

SUP 9

## SOP 5 LONG FORM STEP V - ADDITIONAL TECHNIQUES

Philadelphia Doctorate Course

23 January 1953

This is the twenty-third (is it?) of January, 1953, finishing up the series on Standard Operating Procedure Issue 5 Long Form, and taking up tonight Step V. There will be two hours on this because your Step V is the step which is worrying you, which has worried you, and which will continue to worry and upset you throughout your career as a professional auditor. The I's, the II's the III's you are liable to slight because they're too easy. The IV's and the V's are liable to become your center of interest because they're rough.

I want to give you, right here at first, an evaluation of processing. Would you rather make five hundred theta clears or five?

All right, then process I's, II's and III's and take your IV's and V's and put them on a ration of Self Analysis until they become capable of doing a III, and then spring them. That's the easy way. I give you a formula; it's my suggestion.

All these lectures have two factors. One is my opinion and the other is the technique. Don't confuse the two. I've given you just then an opinion.

You needn't even vaguely confuse me or my personality with Scientology. It doesn't work because I say it's so. It works because it works. Freudian psychoanalysis works because Freud said so. That's the essential difference. It doesn't mean that just because I have opinions you don't agree with, this makes me a bum, by the way. But neither does it validate or invalidate this material.

What's true along this line? The Logics and Axioms are true (the Axioms particularly for Homo sapiens), the basic material on the subject of survival, the dynamics, the Chart of Attitudes, and the techniques which have been put forward as Standard Operating Procedures 1, 2, 3 and 5 (4 only lasted three or four hours, so we won't mention it).

Now, this material, used in its essence, and what I've said directly about this material, is based upon a very definitely good, solid background of investigation and very thorough testing. Very thorough.

Every once in a while one of your instructors comes to me and says, "It works just like you said it did on such and such an incident." Well, of course it did: not because of a magnetic personality or something, but simply because of this, is I found the incident here and there on a lot of people, and this way and that way, before I released the incident. I didn't release a lot of optimism with that incident. I said, "There it is." And my opinion consisted of optimism. I had to keep people alert for a long time before I found that they could do this sort of thing uniformly.

And there's one datum you're not working with, is I don't care what people think of me. Now you can't be very well and still care, by the way.

Where you have, then, an incident outlined, you'll find out in your experience that it's there and it's that way and that it'll run that way. That's all. As tough as it is perhaps to accept a whole track, you show me any IV or any V and I can show you an Assumption, electronic implants and so forth -- not just on an E-meter; I can throw this preclear into convulsions on the subject.

We had such an incident in Philadelphia. I started running an Assumption, for the whole class. We had one fellow whose case had been bogged down for a couple of years; he hadn't had any good auditing. And he started to laugh, and he went into hysterics. An Assumption (grabbing a baby at birth) blew into view, and there he was out in the clear with sonic and visio. That's interesting, isn't it?

You see, every one of you are guilty of stealing a body. You don't own that body.

The only lie there is on the track, really -- the only real truth, you might say, there is on the track -- is that there is no true datum. That's a truth, that's a good, high-level truth.

Such concepts as codes of justice and so forth are made up on bases of workability, