definitely that there were certain auditing commands that couldn't be executed above a certain case level, which was kind of remarkable.

And we found that old time 8-C becomes utterly silly, after a while, on this basis: We say, "Look at that wall" and then insist the fellow turn his head. What's he doing turning his head? For what? What's the matter, can't this thetan see a wall? And he actually could obey the auditing command and be invalidated by the auditor and thus auditing would start to lose ground.

So the auditing command must agree with the reality of the situation, which is that the preclear (being), is himself without mass and that he is handling mass. And if we indicate that he is to – well, let's get a sample command here. You say, "Now, touch your body on the forehead." Well, you'd say offhand, "Boy, that's an executable command, isn't it? 'Touch your body on the forehead,' that's a very simple command." Yes, it's executable up to the time of near exterior or after exterior, then it's not executable. Why? He may be – have a thousand bodies around, he's got old mocked-up bodies, he's got bodies in the next county, he's got bodies on the brain and you say, "Touch yourself on the forehead" and tzuhhh. "Touch your body." He'd be perfectly licensed to say, "Which body?" or "I haven't got one, thank you." Do you see that? So the command then has a limitation.

Now, you could say, "Touch that body." Now, there might be some limitation on this, but it works. We could say, "Touch that body on that forehead." Now we get this thing about "look at the wall." Now, to be absolutely sure, we'd have to say, "Through that body's eyes" or "Through those eyes" or some such thing, indicating them, "look at that wall."

Now, the second we pronounce a truth of this magnitude, why, we're raising hob with the process as well as the auditing procedure. And a combination of these two become absolutely deadly. The two together are irresistible. He might get away with it, you see, if he just had auditing procedure and nothing else, but now we add in an auditing command and then we direct the command very directly toward a truthful state of affairs. We tell him to do what he is doing! When he looks at that wall, he of course looks at the wall through the body's eyes. But we tell him to look at that wall through the body's eyes and after a while he realizes he's obeying the command. Well boy, is that control. Look at the control factor involved in this thing.

Now, it's quite amusing, the control factors involved with "Sit in that chair." This has a certain level of unworkability, but a thetan can still mock himself up sitting in that chair, you

get the idea. So you don't go out through the roof on it. Now you say, "Touch that chair" and if you expect him to touch it with his hand – he's already sitting in it, isn't he, when you tell him to touch it. Well all right, he doesn't even have to twitch to obey the auditing command. You assume that he's enlivening the body and you assume that through the body he touches the chair, and he's done the command whether he even wiggles. He can't get out from under. Have you got it? He just can't get out from under, that's that. He has to do the command willy-nilly.

And there are several auditing commands of this character. Now, those are very reactive commands. They are directed directly at reactivity. They command the thing which is in existence. Total reactivity, you got the idea? This thetan, dead in his head, is sitting in a chair and we tell him to sit in a chair. Well, he's all mocked up sitting in a chair and then we say thank you as though he has complied – which he hasn't done anything else but – and he can't get outside of the control. You see this? He can't get outside the control.

Now, there are several other commands that work in the same way. These commands are, oddly enough, all recognized by preclears as wins and they work on a baby a few days old. Now, Scientology parents are always trying to lead the kid and make him better and get him up scale and get him squared away, and they neglect the fact that the fellow is operating within the considerations of being a baby or a little boy or something like that. And they never give him a win. And after a while the kid gets absolutely wog, he says, "Why can't I please my parents?" Said, "In the state that I am in I do not please my parents at all."

So I've done this several times now, that I've taken a child, put the child in a chair and said, "Be a little girl. Thank you. Be a little girl. Thank you. Be a little girl. Thank you." After a while, kid says, "Hh-hh, hh-hh, ha, ha, ha, hh, I got it made." Little baby, he's lying in a crib, you say, "Lie in the crib. Thank you. Lie in the crib. Thank you." Well now, that's not a very exact auditing command. Let's explore the command and we find out that it is not a very good command, it simply has a workability. Because in the first place a thetan isn't lying in the crib and a thetan isn't being a little girl.

Now, if you refine one of these commands down – and I'm just giving you the clue on how you do this rather than the whole parade of commands – which exactly fitted the facts, you would then have a total reactivity control command which would be 100 percent win and the preclear would regard it as 100 percent win. Now, if you said to this little girl – these commands get clumsy sometimes, and involved, but you should explore them and look them over for their workabilities. You could say to this little girl, "Now have that body be a little girl. Thank you. Have that body be a little girl. Thank you. Have that body be a little girl." And you'd find out it'd probably work faster. See, that's exactly what's going on, you acknowledge it, you say that's fine, they have the sensation of winning and therefore don't have to hang up for-ever on it.

Got a report the other day, some little kid had been audited and Mother said that before she could study to be an auditor she'd have to grow – up and she promptly grew three inches. That was taking her mother very literally.

But your responses on the part of the preclear at the lower end of the spectrum are reactive responses and it's the reactive responses that have him pinned down; these are un-

known. So you give him wins on the reactive responses and you've got it made. So you give him wins on the level – lowest level. Your fellow is actually sitting there and he's doing something and you told him to do it and then you thanked him for doing it. From just an existing state, hung up, you are now acknowledging the state, you're giving him a win with the state, you are telling him that it's all right for that state to exist, you're putting him into communication because that state is the communication and his considerations on duplication tell him that therefore that is communication. The only communication to that state is a statement of that state. You get the idea? And you have very well a perfect auditing command.

We had a flop on one the other day. I sent to an auditor in a very far place – rather tragic flop because I told the auditor to do – who had never heard of Tone 40 processes or anything like that – I told the auditor to run a command, and which was one of these total reactive commands, you know, just tell the preclear to do what the preclear is doing and thank the preclear. And the auditor wrote me back some gobbledygook of some kind or another, a very involved supersignificance, and had completely misinterpreted the process. Didn't even think the process could possibly be doable because the preclear wasn't doing anything.

Now, get obnosis. Obnosis is that an individual sitting in the chair is doing something. Now, don't get so obsessively on change that you never command existing state. You've got the idea? So you say, "Through the body's eyes, look at that wall." What's he doing? He says yes. All of a sudden he says, "You know, there's something obstructing my vision, you know?" After a while it turns out that they're his eyeballs, something like this.

Now, why would that take place? The individual – now get this – the individual is obeying a series of commands which culminate in this state. And it is a series of commands which wind up with this state. The state he is in is in obedience to the commands. All we have to do is utter the commands and we as-is the original commands. Next thing you know, the fellow doesn't have to look through his eyeballs. Why is he looking through his eyeballs? Well, it's all very well for you to say, "Well, that's just the way people are built." No it's not the way people are built, that's the way thetans are ordered around. Whether circumstances or gods, demons, devils or sergeant majors, somebody has ordered him to look through eyeballs.

Now, let's go back to repetitive – repeater technique, old repeater technique. Are you aware of the fact that the auditor can take a key phrase on the case, the preclear's always saying this word – this series of words like, "Oh well, all women are alike," you know, "Oh well, all women are alike." And you say, "Well now, how are you getting along?"

"Well, I'm getting along all right except for my wife, you know. Well, all women are alike."

He couldn't even really get it in there squarely, you see, but he got it in there anyhow. And you say, "Well, what is your opinion of women?"

"Well, oh well, all women are alike." Well, this can go on forever unless there's some knowing direction at the phrase. So the auditor can sit there and say, "Oh well, all women are alike. Oh well, all women are alike. Oh well, all women are alike." And the engram starts to run. This is pretty wild, isn't it?

Now, you could sit there and repeat the Axioms at a preclear, with an okay and a good acknowledgment at the end of each axiom, (this hasn't been done, by the way, and it should be done experimentally) and practically blow his case to smithereens because he's obeying every one of them. Just old repeater technique, you get the idea.

So you say, "Through that body's eyes look at that wall," the only thing that gets him out of the problem is the problem, and the problem is an obedience to an order, which is "Through that body's eyes, look at that wall. Look at the MEST universe only through that body's eyes. You can only see while looking through eyes." Now, that's the order he is obeying. Now, there's no sense in hanging glasses on his nose, there's no sense to tell him to look some other way, there's no sense inventing a system by which he can look another way. Let's just say, "Through that body's eyes, look at the wall." And he says, "Well, er, oohh."

Once in a while an individual goes completely hectic when you do this sort of thing to him. He's nicely seated in the chair and we say, "Now, have that body sit in the chair. Thank you."

All of a sudden he says, "Errr. Why, I'm doing it!"

And you say, "Good. Fine. Have that body sit in the chair."

"But I'm doing it!"

"Well, have that body sit in the chair. Thank you."

What's this franticness? What's this franticness? All that's running off is the duress which makes him obey the command. Other considerations add up to duress and when that duress starts to come about we get the situation known as a blow. Now, he'll blow through. Now, we – somebody has told him in some complicated fashion that unless he does so-and-so, and so-and-so – methods, magic, mysticism, punishment, consequences, if he does not look through a body's eyes he will not see any universe. Now he becomes very anxious to obey this command, "Look through a body's eyes." And for a while, because he's off on the subject of duplication – he's learned that duplication is dangerous and he mustn't do that anymore – he's only frantic because he doesn't think maybe he's looking through the body's eyes. There's something wrong with his performance of the order and that's the only reason he's going crazy on it. The other things can fly off, he can handle them fairly well, but he starts to distrust himself. Well, it isn't himself that is there to be distrusted. What's there to be distrusted is the fact that he thought he was obeying the command and here's somebody giving him the command as though he wasn't obeying the command. And he right away tries to insist to you, but he is sitting in the chair.

And you take some swivilian [civilian] Homo sap someplace or another and you say to him – he's sitting down in the restaurant – you can produce some of the more interesting effects, tap him on the shoulder as you go by his table and bend over and say, "Sit there and eat your dinner. Good." Practically blows him out of the water! But if you were to sit down across the table from him and repeat the command several times, his tendency to get up and run, to leave, to stop eating and so forth would all fade away and he would probably laugh about it. The funny part of it is, it wouldn't be a laugh because he found out you were all right, it would be a laugh of relief. He had discovered that he could obey the command.

And you understand that only – the only persistence of commands contain in them "try." So the real original command said, "Obey the command" and then sat on his head so he couldn't. Get the idea? It said, "Now lift your head out of the water. Slam! Good. Lift your head out of the water. Lift your head out of the water." And this guy is floating around with his head in the water.

You come along to him and you say, "Lift your head out of the water." He will – then he'd get frantic. And then he – after a while he would lift his head out of the water. Don't you see? But he knows this is not an obeyable command.

This is the way people get crossed up very, very madly. But what is his condition? His head is in the water and his command to himself finally was, "Well, damn it, I'll keep my head in the water. I will show them." So what you have to do is come along and say, "Keep your head in the water. Thank you. Keep your head in the water. Thank you. Keep your head in the water. Thank you. Keep your head in the water. Thank you."

And all of a sudden he says, "Well, that's what I'm doing! But I'm supposed to be doing something else." Now, the something else he's supposed to be doing can usually be neglected, because that wasn't what loused him up. It was some force, duress, or cross order and if you release either side of any of these things they have a tendency to spring. You got it? He was prevented from doing the command, actually.

Now, an individual who is looking through the body's eyes and can't see well, cannot obey the command and is up against one of these shuttles. Got it? All right, supposing the thing did hang up so that the command to lift his head out of the water while his head was being held underwater, and the command "Hold your head underwater" got so entangled with each other that it was just a total confusion and he went into a total confusion on it. You could probably speed the thing up by giving him both commands. You got that?

You'd push his head under the water and you'd say, "All right, keep your face underwater. Keep your face underwater. Thank you. Keep your face underwater. Thank you. Keep your face underwater." And then you grab him by the hair and you'd pull his head out of the water and you say, "Now, keep your head out of the water. Thank you. Keep your head out of the water. Thank you. Good. Keep your head out of the water. Thank you." And you're just working both sides of the same command – series. You got that?

Then the thing would for sure just brush off and disappear. You got both sides of it. Now, quite often it disappears on one side only.

Now, I'll give you some kind of an idea of this when applied very directly to a straight mechanical principle – it's nothing but a mechanical principle. And that is this, "Don't give me your hand." Or "Don't give me that hand," the more exact command. He isn't giving you his hand and you tell him not to.

Now, you're doing something else here, you're getting much more significant, because you're going into withholdings, which is right on the button of havingness. See, you can sit there and say to a preclear, "Don't give me your hand. Thank you." And expect every now and then that you get an explosion on the part of the preclear, an anxiety that he must throw his

hands upon you. He must reach you. You got it? You'll get an explosion the other way too. You say, "Give me your hand. Thank you." And he's got the idea that he mustn't give you his hand. You've seen that happen. Well, let's look at the reverse and we would see what would happen on the reverse.

Now, somebody has run bad 8-C on him. They have prevented him from giving a hand, or reaching with anything, while they were telling him to reach. Got the idea? They say, "Now Johnny, don't reach for that light cord. Johnny, don't reach for that light cord." Put his hands up on the light cord. Don't you see? Now they say, "Now Johnny, reach for that light cord," and hold his hands in. Now you've got two postulates which are – or two commands which are so intertwined that neither one can be obeyed without countering the other one. If you split up just one side of it you will have done quite a bit. But if you split up both sides of the commands you've wrecked the whole incident.

Now, in view of the fact that we know that "withhold" has greater validity, in terms of havingness, than "reach," we find out that a very workable process rests in this process, "Don't give me your hand. Thank you." It's a withhold process, isn't it? "Don't give me that hand" would be the process, "Thank you." "Don't give me that hand. Thank you. Don't give me that hand. Thank you." You're liable to get it. But don't you take it, because that would be a violation of the auditing command.

Now, you say that's a violation of communication. No it isn't a violation of communication. It isn't a violation of communication for this reason: communication is occurring, isn't it? Well, I can assure you if somebody is obsessed with keeping his hands to himself, on the subject of hands the only command he will obey is "Keep your hands to yourself." Do you see this?

Now, postulates of one kind or another, to the tune of billions and billions and billions and billions of postulates, different kinds, shapes, sizes and descriptions, have been uttered at people and then crossed up. This is the way the physical universe works. They say, "Lift your head out of the water," and push the guy's head in the water. Now they say, "Push your head in the water," and lift his head out of the water. They pick him up and put him in the Sahara Desert and say, "Drink." They throw him in the Atlantic Ocean and say, "Never get wet."

Now, it's got to be crossed up orders or there won't be any confusion. So an individual after a while becomes very allergic to orders of any kind, and any time you issue any kind of an order he's all upset. Now, we take the basic background laws of existence, which got him into this in the first place, and use those for our utterances and of course we're pulling out from under him the rug of all these other confusions. We're saying, "Well now, just try and find a confusion now, son."

Now, we could run communication and break communication at a CCH reactive level. Doesn't run well on upper levels, it doesn't run long or persistently, but it nevertheless runs. Quite remarkable. If you tell somebody to withhold things you'd certainly better build up his havingness. You're going to run out his havingness, his automatic withholdings. You understand that? His automatic havingnesses are going to be shot. You could make him quite ill by overstressing this without running some Havingness. So "Keep that Object from Going

Away" and so forth are definitely necessary at least as Havingness, or Trio or something of the sort. Now, we run two things then, one against the other, and we're all set.

Now, does it apply in other ways? Now, yes there are some other ways here which are quite amusing. One of them is self-determinism and other-determinism. An individual cannot make up his mind really whether he should run totally on self-determinism or other-determinism. After all, privates in armies do fine up to the moment they get killed by running totally on other-determinism. But that's fine, privates in armies only do all right when they quit the army and follow their own instincts. Now, those two things are crossed, aren't they? Is it better to run my own life or have it run for me? Now, this is just one of those unresolved questions.

Here's another one: is it better to have or not have? Of course, if you have something, then you will lose it and that will cause pain. You'll find many preclears telling you something like that. It's better not to own any-thing at all. But he's got to have in order to live but he can't have because he can't live. But the best way to live is not to have anything because then nobody will tackle you and kill you. You see the basic confusions.

Now, let's look for those basic confusions in the three bottom levels at CCH. The basic confusion of control is to be controlled or to control. So if you ran a permissive control like Trio, you would do very well to follow it up with Locational, which is total attention control. See, you've let him be permissive, let him choose. All right, now you start controlling him with his attention and you'll find out that he'll spark up on it; there you've run both sides of control, see?

All right now, is it better to have or throw away? Well, that's the Trio. Is it better to not communicate or communicate, and you could run both sides of that on such a thing as "Give me that hand" and the other one would be "Don't give me that hand" and you'd have run both sides of the communication. Thus you would have unraveled a tremendous number of confusions and it's only these confusions which keep the thetan stuck in any kind of a track. He can think his way through anything as long as it's logical. It becomes logical to us when we know both sides of all the puzzles. And they are contained in CCH.

Thank you.

Thank you.

Confronting

A lecture given on 8 August 1957

Okay. And this is the nineteenth lecture of the 18th ACC, August 8, 19-5-7, and the title of tonight's lecture is "Confronting."

As you could suspect, anything that would trail as far through a training course as confronting (Training 0) would have some consequences in the field of processing. And there are certain processes in that field which are quite fascinating and interesting and which we will take up, unless I forget it. Now, there is a phenomenon in which you might be very interested, having to do with enough and not enough. This adds up to one phenomenon, meaning insatiable. The thetan, you might say, is insatiable, as far as "enough" is concerned.

Just what is enough? Well, that limit has never been agreed upon. For instance, the government has long since exceeded "enough" with Internal Revenue. The fact of the matter is, though, that if you object to taxes, it is probably because there are not enough taxes.

After all, tax collecting in the past in Egypt provided a fascinating game. As a matter of fact, the Egyptians used to fight with the tax collectors, the tax collectors fought with the Egyptians, and they finally expelled them. And they had a Dead Sea guide with them and he knew all the tricks of crossing the Dead Sea, and when the tides came out and the tides came in. And he crossed it just before the tides came in, and the whole Egyptian army got swallowed up in it. And in the Dead Sea wilderness, why, they used to keep their water under rocks. And he'd hit one of these rock piles and by golly, there was water there just like there always was. And there's terrific games evolved out of tax collection.

You can just see now that these things do have no saturation point at all. Game like that goes on and on and on and keeps going for two thousand years, only they don't call it tax collection anymore.

Now, that gives you an example. And I was fascinated to study and did study with some sobriety and with no sneers and no skipping of paragraphs and very scholarly attitude – I got some glasses and punched the lenses out and – so that I'd look scholarly while I was doing the study. And I examined several hundred governments to discover what made a government persevere. What did people consider a good government to be? Fascinating question, isn't it?

I imagine that somebody like Swizenstein or whoever is president at the moment might very well profit from such a study, but it just never occurred to them to study what would be a government. They just take a sort of fait accompli and they say, "Well, we're riding the saddle now, we don't have to do anything about it."

Truth of the matter is, there are certain requisites to a good government. People only seem to buy, by these facts – they only seem to buy governments of tremendous duress. And governments which are very sweet and very polite and very constructive are all lost. But governments which call in the leading citizens, incarcerate them in the donjon and tear off their toe-nails with pincers seem to be very well liked on the track. They persevere, they go on for years and years. Not because the police in those governments do a good job; probably be only because they're interesting.

This is a fascinating look. When you look at the idea of good government, then to study what people have made persevere and have never revolted against and couldn't have been more pleased with, we find it's a government like that con... misconducted by Justinian, whose wife – who used to get four or five shekels an hour. Not really upright work. Forgotten her name – I think it was Theodosius or something like that. It was Theodumpsius or something. This character used to call in the foremost members of government that had happened to make her a little bit in ire and throw them in the nearest dungeon and torture them to death and sell their wives off to the Arabs for slaves and it just was one horrible mess.

The leading general of this particular nut – I mean emperor – actually was one of the great generals of all time, but every time he'd win a great victory, why, the – why, Justinian would issue some kind of a cross-mandate depriving the victory of any significance at all.

The Roman Empire was all knit back together again three, four times, and each time this Justinian would issue another mandate and crumple it all up again. A fascinating fellow – and at the end of this general's career, Belisarius, why, he was rewarded by having his eyes put out. This great emperor – one of the great "Christian" emperors – this great emperor is the one who is responsible for the desolation now present on the south coast of the Mediterranean, which is to say, the north coast of Africa. He is directly responsible for that. And yet we still use his law code.

Now, this doesn't seem very significant to you, but he made an awful splash. He just ruled for years and years and years and he finally – hand fell off or something like that, from signing silly decrees. And people for countries all around, they just subscribed to this a hundred percent.

The more people he'd illegally tax, burn and torture, why, the happier they seemed to be about the whole thing. There was no smell of revolt! But in – the same people, just a few years before Justinian, and just a few years afterwards, took a perfectly good emperor who had equitable laws, equitable taxes, did things the right way, had his courts just, nobody... In Justinian's time if you had a couple of quick bucks, you could do one of two things: you could get a law changed, or... And the emperors just before that and just after that time were fairly good emperors. And they'd last something on the order of ten, twelve months, be the regime, see? Just, boom! Revolts all over the place. Well, what is this? What is this? Well, that's certainly enough government. Get the idea? Enough government!

Well now, when people get habituated to enough government, they think, or almost enough government (it never could be enough government), some-body tries to lighten it up and the populace blows into revolt. Now, what we're looking at here is a close, short-term look. These good governments actually couldn't hedge themselves about with enough protec-

tion at any given time to let the populace blow. And what you had there was a sudden explosion on the part of the populace, and it merely seemed to be against a government running good 8-C. You got that?

Male voice: Yeah.

All right.

Because these good governments were weak in that they did not safeguard adequately against blows, the whole country would go to pieces, so the apparence to the populace was that it required all this duress in order to make a government at all. The populace had an idea of how much government there ought to be, and if you didn't give them that much government, they exploded!

But they would have exploded to a higher level if somebody could have caught them. But nobody ever caught them as they came up on the up-bounce. They'd just get some new tyrant who would push them down harder. You got the idea?

Well, the only reason I'm talking about governments is I just want you to see a pre-clear. If I were talking about John Jones you might not get the picture as clearly.

Here's somebody's wife. And he's been good to her for quite a while and she explodes. Here's somebody's wife. He's mean to her, mean as the devil! And as long as he continues to be mean, she doesn't explode. The one day he decides to be kinder, she explodes.

Here's some husband. This sounds weird, but this is what makes life so incomprehensible. Here's some girl's husband and every time he comes home he hardly gets his foot in the door, she jerks his pay envelope out of his hand, counts it very rapidly, tells him his supper is on the table – cold mutton.

And here we get a – here we get a tremendous amount of duress, duress, duress, duress, duress. And then one day she's feeling poorly and doesn't furnish this much duress and he explodes and there's – he goes haywire and so on.

What's this prove? This obviously proves that unless one applies a tremendous duress and very bad 8-C, people explode. You see this? Unless one applies very bad 8-C and terrific duress all the time, people explode, whether they're governments or individuals. Man's learned this lesson thoroughly. Well, you're looking at his first chance to unlearn it.

A pre-clear explodes under a mediumly mild 8-C which has regularity rather than a tremendous number of surprises and so on, and this fellow blows up. He's never been given orders he could follow before. What's this? And immediately into restimulation goes all of his efforts to be orderly. His efforts to be orderly were manifest at those times when disorder was in his vicinity. You start to handle him well and the disorder, to his view, goes into automatic. And up he blows. This is a blowup, what you look as a blowup on the part of a pre-clear, student and so forth. Individual is getting a proper duress. It's very positive. The stress is considerable, but it still is a proper duress, don't you see?

Now, this restimulates his efforts to keep a chaotic duress, which he first used to – long time ago, lives and lives and lives ago – he used to have an orderly duress against such

chaos. You actually start running out the tremendous duress which he has had to apply to keep chaos from exploding.

When that runs out, you get an explosion of the chaos he's been holding down. Do you see that? Do you see that clearly? You run out, really, by command, the duress which he has applied to chaotic times of his lives. As a consequence, you get an explosion. But what it looks like is that the fellow can't possibly tolerate good order and discipline. It looks like he thrives on nothing but chaos. And that isn't true at all. He doesn't thrive on chaos. He doesn't want it and he doesn't want to have anything to do with it.

But a short period of application of very good 8-C that is very positive and that won't let him get away with a thing because – actually runs out all of these periods when he, in a very orderly fashion and with great strength and force of character, has kept chaos from exploding under him. And the chaos, which he still has pictures of, goes whooom!

Now, whether you do that on a government level – so on. But this individual will apparently sit around in a sort of a mucky apathy and be abused for years without anything happening. Why? The abuse he's getting is sort of running out former chaotic periods in his life. It's in restimulation. It's convincing him he can't handle them. And he actually goes into, "There is nothing you can do about the government. There is nothing you can do about the wife. There is nothing you can do about the husband." You get the idea? He's in a "nothing you can do about it."

Well, are these regimes or individuals and so on productive or successful in any way? No, they're not! They form the garbage pits on the time track of civilization.

An individual who is subjected to a chaotic duress year after year is not getting anyplace, he's not being productive, he isn't getting anything done. But get this! And this seems to be the criteria by which all this is judged: he didn't revolt! He didn't revolt! He didn't kick back! He was quiet! He was very quiet. And we get the same motto the psychiatrist uses on a patient. The only criteria is, "Is he quiet?" Now, you think I'm being sarcastic. That happens to be a technical fact. That's their only goal, is to make the patient quiet.

So individuals who are mishandled very often are successfully quieted down. Nothing is done for them, their life may be a complete ruin, but they aren't protesting. Then you as an auditor come along and you give them positive direction.

The degree and accuracy of the direction you give them establishes the speed and finality of the blow. And if you want a slow blow, you're going to have a long session, a long series of sessions. It's going to take a long time. And you want a fast blow, you're very didactic, very positive and totally not confused. And you get Tone 40 auditing. Nothing confused about the auditor in a Tone 40 session. The preclear pulls out blow after blow, see? He pulls out tricks. First they're just origins of one kind or another. And then they're tricks and then they're somatics and then they're stomachaches, and these things are just floating to the top just one right after the other, bing, bing, bing, bing, bing! None of them interrupt the positive control. Therefore you just continue to run out all the times when he has tried to control things and has had them blow up in his face. After a while he gets the idea he can control things. This is the engramic, you might say, content of a civilization, or otherwise, that it is chaos opposed to good control.

If the chaos can be continued in restimulation by a government or a person, why, the individual – who couldn't handle it anyhow – remains quiet. But the moment you no longer restimulate this chaos, the individual kind of wogs out of it and looks around and he'll say, "Well, it's quiet enough now, maybe I'll start to handle something." And of course he mis-gauges the effort on the line completely and he goes tearing around in circles.

It's very interesting to watch a child move up into his teens. His parents have been giving him the good 8-C, you know, of, "Go to bed." "No, don't go to bed." "Now get up." "No, don't go to bed." "Go to bed." "Now, have something to eat." "Did you wash your face?" "Well, why don't you have a glass of milk?" "No, you – there isn't any milk." You know? He's really getting good 8-C, familial style. And he gets up into the teens and all of a sudden his parents aren't applying very much duress at him and he revolts. Well, what's this revolt? This revolt is really not a feeling, sentient, knowing revolt at all. It is a restimulation of his own efforts to take care of the chaos which happened to him years ago. So actually, bad control breeds periods of chaos which will someday explode. And an auditor can explode these with great rapidity. So much for a basic theory of what goes on in this.

Now, the actual appearances that come out of this are quite fascinating. One of the appearances is that an individual likes lots of drama, or needs lots of drama. One of the things you'd read out of this, you'd say, "Well, if a thetan would stand up to that much chaos, he must like it." That's not true. He doesn't like it, but it is at least something to do. It doesn't play too much part in it. But we get a whole side panel of rationale about which I'm going to talk to you. And that is his misconceptions – I could hardly call them conceptions – of what is worth confronting. His ideas of what should be confronted.

This fellow had a nice art collection, he lived a fairly orderly existence, he was an interesting conversationalist. He lived in this Maryland village and he never had a caller. Nobody ever came to see him. Nobody ever came near him and so on. He lived a life of great idleness. And one day he died. And everybody went to his funeral. Now, what kind of a silly thing is this? Well obviously, a funeral is worth confronting, isn't it? But a live being isn't, is he?

You just add this up to what we used to have to say about acceptance level. Now we get confronting level. Got that? This fellow hardly had anybody ever talk to him in the office. He went along, he did a good job and so forth. Nobody ever talked to him in the office, particularly. One day he got sick. And everybody at the office came to see him clear down at the hospital. Now, if he'd gotten sick from leprosy, they all would have come in the first five minutes. People who think they need a great deal of attention should learn these little rules. Maybe they subconsciously – pardon me, reconsciously practice them.

Now, an individual has a concept of what is worth confronting. And all of the chaos which he has been handled has got him so joggle-pated that he doesn't understand that things don't have to be horrible, terrible, miserable or dramatic in order to be confronted. And he falls straight away from con-fronting the universe around him and he confronts only the horribleness and nastinesses and so on.

Now, for instance, there were many books written about the Civil War. Many books. Matter of fact, it was the only war American authors had to write about from about 1865 clear

on through till 1917. And they wore it to pieces. That Spanish-American War, that didn't seem to bite too much. You found even after the Spanish-American they were still writing about the Civil War. Very interesting war, I am sure. But lately the reviews of books tell us that a book called *Andersonville*, by a McKinley Cantor, is supposed to be and is advertised as the greatest Civil War book ever written. Well, I took a look at it. Sat there with a bottle of milk of magnesia and a couple of packages of Tums and studied what America considers, at this moment, great literature to be. It's on the pocket book stands at this moment. *Andersonville*. It isn't about the Civil War at all – only incidentally. It's about a prison camp erected in Georgia by the Southerners, in which they incarcerated damn Yankees.

And every nasty, foul condition of humanity is delineated, painfully and unartfully, at exceeding length. Man doesn't even know enough to put quotation marks around the statements made by his characters. They're all jumbled up in the book, too. You can't tell whether somebody's talking or McKinley Cantor is talking, or it's just four or five more Union privates dying in their own excretia. This is really – really, the book runs on at that tone level. This is a "great book!" Well, this is fantastic! Obviously, however, readers (particularly literary critics) consider – they're just a level of the less intelligent reader; that's a literary critic – they think this is worth confronting. There's hardly any part of it that isn't below the belt. I'd hate to tell you where you'd exteriorize those fellows from. But a book like this gets circulation, gets popularity and so forth because people consider that it must be worth confronting. Right? Crazy business, but – it's hard to believe that it would happen, but this is what is happening to American literature these days. It's gone off; it's way below 2.0 at this time and it's going south with great rapidity. They're trying for greater and greater effect.

If you've watched TV lately, some of the 1.5ing and – a high-toned TV actor acts at 1.5. That's a high-toned one. Total misemotional production. Hundred percent. Well, that's evidently worth confronting. Do you see what they're trying to do? Now, if you could just figure out what a lot of people considered to be worth confronting and then gave it to them, just total calculation on the thing, I don't know what you would come up with. You'd probably come up with much greater popularity than anything else. That is one of the reasons people look on popularity with some askance. They don't believe in popularity.

Popularity would be merely somebody having met the sum total of what people consider worth confronting. And that consideration, when it can drop as low as this book by Cantor, or when it can go as bad off as some of the TV programs that you see, with all their misemotion and so forth, and when these things really attain a tremendous rating and so on, you'll get an idea after a while that people are getting into a pretty anxious state. They must be in a pretty fantastic state of mind to – this is all they'd look at? This is pretty weird. Pretty wild. Worth confronting.

Now, a circus erred in the opposite direction. At one time circuses had five rings. Not just three rings, they had five rings, with the same performance going on in each ring, with different troupes, and with at the same time two or three shows going on in the tracks. In other words, they would put up this tremendous confusion of things to watch, and they thought that people would consider that worth confronting. The American circus went out and became much less popular solely because people don't consider that worth confronting any-

more. They don't go there and pay their money. See, circuses play short runs and they play real close to the railroad tracks and only in big cities.

Hollywood got the idea and, I imagine, laid a tremendous multibillion-dollar egg with their Vistavision and wide screen and all the rest of this. They were getting actors up there bigger and bigger and bigger on those bigger and bigger screens and so on. You finally sit down and – you began to feel like an ant crawling on one of the actor's knees.

Now, here we have the other side of the manifestation. We have the anxiety to be confronted. See, we get two sides to this. What is worth confronting versus the anxiety to be confronted. We get these two things in conflict with each other, and those two things in their adjustment make the drama of life.

Now, where we find a preclear out of present time, we are prone to think, in our charitable way, that he is stuck on the time track and that some other force greater than his own is sticking him on the time track. But we long since learned that there was something going on here which the preclear apparently liked.

Well, he – where do you find him stuck? You find him stuck in drama. Now, how does he ever get into this drama? Well, he gets the idea that that is something worth confronting – the drama. You know, some Indians had him tied to the stake and they were circling around him one way or the other and they chopped his scalp off and didn't even send it home to mother. This is worth confronting: picture of all of this going on.

Well, he got lured into this on the idea that if he just had more to con-front, he would be more famous, he would be more this, he would be more that. There would be more prizes offered, he could demonstrate his courage and gallantry and that sort of thing, and the glory would be greater and he'd face up into these things. And they go off on a gradient scale to things nobody could possibly confront and which he never did confront. And that is when he goes anaten.

First he starts facing these things which are – he considers worth con-fronting. And if he considers enormous drama to be the only thing that's worth confronting, then he easily slops over into enormous chaos. When he goes over into enormous chaos he gets caught up in the fact that nobody could possibly confront the thing. But he's already stuck on an earlier postulate there was nothing worth confronting. And so he gets no havingness in the physical universe. Now, this is one of the tricks by which people run down other people's havingness. They tell him, "Nothing around here is worth looking at. Nothing around here is worth looking at, at all. Nothing. There isn't anything interesting happens in this town. This town is a dull town." I think America invented the small town just to convince people there was nothing worth confronting.

And these small communities and these small minds would work one way or the other of making nothing out of the things that a kid was willing to confront. And so they bred, as the child grew older, a contempt for any-thing in his vicinity. And the kid started looking around for something worth confronting. Well, nobody tipped him off as to what was worth confronting. See, there was never enough and so forth. And you pick him up one day, no sonic, no visio, mind all caved in. Now, what did he do? He walked up looking for something worth confronting and went over the edge and went into this chaos that I was talking about in

the first part of the lecture. Now, he tried to control it, he tried to keep that from happening. He found that the most positive control that he could render would not fight back the postulate that he had to have something worth confronting. He was trying to fight against his own postulate and he didn't make it.

All right, what do we get, then? We get a chaotic condition where every time we try to make the individual confront something, he merely goes back to something that is considered to be worth confronting. Highly dramatic, chaotic, colorful in some fashion – he just merely slides back that far. That's the all further he goes. Well, if you can get him back there, that's fine, but he doesn't stick there. He goes right on up and he has to have more. The second he wants more he goes back into all of this chaos of ridges and shooting stars and space opera and everything else. You see, that was worth confronting. And he gets mixed up into electronic ridges and implants and stuck in again.

So if you just ran "Confront it" on somebody, you know, "Well, confront your bank. All right, that's fine. Just confront your bank," you might get somewhere. You know, just told him to do that and nothing more, you might get someplace simply by running out the fact that he was confronting the thing. But let's be a little sharper than this and let's look at anatomy – its anatomy very closely and we will discover some horrendous processes.

All right, we've got a process that's a little bit involved, but it runs this way – just a sample process. You say, "Mock up something that isn't worth confronting. Make it a little more solid. Thank you." You know what the guy gets? He gets the streets in his immediate vicinity. He gets all the having-ness of the only things that he could ever get any havingness from. You got it? Here's all these things. Where is he going to get some havingness, walking back and forth and around? Havingness, barriers, so forth? And yet his total idea is that none of this is worth confronting. If none of it's worth confronting, he never sees it.

And you get your standard Homo sapiens vacant eye as he walks down the street. It's quite interesting. It was a very lovely cool day this afternoon. There were some people walking down the street, some people driving, and there was one lady who was – had a little boy in a little cart. And these people were oh, going along totally vacant-eyed, driving vacant-eyed, walking that way, they weren't seeing anything around them.

All of a sudden this woman who had the little boy on the cart, very smartly and properly, with a great feeling for weights and balances, pulled the tongue of the little cart up and catapulted the little boy out on his behind onto the pavement, with a crash. Instantly traffic jammed. The kid wasn't even hurt. He was crying a little bit. He wasn't even hurt. But all the cars that had been in motion stopped. All their passengers were pop-eyed onto this terrifying scene. Everybody who was walking stopped. And where there had been no crowd at all, there was instantly and immediately not only a crowd of people but automobiles too. And that's pretty hard to do.

That was worth confronting. But the streets and trees and the nice cool day was not worth seeing. You got this? The ingredient of blood-curdling drama was added. But when the little boy wasn't hurt and he shut up, looks of disappointment were on all faces, and the crowd dispersed quietly to the vacancy of other blocks.

That's what you get on almost anybody if you run that process. "Mock up something that's not worth confronting. Make it a little more solid. Thank you." Fantastic process.

All right, how about another process on this line? "Mock up something that nobody could confront." And we discover at once one of the more favorite games of psychos. Something nobody could confront. Not a very productive process, oddly enough. But it produces an awful lot of effects. "Something that's not worth confronting" produces ten times the result "something nobody could confront" produces. Isn't that a great oddity? Now, let's get a process that's quite therapeutic that would take in all things. I'm just telling you the odd conditions.

By the way, when you get "something nothing could confront" you get black minds with ridges and shooting stars and bits and pieces of space opera flying through them and so forth that nobody could make head nor tail out of. Labyrinthine circumstances of one kind or another. If you just said, "Invent something to confront. Mock it up and make it a little more solid," you would probably get the best process that can be worked out of this morass.

And the individual would gradually change his mind concerning things there were to be confronted.

Now, we're talking about the woof and the warp, the alpha and omega of confronting when we're talking right there in that process. Worth confronting. Is there such a thing as "can't confront at all"? I'm afraid there isn't. I'm afraid there isn't. I'm afraid there are only things which are difficult to con-front. Now, I'll give you another manifestation here which turns up on another process. And that other process runs like this: "Mock up something you've got to confront." And what do we get? We get the standard, run-of-the-mill, Homo sapiens nonsense. Five-alarm fires, funerals, that sort of thing. But we also get: work. Now, only in a few nations anymore, here on Earth, is work considered to be nonharmful. In the bulk of nations and amongst the bulk of populaces, work is considered to be about the last thing that anybody should ever be expected to confront.

Here's the main thing, then. An individual who has maybe been running this – he's been running a Caterpillar tractor and it's had to confront great banks of dirt; the duress with which he throws himself into that job is a "got to confront." And one day he didn't feel well. He was getting along all right on the job and he didn't feel well and something of the sort, and he still had to confront it. And another day, why, it was bad weather and he certainly didn't want to do that job and he had to confront it. And another day he'd met a good-looking girl the night before and he certainly didn't want to come to work that morning and he had to confront it just the same. So this "Mock up something you've got to confront" returns in mock-up most of the tools of a trade of an individual in this society at this time. That's rather unusual, by the way.

The Anglo-American view is to put a tremendous amount of kick in the pants on this thing called work. The way you work out work as something that is impossible for anybody to confront is this way: every time a child tries to perform any work, you discourage him. See, you say, "Oh, get out of my way. It's too much trouble to show you. You're in my road." And by the time he's six or seven, he's thoroughly educated that he will not be permitted to work, you see?

Then they keep him in that state with a bunch of laws of one kind or another, so that this amount of child labor and so forth won't get in the road of the trade unions and Dave Becks and Hoffas and other people. And they work him on up and by the time they realize – the police have a vested interest in crime, and they have to move him up there to the good, high-quality status, "juvenile delinquent," you see, in his teens. So they get into a lot of trouble and nobody will permit him to work then either. By the way, if any-body is going to work in the US anymore, as a child, he actually has to get permission from his teacher and his grades have to be at a certain level and there's all kinds of complications concerning this thing. That's why you don't get your newspapers on time.

Anyway, all the ways kids had of getting jobs and getting money and getting out from underneath the tremendous dependence of family were all swept away in some super-saccharine idiosity on the subject of "children mustn't work."

All right, now we get this fellow all the way up the line, see? Get him up there at eighteen, nineteen, twenty, something on the order – I don't know when they let him out – if he goes through college, get him when he's forty or fifty or whenever they get out through college. And we insist he get married.

See? And then we show him that he's got to work. Then we have happy factories and happy plants and we never have labor troubles or anything and life goes on, sweetness and light. And we never have economic repercussions.

I'd say it's just around the corner where somebody would have to stand with a bull-whip if they continue these particular tactics on work. To make somebody front up to a lathe or something like that, or a Caterpillar tractor, would just be a bullwhip job. This is how you make a future slavery for a nation. But here you've got one of these superduress "got to confronts," don't you see? So work is a "got to confront" in this country. No wonder people get tired. Because every time you have put them into a "got to confront," then you run them into all the emergencies.

All right, what's an emergency? An emergency is something which requires a necessity level. What is a necessity level? It is a heightened willingness. A sudden, heightened willingness untaps a tremendous ability, of course. House burning down, so the fellow is perfectly able to carry the furniture out in the front yard, don't you see? He's got something to confront there, he's very willing to confront it, his moment has arrived, his willingness goes zoom!

He untaps or uncovers all of this ability (which he covers back up again rapidly at the end of the emergency) and you get these tremendous feats. But look what this does. Look what this does when work becomes a "got to confront." It takes all of these old moments of hyperaction which he can have in terms of pictures still, and it takes all these things and it works them out very nicely and he can go along for quite a while on this supersupply of old facsimiles and things. And then one day he gets to the other end of it.

You never saw anybody more tired than a soldier who has been through twenty-four hours of battle. He might have been right on the ball all the way through the twenty-four hours and never aware of the fact that he was tired, but all during that time he was running way above any ability he had to continue. All of a sudden the battle ends, he goes thud! Thud. That's that. And boy, is he tired.

Now, this cycle of superenergy in application winding up with super-tiredness then gets applied to the workaday world of turning a lathe or driving a truck or keeping a set of books. And the individual – first he's got to get that work done. See, he just goes grrrrr! grrrrr! grrump! That's a day's work, you see? Just pressure, pressure, pressure, pressure, pressure, pres-sure, flop. Finally he goes into a total exhaustion. He has nothing left of all of his former emergencies but the exhaustion end. He works at a total emergency from one end to the other. Why? Because he has no orientation on what's worthwhile confronting, or he never confronts anything unless he has to, because there isn't anything that's worth confronting anyhow. And all of this logic of one kind or another adds up to the fact that the man goes onto an emergency level. And his lifetime is one long activity at an emergency height.

I'm well aware of this, by the way, at congresses. It's quite amazing at congresses what we – here we have a tremendous number of lectures and a tremendous number – a lot of activity. There's a lot of pre-congress planning and so on. And all the people come to the congress and you pour on the coal, you got the idea? Very fine, pour on the coal. Four days go by and all of a sudden there's no more coal needs to be poured on. If I didn't watch myself, I would still keep going at high C.

Day after the congress, my feet are tired, maybe, something like that, but I'm all willing to get in there and pitch and lick the other half of the world and so forth and keep on going. And the day after that, I'm perfectly willing to go on and go out rrrhhh rrrhhh rrrhhh and the next rrrhhh rrrhhh rrrhhh. And I've found out if I don't get by the first three days after a congress taking myself by the scruff of the neck and throwing myself in a bunk, that all of a sudden I come up against a dead end. I get dead tired about a week after a congress. Well, that's a silly thing to have happen.

In other words, I know enough about physical anatomy to know that unless I just slow it down perforce, and then build it back up again at its ordinary peak, that I will be having a "got to confront" go right on going. Because I'm not kidding you. About the third or fourth day of a congress, walking out again in front of the audience is a "got to confront." There's a terrific amount of communication involved in something like this. It knocks havingness to ribbons. There's a bunch of energy thieves always in the crowd. They just take your ridges and just tear them to bits. You look like Swiss cheese.

Now, here is a reaction, emergency level. It tells us a great deal about performance. It tells us where this hectic anxiety to get the work done, to get it done all at once, get it done right now, grrrrr – both where it comes from and where it'll wind up. It'll wind up with flop! Got to do it all at once, got to do it right now, pressure, pressure, pressure, pressure, pressure – collapse. Now, if that's a cycle of action, I don't want one.

Human body has certain limitations – stands up and caves in at certain stress levels, completely independent of a thetan. That's one of the things that you very often overlook, is the fact that a body is built on a number of now-I'm-supposed-to's. And every now and then you think you've got all these now-I'm-supposed-to's erased and you take it out on the middle of the Sahara Desert and a "now I'm supposed to have a drink of water" keys in and you haven't got it licked at all. If you had mocked them up they would be different, that I'm sure, but you probably had nothing to do with it.

Now, here we have confrontingness added into a tremendous auditing practicality. This is very practical stuff I've been talking to you about. Go over this again – just by running a process to predict exactly what will turn on in the preclear is quite interesting, just as a phenomenon. You can run "Mock up something you've got to confront." You'll get the guy's tools of the trade. Run it a little bit further in a man, you'll get women. Run it a little bit further in women, you get a man. It's a "got to confront."

All right. Now we go over this again, "Something not worth confronting," and we'll get the present time environment. Present time isn't worth confronting. By agreement with Father and Mother and so forth, present time is not worth confronting. Obviously at no time that he was in present time did he find anybody confronting present time, so obviously it's not worth confronting. That follows, doesn't it? Racial agreement, and everybody should abide by those (if he wants to go crazy).

Anyway ... Now, you take this "Invent something to confront, mock it up and make it a little more solid," and you have a workable process. And you take "Something that..." – just the third predictable one – "Something that cannot be confronted," or "nobody could confront," and so forth and you normally get the more black messes that some people call minds. But the workable process on the thing is, no more, no less, "Invent something to confront. Mock it up. Make it a little more solid." This is quite, quite reliable. Has the liability of all mock-up processes, of course, in that the mock-ups behave in certain ways and so forth, and you have to pay attention to that.

Also, you have to run, sometimes, before a person can mock things up and make them a little more solid, you have to run keeping them from going away, you have to run holding mock-ups still and then make them a little more solid. It behaves exactly the same subjectively as it does objectively. This we take into consideration that you've done something about. And you solve this confrontingness material in the pc.

Now, you could ask yourself what the solution of confrontingness in the pc would mean in terms of exteriorization. Things that are impossible to confront; things that have to be confronted; things that are not worth confronting – each one of them plays its role in exteriorization. Somebody's dead in his head. Well, he's – he knows nothing else, maybe, but he knows that one cannot possibly confront a skull or a body, but one has got to confront one. See, now there's an odd frame of mind and that's what hangs people up in it.

A lot of cases can run this – pretty low-scale cases can run this sort of thing. But I would say offhand it would take a lot of preparation with the early steps of CCH before one started soaring into those rarefied realms of confrontingness. You're liable to tie into a pre-c, you know, and with great enthusiasm you're auditing and you just know you're going to get him there and so forth, and you – "Mock up something else that you've got to confront." Fine, you know, really getting there, and he – you know, he does and go ahead, and you audit about four or five hours on this and he turns around and he says, "What's 'confrontingness' mean?"

It's happened more than once to me. Terrific process and so on; way over the pc's head. Now, there is one process that is called a training process – or it was and it really shouldn't be – Locational Processing, which works out a tremendous amount of confrontingness and controls attention at the same time. And it gives you – actually, your best con-

frontingness Objective Process is simply old-time Locational. That was the best one up to a certain period. "Notice that wall. Notice the ceiling. Notice the floor. Notice your chair. Notice the table." That sort of thing. No more than that, run with great accuracy and great precision by an auditor, actually at once controlled the attention of the preclear; and the preclear's attention was controlled all the time by fac-similes and odds and ends in the mind and it took over the control of these things and ran them out and let them explode and go to pieces and so forth.

Actually, a steady control like that runs out the preclear's attempts to control, as I told you earlier in this lecture. But we just say, "Notice the wall. Notice the ceiling. Notice the floor," with good acknowledgments and so on, particularly if run at a Tone 40 level with great precision and exactness. Not hem and haw and aw and er and "I don't know what that thing is called, but notice it anyhow I guess. Maybe. Huh?" That sort of thing won't do much. But precision control on Locational Processing gives us a tremendous objective confrontingness process, and Locational is just as good outside as inside.

There are very few of you have ever run Locational outside with malice aforethought. Just said, "Well, we got Locational a little bit flat up close, let's take him outside and just run nothing but Locational outside." We put other significances on top of it. We ran locational type processes with other significances, but not just Locational all by itself.

Now, in view of the fact that Locational Processing, "Notice that wall. Notice that floor. Notice that chair," happens to make the thetan make the body confront the wall, the process in the training drill is not the top Locational Process. You'd have to have some sort of a command qualification that would go somewhat like this: "Through the body's eyes, notice that wall." Now you're asking him to confront on a via, which you are declaring. And you're actually asking a thetan to confront the wall.

Early Locational, by the way, (it might interest you) and early 8-C were both designed as exterior processes, and were not designed for a body at all. Hence this randomness of commands. Never been reinspected from the earliest days.

We expected the thetan to notice the wall, move over to it and touch it. Those commands, the earliest time that they were used, were supposed to be on an exteriorized case. Then they were adapted to get the preclear under the auditor's control and so help me, the commands haven't been refined from that day to this. And so we found some bugs in the commands not very long ago. That's just because we never inspected them on a body basis, although that was the main use they were getting, which is quite amusing.

We could run Locational so that we're asking a thetan to confront the walls while moving a body around, we would have the attention of the thetan himself under control and he himself would not dog off very badly. So this is a tremendously valuable confronting process. And I would say as of this moment that we had two very valuable confronting processes. Locational, which works better and better the higher a case goes. That's quite weird – works better and better. But it has its limitation because if you just say, "Notice that wall," and then you expect him to turn his head over there, it might have nothing to do with his noticing the wall and you yourself have put something else into the command that would limit it. But "Through that body's eyes, notice that wall," we are actually running a process which would

exteriorize somebody after not too much time. And that would be the objective confrontingness process. That's a process, you understand, not a drill.

And the other process, the subjective one, is something on the order of, "Invent something to confront. Mock it up. Make it a little more solid." That's the best all-around subjective confrontingness process. Now, you've been get-ting, as you – speak of confrontingness and I notice people sneezing, that's quite interesting. You've been getting a lot of "you confront it" here in this ACC, haven't you? Confront it!

Well, all right. It was intended, in the main, to desensitize the necessity to confront and I think very few of you now feel frantically on the subject of "You must confront it!" You're not gritting your teeth and spitting out the enamel and holding yourself in there and so on. If you still are, it is still a case of some more "Go ahead and confront it!" see? If you can't stand it, confront it, you know? That sort of thing. Now, that is the – training's answer to getting through confronting because it runs out the necessity to confront and brings a fellow down at last into the cognition that he simply can con-front it. He hasn't got to, he just can. Big difference! And the processing equivalents of confronting, I've given you tonight. And I hope they'll be of some use to you.

Thank you very much.

Instructing A Course

A lecture given on 9 August 1957

How are you doing?

Audience voice: Fine.

Female voice: How are you doing?

Ah, yeah!

Here we are at the last lecture, the twentieth lecture of the 18th ACC, Aug. 9, 19-5-7.

And tonight I have to cover two or three loose-ended points. As you realize, an ACC of this character is organized and run primarily, of course, to raise the training and ability level of the persons in it and secondarily, to learn a lot more about doing it.

Now, one of the reasons we learn a lot more in an ACC is the people on it – in it aren't usually groping for fundamentals and asking foolish questions and so forth and they have some sort of an idea, usually, that a pc's brain is in his head and that's not what we're processing. But we get a tremendous insight into training. And you might say that the training skills of Scientology have advanced entirely through the ACCs where important progress was made, and only occasionally in the Academy. That doesn't mean that Academy training isn't good; it means that Academy training takes off from ACCs. This is usually the case.

Here we have, then, a circumstance of development which is going forward continuously on the subject of training and I was willing to confront the possibility that we would have a tremendous change in training. You see? This was not the case. The training skills which were – and drills which were worked out have held good throughout this ACC. We have seen consistent and marked progress. And it means, then, that the Academy or HCA/HPA organizational training would remain rather constant, as far as its general form is concerned, but considerably improved as to the exact action required of the student.

And I'd like to cover here just a couple of things of considerable importance to us. And one is training. Just some fragments of the things we have learned in this ACC – and then cover PE Courses. I'd like to cover these two things. Now, here we have, in training, a stability. We know where we're going with these processes. We have a set of processes which apply to cases that ordinarily would not comply with auditing commands. In other words, nonverbal processing has been achieved and it was – has been achieved after all these years, actually, by the handling of the body and the attention. Now, you say it's nonverbal in spite of the fact that you are using words. The truth of the matter is, the words don't play nearly as large a part in it as otherwise.

Now, in 1950 if a preclear said, "No, I won't execute the command," we were licked – which limited us only to those people who would execute a spoken auditing command. Wow! There's a high ceiling, isn't it? I mean that we were way up! Now, gradually we've gone south in the type of person we could process and our first steps in this direction actually came about – besides other things, besides trying to get processes the lower-scale cases could do – with the advent of body mimicry. And we had people mimicking what people were doing with the body and this had some efficacy. This, however, wasn't particularly new as far as we were concerned. This had been done by Homer Lane many, many years ago, who was a squirrel, a psychiatric squirrel in England. And he didn't hold with old-line psychotherapy and he, a layman, simply went up to an institution and started working on people the way he thought he might be able to help them. Well now, that was a step in the direction of physical control and then we move up from there to physical contact. And the first time we got into physical contact, we began to be able to handle these lower-scale cases rather easily. Well, from there on it has been an avalanche.

Now, just when did we start doing this with any ferocity? Many of us here and there had done it. But we didn't start to train people to do it until the middle of 1956. And there we were really training people to do it on the basis that it was absolutely necessary for an auditor to know how to do this. It was part of auditing skill. It had arrived! There was no question about it anymore. Now we have moved along and finally developed what we call Tone 40 processes, which didn't depend on anything the preclear said at all. We moved that far out.

Well, the development of actual techniques to fit this processing drill of course is not ended by a long ways. There are many drills, undoubtedly, that could be done on a Tone 40 basis. And I'd be rather – I'd feel rather upset with you if you didn't here and there suddenly think a long blue spark as you're confronting this preclear and say, "Wow! Now, why didn't I think of that before?" And all of a sudden plunge in there and get him to do something he could do and get some very remarkable result, as a result.

Now, if we did that, we have a background of what to do. It would be control of body, then control of attention and finally control of thinkingness. And we could advance across these three levels in that order and win every time. We get a control of body, then we can get a control of attention; we get a control of attention, we get a control of thinkingness. If we could get a very good control of thinkingness then the preclear can get a control of thinkingness. And all that's wrong with him is, he can't control his thinkingness. In the final analysis, that's what's wrong with the mind: a fellow can't control his own thinkingness.

All right. Very well. We know then at what we are aiming. Therefore, training of an auditor must wipe out diffidence in these three levels: (1) control of other people's bodies, (2) control of other people's attention, and (3) control of other people's thinkingnesses – obvious. Now, how do we encourage an auditor in his willingness to perform these three types of addresses to a case? The training drills, as we do them, were modified early in the course to include an actual process on the last day of the Comm Course. And that was found quite beneficial. That made the Comm Course integrate all the things they'd been doing in the week, and do them all at the same time with "Sit in the chair," and then we even comm bridge it over into "Touch that chair," and it was an actual process, not a coached process. So this wound up the Comm Course and made it a very excellent unit.

I think one of these days we will round out Upper Indoc similarly. Upper Indoc probably will be narrowed down to a point of where the last day of that week the auditor will actually do, probably, some version of 8-C uncoached. You got the idea? I mean, it's just actual preclear. Now, that would – that seems to be indicated.

Now, the actual training of people in how to do processes is something else – something else. This actually falls halfway between getting somebody processed and teaching him to do the process. It's halfway in between. We've moved out of the sphere of pure training for case gain when we move up into the CCH course. When we get up there, why, actually, what do we need?

Now we – although we have this thing called a repetitive question in the Communication Course, the repetitive question actually does not guarantee an ability to duplicate by the auditor – doesn't guarantee it at all. In the first place, origin is getting in his road. In the second place, coaching instructions interrupt the duplication, and the tedium of absolute duplication is relieved by the drills themselves.

So you could say (1) there is no duplication to amount to anything in a Comm Course, and (2) duplication is absolutely necessary in a CCH course. "Give me that hand. Thank you." Oh, man, the duplication this requires! The ability to sit there and take it. Therefore, it's necessary to add some duplicative process in the later stages of training. And the earliest version of Opening Procedure by Duplication – Book and Bottle – the earliest version is undoubtedly the best version. It was right when it was released, and that contains color, weight and temperature.

Now, we say, "Pick up that book." We don't really tell the fellow to pick it up with his body and every now and then you have a tremendous confidence on the part of the preclear that he himself could pick up the book, which is quite interesting. We do tell him to look at it. And that would probably be the only limitation of command: it would be "Through that body's eyes, look at it," would be a much more accurate command at that point. But this Op Pro by Dup as we used to do it way back when, does accomplish this duplication and breaks down the unwillingness to duplicate on the part of the student because it's almost as therapeutic to run it as to receive it.

Now, there – there we have solved something that there is no need to solve in the Communication Course. There's no need to solve this in the Communication Course. In the first place he's already handling a formidable battery of new skills if you're just taking somebody brand-new on this. And to add the arduous of duplication would almost murder him in his tracks. So that can be very well – now, that doesn't mean that you'd permit him not to duplicate an auditing command, but it's very, very easy, really, to duplicate a simplicity such as "Do fish swim?" and so on. But people quite often, in spite of all this, wind up at the end of a Comm Course sitting there in the chair just counting the seconds until the end of the session, see? Quite an ordinary frame of mind at the end of a Comm Course.

Well now, this is broken down at CCH level. It is best – be best broken down by, evidently, Op Pro by Dup or something of that character. And there's hardly anybody here who hasn't run or been run on Op Pro by Dup. Therefore, for this particular unit we are omitting it

and substituting a very beefy process designed to do things with confrontingness. Much beefier than was being run in the CCH A course. That was a pat-a-cake.

Now, here we have – here we have then, what will apparently be for a long time to come the training pattern of Scientology – and it has been very well confirmed. And the number of changes that have taken place by reason of the 18th ACC are few. I have pointed out what most of the changes and differences would be.

Now, I could add these various things. Evidently shouting in the Comm Course gets the student entirely off and away and out of control because he's already trying to run a total effect on the other one. He's already trying to run a total effect on the other fellow. And when you encourage him to shout, he really never does learn the elements of the Effect Scale. And the Effect Scale definitely must be taught to somebody in the Comm Course. And then he is going to be permitted to exercise the Effect Scale where it is effective – and shouting isn't part of it. He'll get much further whispering. You can knock somebody's silly head off with a whisper.

When I was at dinner tonight I noticed some of you people getting real slippy. A person came over and he gives me a note back and so forth and he gives me a nice Tone 40, very low-voiced "Okay," you see? And it almost knocks my head off! You people are getting there, that's for sure.

Well, this is a skill. You don't have too much time to teach somebody in a Comm Course anyway, and if you, in a Comm Course, get this whole idea of putting a vocal communication across, the Effect Scale, on the quiet side, they'll learn far more. All right. That's evidently according to findings here.

Now, in the Upper Indoc Course, let them shout their heads off. It doesn't matter. Shouting is less important than you might think. But ability to get a win by reaching something with a voice is not to be despised, by a long way. But if you had a very, very limited time, the drill which was run second could be run just in its basic three elements of space, voice into the space and intention into the ashtray. Those three, all by themselves will do a job in a rather fast hurry if you haven't got any time to flatten a person's vocal upsets.

Now, a lot of people threw ridges out in front of their faces, just the exact shape of their shoutingnesses. They threw a bunch of ridges out in front, and when they did the second drill they disintegrated the ridges which they had built with shouting. Quite amusing. But if any shouting is going to be done, it would be after he has learned that to achieve an effect he had better not try for a total effect. And it's a good thing to get an auditor over that in a hurry and early.

The trouble we have had in Dianetics and Scientology in seven years has mainly stemmed from people who had to have a total effect on the other fellow. Total effect. Best possible processing that could be done would throw the person into an entire convulsion, leave him retching on the floor for hours, and end of session would be picking up his legs in one corner of the room, his arms in another and gluing his head back on like a Dresden doll. And these boys never did make any cases gain. They just wanted a big effect. So to get an auditor over this very early is very, very good.

But in spite of all the little odds and ends that we've learned, we have learned something about coaching. Besides, we knew already that it took a good coach, that coaching was a high skill all in itself. There was a lot to know about coaching. But just here toward the end of the course, was finally able to articulate a coach's – not his responsibilities and not the other things, we already have gone over these things – but something he could do that would keep his auditor winning and keep him advancing rather consistently. And that is emphasis on single points in the drill.

Now, that rotational type of coaching is proving to be quite successful. But let me cover this and articulate it the way I see it right here at its conception, before it has any chance to get complicated. You'll notice all of these drills tend to get complicated. But we knew this. Earlier ACCs, we talked about simplicity-complexity, how people would ordinarily slip over into complexity rather than to move back into simplicity. All right. So these drills quite ordinarily become complex.

You will find that any Instructor, lacking a lot of self-discipline, will take a Comm Course and make it terribly complex. It'll just get more and more complex. And if you were just to start up some sort of a school and you were to teach the upper grades and you had somebody teaching the Comm Course and he didn't know much how, but you just thought, "Well, he'll get away with it somehow," you would find out that he starts teaching them more and more and more and more. And finally, on the first day, they get the rudiments, the Axioms, Book One, Dianetics 55!, AP&A, and then they memorize, toward the end of that evening, all the Dianetic Axioms in case they might miss something. And that would be a good first day in a Comm Course according to a lot of Instructors. They learn better. They learn better quite rapidly.

Actually, what a person can grasp when he first fronts into this is not what you have been able to grasp in this unit at all. It's quite microscopic. His attention is terribly confused. You have to give him little tiny data that are acceptable to him. And he goes out of the first couple of days clutching to his bosom some of the oddest data. If you just stop some of these people and ask them, "What did you learn?" – because I get reports from these people all the time and it's just perfectly wild what an HCA or an HPA report will consist of. "What I have learned!" and in all sobriety the person will tell you, "Well, I've learned that the Instructor's a professional auditor," or something like this. I mean, he's gotten something big out of his first few days, you see?

Well, first place, everything is new to him. He's in a new locale, he's addressing a new subject, he's not quite sure what's expected of him and the stable data he can be given are very few. He has tremendous questions. Amongst his questions is, "Does Scientology have any real workability at all?" See, he doesn't have any experience in this line. So therefore he goes through these early drills with a considerable amount of fog. And to give him a successful run through a Comm Course, it is essential that he be given things he can grasp and that they be said often enough and done often enough so that he eventually finds out that these are the things he's supposed to grasp! You see, that is the thing he's trying to learn: "What am I supposed to grasp?" He's supposed to grasp the training drills. That's what he's basically supposed to grasp.

Now, he also grasps, on a Comm Course when you're just starting out with new people, he's also supposed to grasp an Auditor's Code. He certainly wouldn't be much good for that. If he wants to know more about communication, you give him Dianetics 1955! to read. But if you go any further than that, why, you're going to be in trouble. Now, we don't expect a person to have a finished attitude toward Scientology at the end of one week, but we certainly expect that he would be able to communicate much better than he had been communicating! That's the only thing we want out of that week.

All right. If that is the case, then what is the coach? Remember this fellow is also the coach, alternately. So we have to give him a rather simple series of things to do, which he himself will feel he can do. Well, all right, that's fine. If you were to tell him, "Now, you're supposed to keep that – in confronting (TR 0), you're supposed to keep that fellow's feet on the floor, his hands in his lap and he isn't to fall out of the chair, his head isn't to sink on his chest and he's to sit there in that position and that is what the coach is supposed to maintain.

Well now, you'll find out he can do this rather well. But you still have to needle him a little bit and get him in there – and he'll be very diffident. After all, you forget that possibly you too were diffident once about suddenly reaching over and touching somebody. You know, very diffident about touching somebody's chin or adjusting his head and so on. You got to make him do a little reaching toward the auditor in order to get confronting done. Well, that's fine, that's an awfully simple drill.

As we move on later in the course, however, the drill is never absent. And the next day we pick up communicating to somebody. And that's confronting and communicating to – and we have to do both of these things. Right? And on the third day we do confronting, communicating to and acknowledging. Right? Getting more complicated now, isn't it?

But let's look at it from the coach's viewpoint. He did find out that he could make somebody sit in a chair. All right. He found out he could make somebody sit in a chair and not fall out of it. Well, very good. Now, on communicating to, however, he will happily open up the whole world of elocution, diction! It wouldn't matter if the preclear had an accent that was a perfectly normal accent for the area, why, the coach would certainly criticize it. It has nothing to do with the drill, don't you see? That's because the coach doesn't know what he's supposed to be doing! That's why he does that.

So we could look at this this way – this is the way we train a coach. And this we have learned in the 18th – he does win with the first day's drill because he did get the fellow to sit in the chair and not fall out of it. Right?

On the second day's drill, he's handling something new, which is communicate to. Well then, we could do it this way: for three commands he pays attention to nothing but confronting; for the next three commands he pays attention to nothing but communicate to; for the next three commands he pays attention to nothing but confronting; the next three commands he pays no attention to anything but communicate to. Do you get the idea? And we just go on that way for the whole day! Got that? It doesn't have to be three, but that's to give you order of magnitude. It isn't important on this second day, but the number of commands gets important on the third and very important on the fourth and extremely important on the fifth,

because there are so many parts now that a coach could hang up easily for half of a morning on one part, if he didn't have some specific number of commands to handle.

So what would this look like on the third day? Three commands, the coach would pay attention to communicate to; next three commands, he'd pay attention to acknowledge; next three commands, confront; next three commands, communicate to; next three commands, acknowledge. You got the idea?

Now you could shift this over and emphasize the fact that today we were doing acknowledgment by doing this: first three commands, confront; next three commands, communicate to; next five commands, acknowledge; next three commands, confront; next three commands, communicate to; next five commands, acknowledge. You got the idea? Just stressing that day's drill because it's so brand-new. Now, what would happen if we got clear on down the line to pc origin, with comm bridges and everything else? Well, that's starting to look real complicated. All right.

Now, what's the advantage of this type of coaching? We've found that coaching was bad only when the coach would not permit any wins to the student. So therefore, we could phrase it this way – well guarding the quantity that I've just enunciated, you know – don't let it go on and on and on for an hour on one piece, because the preclear-coach angle is only trying to get this other fellow comfortable with this step. All right. So if this is the case, he should really come off of it every time he gets a good one. Give the auditor a win and go on to the next one. Give the auditor a win, go on to the next one. Change only at wins. And the auditor would eventually discover that he could do the whole drill, and he'd have a win on the whole drill, only because he had a win on each of its parts.

Now, look how many steps there are in such a thing – tremendous number of steps there are in pc origin: understand it, acknowledge it, maintain ARC, return to session. This would apply the same way. And some such system could be worked out on each one of the parts, only we could take this just separate of all the other drills and just do these four parts.

Now similarly, we could take a comm bridge (the day before) and break it down into three parts. And for a little while, drill on nothing but the comm bridge and then go back to all the parts, don't you see? Confront, communicate to, acknowledge, repetitive question and then comm bridge. You see? And then you could – but you could take comm bridge all apart into its steps and have him do these, one right after the other until he just got used to handling each one.

Now, it's actually running a sort of a contact. As he contacts them he gains familiarity, not experience. And out of his familiarity comes confidence. It isn't how many gimmicks a coach can think up, really. It is the good 8-C that the coach can run upon the auditor. And if he runs good 8-C and doesn't give contrary directions of one kind or another, why, he could do it very, very well.

Now, this isn't trying to limit various hints, discussions, that sort of thing; that isn't trying to limit those things. But if you gave him a framework in which to work, by which he progressed every one of these steps all morning long as he was doing the drill as a coach, and he just brought it up to a win, changed it; brought it – next one up to a win, changed it. See, now we'd have the individual doing all of these things – doing the whole thing on the third day, of

confront, communicate to and acknowledge. And he'd just go on doing all three of these things, see? He'd confront and communicate to and acknowledge. But while he's doing all these three things the coach only pays attention to acknowledgment. Do you see that? He does all three things; coach only pays attention to acknowledgment and then shifts over, and only pays attention to communication to, while he's doing confront, communicate to and acknowledge, and then goes over and only pays attention to confront while the fellow is doing it.

Now, you see the amount of familiarity which we would get there? We would cut down the amount of confusion, considerably raise the number of stable data. Now this we have learned and I consider it very valuable. Because this has been our puzzle: how do we make a good coach? Well, we can tell a person what to do in a little round of roodles here: he goes round and round and – on this, concentrating on first one part and then another part. He really would be interested enough in doing this so he'd never get off onto some pet bent of his own and start riding a hobbyhorse down into the ground, such as that broad "A's" should only be used, something of this sort.

I've heard some silly things said in coaching – very silly things. "That was not – did not sound mannerly." "That was insufficiently formal; this is Formal Auditing and your tone of voice is not formal." Now, funny part of it is, I've heard a great many very smart things and very wise things said by coaches too. But I also know that coaching here is not coaching in a raw state. Now, this all becomes important, what I'm saying here, because for true, there'll be a lot of this sort of thing done. That's why I'm going to talk now, a little bit later here about the PE Course.

One other thing has been learned, and I already touched on that, and that is: evidently, the way to succeed on Tone 40 on an Object is give the guy some kind of a win that he could reach something with his voice. This knocks out his voice machinery. But don't pay any attention to the machinery of voice, see? Don't pay any attention to the fact it's voice machinery. Just give him a win on reaching something with his voice. Got that? That's the concentration point. And then go into this drill, which is simply: make the space in which the object exists; fill the space with the voice, and put the intention in the tray – make the tray stand up, sit down and so forth. But those three things have to be done in rotation. And you would coach them exactly the same way as I've just described.

You'd just go over it first and show him making space – what you mean by that. Clarify it all up. Find out what kind of space he's making: is it pink or purple? It sometimes is. And you just want space; you don't want anything in it. Then you want his voice filling the thing, and then you want him to get some familiarity with putting an intention in that.

Sometimes he can't get a thought into it, but he can get effort or he can get misemotion or he can get emotion. Sometimes he can't get the thought in there, but he could get effort. His idea of intention is effort in the ashtray, so you have to sometimes pay attention to that. And then having showed him each one of these, we would have him do these in rotation. And while he was doing these in rotation, we concentrate on just one at a time until he gets a good win. And while he's doing these in rotation, we concentrate on the next one until he gets a win. And still doing this rotation – he's doing three things but the coach is only paying atten-

tion to one. Then we have him put the intention in, don't you see? And he'll finally come up the line. He knows what's expected of him and so could win.

Now, it's quite important – quite important, that all of us have some kind of an idea of how to train people through these various steps. The most important of these are Comm Course and Upper Indoc. These are the most important.

Why? In the first place, there is a new grade of auditor that has been proposed. What the title will be or not, I don't know. But it is something on the bas – – . We had for a while Hubbard Provisional Auditor. We didn't issue very many of these; I don't think we even printed a certificate. I don't know. But not many of these were issued. Mostly because people were chopped up concerning the course and we were changing policy. It is no longer the policy here to permit organizations to issue, teach or certify; only individuals. You've seen a ghost of this in the past. So an individual has the right to do several things. Amongst them would be to issue this certificate.

Now, whether this form is final or not, this title is final or not, I could not tell you, but it is something on the order of Hubbard Apprentice Scientologist. It's an apprentice Scientologist. You get the idea? And all this fellow would have as a background would be a Comm Course and an Upper Indoc Course and nothing else. And all we would teach him how to do would be to handle people. And we wouldn't teach him how to process at all, or give him the idea that he was studying psychotherapy or the mind or anything else. Do you understand that? He's merely learning how to handle people, that's all. Handle people on the job, to handle people domestically and so forth. That's all you're teaching him how to do.

And the way we teach him to do it is just exactly as you've been studying Comm Course and Upper Indoc. No Auditor's Code? Don't have to worry about an Auditor's Code as far as he's concerned at that level because he wouldn't have a clue what it was all about, really. Instead of that, you tell him about misemotion. And you tell him that in the Comm Course with the drills! You say, "This is the way you talk to people. You don't shout and rant at them. You don't catch people when they're tired and worn out and bawl them out and kick them in the corner. This isn't the way to get any compliance." You'd have to back that up, out of your own initiative.

But here we discover something: that an individual who can handle the drills of the Comm Course and the Upper Indoc could teach people and handle people rather well, no matter what sort of a job he had. The only processing we would teach him would be those training drills which we saw back in the ACCs, the winter of '56-'57. Those little training drills. Teach him those drills. Give them the idea of repetition and so forth, the ideas of what he has to do to make somebody understand that. Do you understand that then?

Now, of course, this fellow – you'd say, "That is a code, that's called the Auditor's Code." Don't beat his head in with it. You'd say, "Well, here's the Code of a Scientologist – should have some vague working knowledge of this situation." You say, "Well, here's some axioms, if you want them."

But you don't try to teach him any of these things. Why? Good God, you're teaching him enough! See, you're just teaching him enough. The only theory that you'd teach him is, "People can be handled. How are people handled? They are handled by these drills. That's the

way you handle people. Now, if you're a foreman on the job or an executive or somebody like that, you have to know how to confront these people and talk to them and answer up and so forth, and this is the way it's done."

Quite amusing. It's an amusing simplicity. It looks ghastly simple to you. It'd look quite upscale to somebody who'd never run into it. We sell it on the basis of, "This is how you train people; you have to know this, these drills, in order to teach people things, to get people to work, to get people to follow your orders. To associate on an even keel with the society at large, you need these drills." That's – we – he needs to be good in them.

Now, this would be quite interesting. If you can envision a foreman, a labor foreman knowing these drills, and just compare him with some run-of-the-mill person that you have tried to, just for a moment, show one of these things to (who knew nothing about Scientology), compare the blunderingness of that person with the possible ability to communicate and to handle people which would result from a rather thorough grounding (nontechnical, but awfully practical) in Comm Course and Upper Indoc. Now, that grounding then would be – would make quite a difference in this man's behavior, his ability to handle his – the human race at large, get a job done, get cooperation on the part of people and so forth. You know that is the case. So that's a pretty good grade.

Now, why do we give anything like that? That's because their certificate ought to be a little more than a basic auditor's certificate, and it shouldn't be as good as a professional certificate. But it ought to be a certificate. And it ought to be something that anyone certified to do so has a right to issue. You see that? He should have this – a right to issue that certificate.

All right. That certificate then would simply signify that this individual had had quite a little bit of training in Comm Course and Upper Indoc and could handle people and probably teach them things with the learning; and was probably of good moral character and wouldn't do you too much damage in the community. And you – he says, "Well now, what if I want to process people, what you call processing people?"

And you say, "Well, go ahead." And give him an assist sheet. You know, the old assists of one kind or another. Just give him an assist sheet. He'd certainly be able to do those assists better than anybody else. He'd probably get some considerable – but play down the idea that he would know anything really about professional processing. Because that can get pretty wild and he would not be able to cope with it, not even vaguely.

All right. Now, how about – how about more people to teach this to? What would happen if we had some sort of an activity which really squared these PE Courses around and moved people through? Well, I'll tell you the PE pat-tern that is now going to go into Dublin.

As you know, the PE Course consists of one week of evenings, of a free course. This free course is simply attended – registered in properly – Monday night, and is attended for two hours a night (with a break between the hours), for the remainder of the week. And the only thing that is done in that course is the basic definitions of existence, as contained in Scientology: Fundamentals of Thought, in Definition by Agreement. And that's all that's done that whole week.

Step two – not an advanced course. They're not ready for an advanced course. But weekend group intensives with some small charge; very small charge, just a few dollars. And you bring them in and give them – anywhere that suits your fancy – six to ten hours of Group Auditing on Saturday and Sunday. That's all. And during the week, you pitch this. You'd keep telling them, "This is what you ought to do. Once a month we have one of these intensives" (if you don't want to do it every weekend), "and the next one coming up is such and so." But you'll find out that you will get more people in and they will stay with you better if you gave it every week that you gave a free course, you followed it with. But that's pretty exhausting.

Well, you'd get those people in for just a few dollars and those people now have a reality on existence, as shown by the averages that have been worked out by many tests. Those people have a greater reality on existence. Their IQs are a bit up, their personality is a bit improved. Oddity, but just Definition by Agreement does all that. Then we move them up to where they'd get some Group Processing. And this Group Processing, over a period of these few hours, however few – if you're going to run it every weekend, you ought to probably cut the number of hours you're going to give right on down. But there we would have these people with something to come to which they could afford and which they would not find antipathetic, and about which they would probably be curious.

Unfortunately, it really takes two auditors to run, on new people particularly, a group intensive. And if you're doing it, just two auditors doing it, your goon squad of course can be somebody who is very untried and who knows very little about it. But two auditors, it actually takes, to alternate over the period of hours if you're going something like six or eight hours. You don't want to stand there for six and eight hours on a Group Processing. In the first place an individual isn't fresh, he tends to run down. A little bit harder to handle than an individual session, any day of the week. And so you would just run alternates or one auditor would do a couple of hours and the other would do a couple of hours and you'd work it off between you, you see, with an untrained, relatively untrained goon squad. It takes two people on the floor, one of whom must be an auditor.

And you do Tone 40 Group Processing. You tell these people what it's all about. You tell them you're not going to stop for hell or high water and that this is the way it's going to be; and if they don't execute the command, that fellow at the back of the room is the goon squad and he does see that they do it. You get an agreement with them on this subject, no matter how new or raw they are, and just run it. Don't go running a pat-a-cake. In other words, don't mess around. Because the boy who won't do your commands will mess up your group activity like mad. And if that guy's going to blow, you want him to blow early, not when he's enturbulated everybody in the group. That's for true! Because these boys are always present. They talk obsessively, they interrupt people, they spread entheta around, they raise hell. And it's a wonderful way to blow them. Wonderful way to get rid of them.

And they are gotten rid of in one of two ways: they're gotten rid of because they did the auditing command under the duress of your goon squad or because they couldn't take it and blew out the back door and you never heard of them again. And either way is okay. Somebody'll pick them up, maybe next couple of lives. Anyway, we're very hard-boiled on that subject because we've seen very fine groups disintegrated by people who would not perform the auditing commands, wouldn't buy any auditing, would prevent everybody in the

group from getting auditing if they possibly could. Lot of entheta and so forth. So you don't want to play this on the light side when you're running a group intensive. Be "sweetness and light and everybody's right but you" just before the intensive and afterwards, if you insist on this social pattern; but during the intensive, run it!

All right. So, there's your next leg up. You got a week of free Definition by Agreement training. People turned up. Don't try to give them lectures. In the first place, you have to be in good enough shape to run Definition by Agreement, to lecture. And lecturing is no substitute because you don't like to run Definition by Agreement. Do you know that there are people around that won't run Definition by Agreement, and then will only lecture because they cannot confront individuals of the group? It's very remarkable. Have to be above that level. So you run this Definition by Agreement, nothing but, for that week. And you run either that week or at regular intervals which you publicize, your group intensives, for which you charge a little bit of money.

Now, out of those group intensives you'll get individual preclears. That's for true. And out of those group intensives you will also get candidates for a low level of training, if it's pitched at something they can understand; and that something they can understand is handling their fellow man. And that's the only thing you talk to them about.

"You want to handle people better? Why, I can show you how. And you'll have to take, however, a course. Probably of some three months in length. And that course winds up with a certificate that makes you an apprentice Scientologist. And here's this course, and it runs this way: you sign up and you go something on this order: for the first six weeks you get, Monday, Wednesday and Friday." People, by the way, will not consistently and continually go to five-night-a-week courses. Wears them out, their families object and every-thing else. But they will go to three-night-a-week courses. So you say, "For the first six weeks, it goes three nights a week: Monday, Wednesday and Friday. And for the remaining six weeks it goes Tuesdays and Thursdays. And if you can make it, Saturdays. That'd be three, but remember you can do it two." I just had that offered me this afternoon as a fine solution. I know it is a good solution.

So, what would they do in these courses? Well, maybe they would go through the Comm Course twice and the Upper Indoc twice in those twelve weeks. Well, but do you run this course consecutively and continuously? And you run it three months and then get another batch of people and you run it three months? You certainly better not. The least you should enroll it is every six weeks; that's the least you should enroll it. And if you have your steps planned out in some fashion or other, you probably could enroll it every couple of weeks. Because I don't say three months is the right number. And if you wanted to enroll every couple of weeks, then you'd be running a Comm Course every couple of weeks, don't you see? That would give you six evenings on which you would spend an hour on each side of each step, in two weeks. And you could enroll every two weeks. Then you'd run your Upper Indoc for what-ever length of time was necessary to run them through an Upper Indoc, at two or three nights a week.

Now, why do we stagger this? Why do we put the Upper Indoc and the Comm Course on a stagger? And that's because the liability for anybody working with few hands is that he

himself cannot – well, he can't teach two courses at the same time. You have to have the same man teaching both courses, don't you see? So you stagger them so you've got a person available. It isn't whether the people have this time available or not. It's whether or not you've got an Instructor. You see this? That's what's important. So you can just take just one Instructor and run a whole HAS Course over and over and over and over. Enroll it every couple of weeks if you want to. And run them out the other end with nothing but Comm Course and Upper Indoc under their belts, and with no understanding except that they were going to handle people better. That's the only thing that you're promising them, the only thing at all that you're promising them. You don't tell them anything else – not going to be able to make anybody well or spit further or anything – it's just going to – they're going to handle people, that's all.

Now, you know and I know that in three months you're certainly not going to level out a Comm Course and an Upper Indoc Course in evenings at that infrequent an attendance. But you're certainly going to improve the living daylight's out of somebody – enough to make him surprised about it. Now, this doesn't say that you couldn't take the ones that didn't catch on quick and run them back through again before you issued them their certificate. If you thought they were going to be a disgrace to you in some fashion, train them until they wouldn't.

But what does this give us then? This gives us a very good opportunity to build up a number of people in our own community who are not pretending to be professional auditors but are only handling people and jobs better. They're doing a better job of living because of Scientology. They can call themselves a Scientologist, which would not then mean to them a psychotherapist or a psychologist or something of this sort. Do you see? Wouldn't have that connotation to it at all. It'd be somebody who was handling life better.

All right. If you have this strung out to that degree, let me assure you that you would have a great many individual intensives to do. You would have income – rather significant income.

Now, what is the real beauty, financially, behind one of these HAS Courses? That is, they can pay a very small amount at the beginning of every week. Monday night they appear with their small payment. This payment for the whole course is stretched across all three months. Now, maybe you make them pay down a little bit of money just to make sure they'll appear and continue to appear, but you can certainly work within their financial reality. And you would be surprised, if it cost them five dollars a week or three dollars a week even, how many three dollars add up into a considerable sum of money. You got the idea? And you'd be surprised if you were only charging – this would be ridiculous – two dollars per group intensive, see? This is awful come-on. You're only charging two dollars for that and you still have built your group up to where you had thirty, forty people taking the thing. Why, you got a hundred and some dollars for a weekend's work, and who would despise that? I wouldn't. Matter of fact, I've been giving my auditing away too long here, I mean...

Now, looking at it in this wise, because we're dealing in small sums, always dealing in small sums, then nobody jumps. And there was an outfit once called Woolworth. And a Woolworth approach to this sort of a situation is not a bad approach at all. And I'll be brutal

with you – you are entering in upon times when money isn't what it was. It isn't – there's all kinds of it in the society and none of it loose. Well, the way to get the money loose is to get it loose a dime at a time. Get the idea? Chip it out there a nickel or a dime at a time and you've got it made.

Anybody would take a course – I don't care, let's be ridiculous, let's say this course was going to cost them \$150. Let's peg it high or something. And that \$150 would look awfully big to somebody. But now let's break it down and that costs \$50 a month. Now let's break down the \$50 a month: well, it costs \$12 a week. Now you see how fast that would break down. Now let's take \$5 a week and add it back up and find out what it would become and we find out that it's a \$60 course. Now, if you're enrolling quite frequently, why, you're still taking in \$60 for every one of those people that goes – going to go out and handle people better.

In other words, we have to think of the financial side of this. We're not in this business to make money or we wouldn't be here, but we certainly had better not starve to death in the process, because people don't approve of your ribs showing through. That's an Asiatic fixation, that a man, to be holy, must be suffering from malnutrition.

All right. How do you get the people there in the first place? We still, to this minute, do not have a better gimmick than, "I will talk to anyone for you, about anything." That's still a winner.

The only trouble is, those people who have used it and then have answered the phone when it rang, and who have actually attended to this thing across the boards and have done it in a very businesslike way, get off on this silly kick: they get a mailing list of three or four hundred people and then that mailing list by word of mouth keeps expanding because of free courses and they don't do it anymore and it gets lost. Or they put ads in the paper and they get it all set and then they don't have anybody there to answer the phone – they're very unbusinesslike about the thing. Or – and this is the other thing they did which was real cute – they solved everybody's problem over the phone when the person called.

That you must never do! And where we've had flops, why, that's really been the flop point. Person would call up and say, "Well, I'm having an awful problem with my husband. He won't come home, he's down at the local bar and he's in those wide, swinging doors and nobody can get him out."

And you say, "Well, why don't you do so-and-so and so-and-so."

And she goes down and gets him out of the wide, swinging doors and you never hear of either of them again.

You don't do that. You always have them come in for an interview. It doesn't matter if they're suffering for a broken leg, it doesn't matter what's happening. They come to see you for an interview and you book their name and address fully. If you can make them come to see you, not you go to see them, you eventually wind up with a very fine mailing list. Now, there are dozens of ways to get around, but that has been the one which has been most functional.

Now, word of mouth spreads to the degree that you are good. Let's not kid ourselves: our word of mouth is as good as we're good. I can go into the Academy any day and tell, within a three-week lag, whether or not the Academy course is good. This is a fantastic thing. It's not so true in processing, but it is true in training. You go in there and these people, if you've got a heavy enrollment, your course has been good. If you've got a lot of new people in the Comm Course, your course is good. If you haven't got anybody in the Comm Course, it's for the birds.

I don't know why this is. It's almost esoteric. I don't know how they find out about it all over the country or all over the world so quick. But you get a lousy Comm Course Instructor and you all of a sudden have nobody. You have a good one, all of a sudden you're full. Now, the only other thing that happens that monitors this, is when you have a good Registrar, you have students; when you have a bum one, you don't have any.

Ireland was busy complaining about the lack of business and an auditor was sent over from London to find out why the Irish office wasn't getting any business. He found the Irish office wasn't even answering people's letters. He answered all the letters he could find lying under the blotter, which wasn't all the letters that had arrived by a long way, and he has, from a zero bank balance, achieved a ninety-six pound bank balance in about two and a half weeks, zoom! Just by answering the letters. He didn't even improve the service! You understand? I mean, this is functional. You have to answer your mail! And when I say answer your mail, I mean answer it. I don't mean write a letter back.

When people ask you questions, answer them. It doesn't matter whether they are well stated or not; try to answer them.

Now, a lot of people here the last few nights have been giving me some questions about processes. Somebody wants to know the difference between anger and antagonism here – it's .5 degrees on the Tone Scale. And somebody said, "You'd said earlier that you had a process to run out between-lives area." That is exactly right, and you'll be running it next week. Having answered those questions ... Answer their questions!

We did a very silly thing the other day. Bonnie went down to find some-body out of the Central Files for me. He brought back a letter which was the wrong person but it had a letter in it that was eighteen months old and the person hadn't added any letter for eighteen months. But eighteen months ago this person had written in and this person had said, "I'm working with children and I wonder if you have any more information on the subject." And whoever had answered the letter had answered it just a little bit off pitch. It was almost an answer to the person's questions. So I said, "Bonnie, answer her questions." And he did. And promptly we heard from the person; instantly and immediately the person ordered the book. We told her to order and she's in communication and everything's going along beautifully.

How many dead end like this? So an auditor has to do some administration. If he doesn't, he's dead. So given administration, which is to say, answering the mail, at least putting the money in your hat when it's thrown on the floor – these elementary things. Given that and given the fact that you're running a good PE, free course, and you're running some Group Processing and you're running a basic course to teach people how to handle people, you abso-

lutely couldn't lose, not for a minute. Couldn't lose. And I don't want you to do any losing. I'm here to see that you win if you possibly can.

This is very far from the last lecture of the course, because I will give you that last lecture on the last day of the course. And we've got a whole week and one day to go in which you're going to make a tremendous lot of strides of improvements. You have done beautifully, but you're only up to a lower order of miracle, and I don't buy that.

I want you to put into practice particularly what I've been telling you tonight about coaching. And I want you to at least double the amount of advance which has been achieved on the people you are coaching for the remainder of this course. There are eight, seven, six – six whole days left. And you've got four days of processing next week – nights of processing – which shouldn't happen to anybody, not even you. But there's quite a long ways to go yet. This happens to be, however, the last technical lecture of the series.

So thank you very much.

The Future of Scientology

A lecture given on 16 August 1957

How's it all going?

Audience: Good!

How's it all stopping?

Audience: Good.

Well, here we are with the last little short momentary period to go. It's a very good thing here to wind up this unit on a cheerful note. This is the first ACC for a very, very long time where we had total course completion. And that is pretty doggone good; it's never happened before that I recall. So thank you very much.

Now, there are tremendous numbers of things which I didn't tell you during the course and I'll have to write you a letter about them. They're not very important, really. They have to do with processing and processes of one kind or another.

That's the clocks, they – just shows you that the end of the world has arrived with the end of this ACC. Clock falls apart, just like that.

But you made it, you made it alive. That was news to me in some respects. And you did a very good job of pushing other people through this. I want to thank you for that. I think you actually have done very fine.

The only ACC which was to any degree comparable to the amount of success achieved and so forth, was – if I remember rightly there were three, really, before this which were quite different than earlier ACCs, and those were the 15, 16 and 17, and the people wound up in those units looking very, very bright; very bright indeed. But this one has well exceeded any of those three.

Well, you've really done a very fine job. I want to give you a little bit of data that might be of interest to you. From here on, the research is not south. To hell with that – we can crack cases. You should realize that CCH basic steps are applied all the way south, and just in case you ever get fooled, run them on everybody. Got that?

I mean, they take in all the way south; also they work quite well on upper-scale cases, and if you always take in people all the way south with CCH 1, 2, 3, 4, you will just never lay any eggs.

Now, there is today an official version of CCH 1, called CCH 1B which is "Don't give me that hand." This has been tested and has been found tremendously workable. It works as

an alternate, but not as an alternating, process. Once you run "Give me that hand," and flatten it a bit, then you would run "Don't give me that hand."

Now, actually, if you've got a case that is way down in the basement someplace, "Don't give me that hand" is the first one you run. And they really explode all over the room. It's one of the more interesting manifestations. Get somebody who is stark, staring goofy and you don't think you're communicating with him at all and you just sit down in a chair and start a Tone 40 "Don't give me that hand," and all of his covert bestiality starts rolling off at an enormous rate of speed. Quite amazing.

Now, this works extremely well on children. It has not been tested on comatose people, people who are unconscious, but nevertheless it possibly has some workability there.

Now, for a person who is lying in bed there is another one which proves efficacious and that is some command which tells them to "Put that body in that bed," you know? Or "Make that body lie in that bed." Some very factual command. "Thank you." "Make that body lie in that bed." "Thank you."

Now, the person is unconscious and evidently one of two things will happen if this happens; if the person is close to death anyway, they're liable to come to enough and get enough control to just kick off, wham! you see? Or come around and bring the body back to.

Now factually, to a Scientologist, we don't care which. I mean that. We don't care which. I'm not being funny. You talk about some overwhelming – the overwhelming of a person's self-determinism. Nothing compares to making them live when they would rather die.

Now, once in a while out of orneriness you can run a process on some-body who is absolutely convinced that the reason they should have auditing is to put the body in the chair, kick it off and leave you holding the bag. And you'll run into these once in a great while. I myself have run into three.

Well, there is a method of making them go on and survive which is almost a dirty trick, which is to mock themselves up dead. And they do that a few times and they run out the facsimiles on which they're counting to help them kick the bucket, and they go on living. You got that? Now, that is a process which makes somebody live. "Mock yourself up dead," or "Mock up a dead body." It doesn't matter which. It's not a very therapeutic process. It simply prevents this death from occurring. You've got that?

But somebody who is comatose, you process them, "Make that body lie in that bed," something like that. It will go either way, probably that direction which the person feels best. But their self-determinism has been overwhelmed to a marked degree by the various vicissitudes of fortune and all that process does is return their self-determinism to them. They say, "Well, there's no sense in keeping this thing running," and they kick off and find another one. That's actually the humane thing to do.

I'll tell you why that is. The total trick of brainwashing – this is another little item I've got to give you here – the total trick of brainwashing is to make somebody postulate that he's going to survive.

The total modus operandi of a surprise is simply to make somebody postulate that he's going to survive. You got that?

Now, for something that can't do anything else but survive to postulate that it's going to survive creates a very interesting state of beingness. It mocks up the potential of nonsurvival. In other words, instead of being relaxed about going on living, this fellow now mocks up the potential of nonsurvival and begins to dodge from living while determining to survive.

For instance, a whole regiment back in the War Between the States would occasionally turn into a complete rout. Everybody had decided to survive at that moment. And oddly enough, to survive is not to confront; these are two different things. Surviving is not confronting. These people have decided to run and live another day, and they get shot down in their tracks and dead bodies are spattered all over the terrain.

An individual has a threat to his health and decides after that that he's going to have good health! He's on what? He's on one side of a dichotomy; he leaves all bad health then on automatic.

For an individual to postulate that he's going to survive is to make him leave all succumb on automatic. Therefore everything can happen to him after that. This is the trick of brainwashing, and I impart this to you in some confidence for this reason: the Russian does not know it. This is something he doesn't know that he is doing.

Any one of you could make Russian brainwashing so much more work-able that it's grim to believe that there is no check on our information lines. I work it the other way around. I am hoping that someday a great deal of this material will be broadly circulated throughout Russia.

You remember the story about Detroit?

Male voice: Yeah.

The fourteen cops, and I think twelve of them resigned from the force; it was something on that order. In other words, they were supposed to listen to these tapes to get bad information and reel up a case and they said "Oh, so the state is attacking this sort of thing, is it?" And they resigned. Quite interesting, and I think you'd find the Russian doing the thing similarly. So it isn't totally bad that the information get to them; it'd only be bad if this information only, tailor-made only to brainwash people, got to them. Get the idea? Give them the whole story, not part of it.

Now, if we can get somebody to postulate that he's only going to be good, he leaves bad on automatic. Do you see that? It makes an unbalanced life since good and bad – and to a thetan, survive and succumb – are simply considerations. They're no more than that.

There is many a fellow who is suffering badly in life who has only one thing wrong with him: he is being good. And he does some of the most vicious, underhanded, dirty tricks to his fellow man, and he can't understand how they occur because he knows that his intentions are just to be good. But all of these automatic badnesses happen in the person's vicinity. Got that?

Now, one of the biggest religious tricks which is played on any populace is to make everybody be totally good; and they all die. Because then we classify disease as bad and they have no control over it. We classify death as bad and immediately they have no control over that. Now, this is throwing people out of control, isn't it? So an understanding of these factors really is necessary for a whole population to live a decent sort of life.

Well, the way you make people lead a good life is to put them in control of their lives, not to make them postulate they're going to survive or postulate they're going to be good, or postulate they're going to sin no more. This sort of thing is definitely detrimental, because it knocks out 50 percent of the control.

We say, "Now, promise me you will be good."

Fellow'll say, "All right, I'll be good. I'm going to be good. Yes, I've seen the light. I've repented because the Kingdom is at hand, and all is well. I shall now after this be good."

Well, what is this thing "good"? It's just some consideration. After that it is only necessary to tell people what is good and they – this person will be it. Don't you see? So we could say, "Well now, being good is paying everything you own into the exchequer." That's being good. Being good: "permitting yourself to be eaten at priestial feasts upon the rock above Mexico City." That's being good. Get the idea? All we have to do then is define the consideration of what is good.

There is an oddity; there is no thing that is bad in one society that isn't good in some other society. There is nothing immoral on the face of the Earth that isn't moral somewhere.

So we get this great philosophic enigma: What is bad? What is good? What is desirable conduct?

Well, Confucius laid down a bunch of desirable conducts of one kind or another, and he certainly made a government capable of controlling a people. Confucius is the patron saint of Chinese government since time immemorial, until this one. And this one is going to be very sorry, because they don't realize that there's a hidden philosophy running back of all Chinese civil service and so forth, that keeps them into a slavery. And they have come along and they've fed them something straight out of Karl Marx's delusions about the American Civil War.

You probably didn't know it, but the American Civil War was what influenced Karl Marx to turn antisocial. You didn't know that?

Audience: No.

Well, that's true. He was over here and he saw what he supposed to be industrial giants condemning labor to misery, starvation, death. He even claimed to have seen a twelve-year-old boy who died at his post in a factory thrown onto a scrap heap here in America. We never find any of these things in American history, but Karl Marx seems to have found them here. And this inspired him to go back and write *Das Kapital*. It was his experience here which caused him to write *Das Kapital*, which is what makes America Russia's number one target. Out of a network of lies about what's bad; good; something; we get civilizations. But if you

wanted a civilization to advance or to achieve anything, it would have to have within it enlightened people; that would be vitally necessary.

The whole post of sage, philosopher, wise man, soothsayer and so forth, was long since relegated to the dustbin in the United States. A philosopher is somebody who sits alongside of a cracker barrel in a country store and makes wisecracks; I think that was the last well-known definition of what a philosopher is.

Nevertheless, although this country does not know it, it is totally starved for guidance throughout its ranks. And that guidance then isn't the kind of guidance where we say, "Everybody should get down and worship the great god Baal or the great god Moola." That isn't the sort of guidance it needs at all.

The guidance it needs is very easily stated, and that is guidance which permits the individual to reassume control of his own destiny: that's the sort of guidance this society at this time needs. If it gets that guidance it will live; it will be a good society. If it doesn't, we will have, not Earth going around the Sun, but a billiard ball.

Project Billiard Ball is going on at great pace right down here at the AEC.

Now, to rehabilitate any person, it is only necessary to rehabilitate his control of his environment. He isn't rehabilitated to the degree that that control is impeded. We were perfectly right once upon a time when we said, "Self-determinism is the solution." Yes, but self-determinism we didn't understand too well. Self-determinism must carry with it an element of control or it is a series of failures.

If an individual determines that something be so and then he has no way to make it so – in other words, the control factor is missing – then he is nothing but a failure and out of these failures are made broken lives.

Now, an individual, then, must be able to control his environment. But here is a great oddity: an individual must also be capable of being controlled. Just as we make the individual postulate survival and let succumb stay an automaticity, so when an individual is placed in a position where he himself controls things, a failure to rehabilitate his being controlled thereby leaves all other control beyond his own on automatic, and it makes that an automaticity and that too can sweep him up, sweep him into a fascism, sweep him into socialistic economic nonsense of some sort or another. In other words, he becomes very easy to control the moment that control of him is left on automatic. Therefore this is something that he must know something about, and this is something that he must be able to tolerate.

And between the two buttons, the one that is suffering is his inability to withstand or answer up to control of self. Hence the lower steps of CCH are terrifically workable. This is where the individual is starved and this is where he is victimized.

Now, that control is leveled at the person, leveled at his attention and leveled at his thinkingness, and unless these three things can be controlled, unless he himself discovers that they can be controlled without his dying, then he becomes the victim of every control that seeks to enslave him.

So to have a free society, you get this great oddity, that an individual in the society must not only be capable of controlling himself and his environment, but he himself must be capable of being controlled.

Now, there's practically no such thing as controlling yourself, there is practically no such thing as this, and we have most control centering on this. We have in the armed services in several countries right at this moment this great lie: "He who would learn to command must first learn to obey himself." Isn't that an oddity?

Now, they – if they said this sincerely, "He who would learn to command must first learn to obey," I would say that they were hoping that when he was first learning to obey he would forget how to command. And I wouldn't put these things first or second. "As he learns to command, so must he also learn to obey," and that becomes a true statement.

The only thing that's wrong with any person that you will ever meet in this society at this time is that he cannot withstand control exterior to him-self and so becomes a complete dupe for anything that would control him and unless his tolerance for exterior control is built up, he will continue to be a dupe. And the society has lots of those; there is no shortage of supply today of potential slaves.

Now, all of this could begin very easily and very well way down in the kindergarten of our public school system. One of these days in very, very short order – I'm not just giving you a lecture on this, I'm telling you very factually that beyond the fact that we ought to make the society better, we ought to do this or we ought to do that, there is a central modus operandi contained in control itself which tells us what an individual would be capable of if he was in good, very good condition. He could command, determine, control, whatever you want to call it, and he could be commanded, determined, controlled. Don't you see? If everybody in the society was in that condition, you would have a tremendous society. You would find various things in the society which are considered evil today would fade away.

Now, you're on no mission to go out and tell people to be good, that's for true. But I think you're on one to go out and tell people to be a bit better. That's for true, because they could all be a lot better.

Now, the only trap that we ourselves could fall into with that is by continually conceiving everybody beyond our immediate notice to be very evil, to be incapable, because this puts us out of communication with the society, and we shouldn't conceive ourselves to be surrounded by this sprawling mass of relatively undisciplined, incapable people. We should conceive ourselves to be surrounded by a sprawling mass of potential people. And as long as we keep that in mind, we're on solid ground. But as soon as we say, "They're all bad, they're all bad, they're all bad," we also are saying to some degree, "There's nothing can be done about it." And we know that there is everything that can be done about it.

Now, individuals are caught in the machinery of a society of custom, precedent, tradition and they're ground to very fine bits. And one of our levels of attack is going to be against the educational system, since it isn't an educational system. We don't know what it is, but it's not an educational system. Maybe it's some other kind of system. To put a child in a classroom and to keep him there ad nauseam, endlessly, is a very, very terrible thing to do.

The only reason people do that to him and are willing to do that to him is because of this misconception that he is a wild thing who has to be civilized or controlled in some fashion and the best way to do it is to knock in his anchor points.

No, he has been subjected to too much duress already and his salvation would lie in the application of some such formula as this: for every hour in the classroom, an hour on the athletic field. One for one, at least. Two for one would probably be better than one for one. But if you're going to put a child in a classroom for an hour, you would have to put him at least one hour on an athletic field.

Now, this is a perfect solution to modern education. They do not have the buildings by fifty percent. They do not have the teachers by fifty percent. But they could get coaches. So you send the child to school in the morning and put him on the athletic field in the afternoon. Or put him on the athletic field in the morning and send him to school in the afternoon. Insist that he have one good meal a day and you would have the stock necessary to continue a race.

They don't have it now. It's an appalling thing to read the figures of physical disability amongst modern children. It's a very serious thing.

During World War II – at the beginning of World War II they were trying to get people squared away and into the armed services to pass physicals and so on, and they found an alarming percentage of the country was physically incapable by reason of bad diet and by reason of this and by reason of that.

And it seems to me that if the state has to go into socialism simply to get good training for its children, I think they have sacrificed the end goal of freedom and decency for a stop-gap, just to get children fed well. That's one of the things that socialism promises, you know, is equal education and good food for everybody and all that sort of thing. And I think this country is capable right now of doing that.

I have in the works a book called Creative Education which will bring up all these factors. And I don't want you to be timid about shoving some of this material under the noses of principals and that sort of thing. This could carry us a very, very long way. This could be pretty exciting.

Actually, that education could become a science is fairly exciting news anyway. The great oddity is, is the Prelogics are the axioms of education. And all I'm going to do in this book besides advancing ideas and experience on child processing and how to put data across and the learning processes and that sort of thing, little material we developed since, is just to take these Prelogics, call them the axioms of education and beat each one to death and say that a teacher who doesn't know this is a schnook. And then make sure this one lands in every public library around the world. See? That could be quite a campaign all by itself.

Now, that sort of thing is all grist to your mill. Certainly, to improve a country at large, some attention has to be paid to the immediate oncoming generation. Otherwise they would grow up and undo all the work you have done. So you have to pay some attention to them.

Now, there's another factor that goes along with this and that is juvenile delinquency. And I don't believe you know this, but the FBI is hysterical – they're just totally hysterical on this subject. They do not talk logically to you anymore about it. Hysteria.

The current issue of Newsweek magazine is a very good reference; they give diagrams in there of the juvenile gang murders and they give in there the figures of crime increase in the juvenile department. Now, there isn't much you can do about it, they say. In other words, they are men without a solution and men standing into confusion.

If you have a little idle time, I would ask you to overcome your unwilling-ness to confront courts of law and cops, since they aren't too easy to get along with, and go down to the juvenile court and have a talk with the probation officer, who's usually the most hysterical person present; have a talk with the probation officer. Tell him you're a minister, you're interested in children, and you would just like to have some children to do some Group Processing with. "New method of group therapy," you might say.

You possibly could find considerable financial support in your area if you had any set of figures at all that would substantiate your efficacy in the field of juvenile delinquency. After that you would move forward into the area of the judge, and you would find the judge would be making statements such as are made to me occasionally by judges. Oddly enough, we sometimes our-selves get stuck on the time track about our position in the society or our representation in the society at this time.

The battle is won at this time. It is won. It's won about the same way the Battle of Gettysburg was won on the second day, you see? There's an awful lot of shooting going on and nobody has mopped up any of the mess, but people involved know that the battle is over.

The seriousness with which a psychiatrist consulted on this assumes at your immediate mention of the word "Scientology" tells you volumes. The head of a hospital out West – and I had a report on the head of a hospital up here in the East, almost said exactly the same things; they said, "We'd be very happy to have you present in any capacity at all, if it weren't for the fact that we would endanger our standing with the AMA. And we have to watch out, because we know you're doing good work."

Now today, although violence could flare along this line and it isn't all done at all, there has been – a lot of which perhaps I have kept from you – a lot of randomness of one kind or another out in the public at large.

One thing, there was no sense in bringing it up particularly, and the second thing, one was simply giving a communication line to a bunch of con-fusion when he did so; and the third thing, to bring it up was to assume the role of defense, which I wasn't in mind to assume at all because the only role I have ever assumed and the only one I understand is attack. That I find is successful.

Now, it's sometimes foolish not to have somebody holding the fort while you attack. I have discovered that too. But we're still here.

Well, today there are many interests afoot, many concerns in one way or another. People are entering the messianic level which is described in Science of Survival* This is a bad piece of news which I give you. But as they enter it, for some reason or other we're thought

better and better of. People think better and better of us. And if we get stuck on the time track in believing that there are people around who just think Scientology is terrible, remember this: as a society sinks on the Tone Scale, they are more and more apt to protect the underdog. It takes several years of vilification to make a hero. And this to some degree has happened.

This is almost a standard social cycle. We're just into the end of this cycle, and you'll all of a sudden – oh, it won't be many years before – maybe not even years. Tides like this have a tendency to turn rather fast when they turn.

You're not at this moment looked down on, but you will find yourself very thoroughly looked up to. This has already happened.

Looking down on a person has – pretty well over. But looking up to is a new experience for you and the only thing I would say if this starts to commence and if you did manage to dig yourself out of a PE Course or something like this and dig yourself out of what you were doing and exteriorize to the degree of going out and conducting a juvenile delinquency program – you know, by the way, all you have to do is get the names and addresses of people who support boy's clubs and that sort of thing, go around to see them. Tell them you have a new program. Ask them to write out the check. I mean, it can be done just as simply as that, you know. Because these people write out many large checks all the time just to see something happen, because they're interested in the society at large.

But the point is that when you get up to a point – since I think there are here people who will not retread again, I'll tell you this now in case I don't see you in the next year or so. And that is just this: is beware of anoxemia. It is a dreadful disease which makes a person do foolish things when the air gets too thin.

Pilots go up in airplanes, their masks slip off, they're too high and they all of sudden conceive themselves to be elsewhere and they do silly things with the rudder and stick.

It is very, very easy to support misfortune. That's rather simple. It's very, very easy to go out and slug away and work at it and hope and figure someday you might really get somewhere and amount to something. That's easy. Half starve to death and not have enough dough to do this and that with and owe a lot of money, that's easy, that's almost routine.

The other one is the hard one to bear. Altitude. What humility it takes to survive altitude. I can tell you that from personal experience way back when.

The last time I got a whammo out of being set up with altitude was so many years ago that I've forgotten all about it. And I had the experience of being a very well-known writer back in the middle thirties. And I found out at that time that it was very difficult to keep a check on myself so that I could continue to perform, and I had to get over it in a hurry. And I found out something: that it is much harder to survive good repute than bad. It's much harder to survive good fortune and plenty, than misfortune.

*See Science of Survival, Book One, Chapter 27, "Method Used by Subject to Handle Others."

First place, it gives you very little to confront. You begin to run out of things to confront. Everybody all over a whole area is calling you and looking up to you and the TV station

wants to know if you'd come down and make an announcement on this national event of some kind or another just so they'd have your opinion. That's a sad day. That's a sad day.

So if you ever get the suspicion that you've just grown the proper whiskers and halo to be Christ, for God's sakes come and see me. It's easy to do when several thousand people start looking up to you. Now, I say that very prematurely. This is way before the time this will happen. That's why I'm saying – it'll sink in. One of these fine days ...

Well, it was nothing – it was nothing in the – even in the early days of Buddhism for anybody that had any knowledge of the subject at all to be wined, dined and feted halfway across India. You get the idea? Well, I'm not making a comparable line, but I'm telling you and repeating this, the society is going into a messianic level. If you want to know more about that, read *Science of Survival* and what it says on the subject.

I have had five messiahs in communication with me in the past two months. And I haven't been looking for them. The weird part of it is, is they call me up and think they're reporting to headquarters. If this doesn't make a liar out of me, nothing will. But this is getting just a little bit wild. Now, this has been happening to me here and there and so forth. Very peculiar.

A fellow the other day in New York City, former bartender, had all of a sudden got the Word, and he was telling me about the next three hundred years and the various orders and so forth, and he defined what this was all about. It was total surrender to predestination. That was it. If you made a total surrender to predestination, you had it made.

In other words, the country is entering into fatalistic lines. Now, that's quite remarkable. It's quite remarkable, because I'd never heard fatalism in this country before, but that's fatalism. This fellow had just gotten the Word and he was on his way.

When you mock up anything as formidable as an A-bomb, and people can see no more future than they can see, even though they don't understand it, they begin to turn around and find some way which is the short road to heaven.

Now, you are the only qualified messiahs in the world today. It would be so confoundedly easy for you to turn in your shirt for a white robe that it isn't even funny. Now, I'm speaking to you a little bit ahead of the fact. This hasn't really come out to a tremendous big thing in the society yet. It is really not totally visible.

But you're going to find people turning more and more to churches. You're going to find people more and more – somebody suddenly stands up and says, "Hallelujah! I've got the Word." And everybody turns around and says, "What is it, for God's sakes?"

Only they will not be the intellectuals which turned to Dianetics and Scientology, they will be the emotional, worried, anxious people. It's a good thing we wrapped up far south, because to salvage one of those boys when he's three-quarters spun-in is a job I wouldn't wish on anybody.

So I'm speaking to you perhaps prematurely by some long, large period of time, but nevertheless, you see what I'm talking about?

Audience: Yes.

So keep your head; keep it sane. Because it's dead easy and I don't think there's any person here who wouldn't.

But I'm telling you very, very bluntly that you are the only qualified messiahs. You're qualified. Why are you qualified? Do you realize that you are the only people that have any understanding or reality on the hereafter? Well, what more do you want? Do you realize that if you read down the list of all the messages brought by messiahs in former times, that you have the answers to each and every one of them? Well, what's that make you?

And yet you don't have those things because I've stood up and lectured to you and yakked at you and so forth, because I've told you consistently, "Find out!" And if you've got any information on this subject, you've got it for real, so you're not even taking it secondhand. See, you're perfectly qualified messiahs. And I'm not going to issue a certificate to that effect.

You probably want to know something about wafers. The Instructors have already graded all of the wafers and those have been set up, and set up very nicely and will be released tomorrow after your tests are available. There isn't one of those that is below tops that isn't rather easily repairable, and you will get a note on that tomorrow, anything that has to be done to up the grade of the certificate.

Now, those things will not come forward for my review until next week sometime, and when all of the material is there, why, we will have that squared around. And actually I don't expect otherwise than we will have eventually 100 percent gold-seal sweep here. It's not that now; it's not that now because there has got to be some things done by people before they can, as the Instructors have informed me, and I have no particulars on this at all. You will know all about this and it's not very bad news.

But I have some very good news here, and I'll just pass these out and you just pass them right back through to the person, would you, sitting back here? We have course completion. I notice that – did I put some tension on you when I told you that you wouldn't know about this till tomorrow noon?

Well, I'll tell you how to do this; I'll tell you how to get off of a maybe. Just consider that you've flunked and are going to get no certificate and that it's probably going to take you a couple of weeks to get this repaired somehow or another and you'll have the worst news that is in the pile. Got that?

All right, now these are your course completion letters and you will be interested in having these; these have a value in themselves because of the material going out in Ability.

Now, we have a very, very good party coming up here tonight and I am now going upstairs and arrange a Fac One machine so I can get all of your pictures, because I wanted to get the class pictures.

Now, one of the things that was fairly interesting in earlier ACCs is we always took people at the beginning, always took them in their class clothes and never had a prayer, you see, of getting nice, shiny pictures because they would be all restimulated and everything. But this time, why, we reversed it and decided to take the pictures at the party. So, I will get all of your pictures tonight, so I trust you will all be there.

Audience voices: Early. Early in the party, yes. Yeah. Early.

Early, you said it! You'll miss it if you're not there at eight, straight up.

Male voice: Okay.

Got it now?

Audience: Yeah.

It's been a terrific pleasure having you here and thank you very much.

Audience: Thank you! Thank you, Ron!

Thank you.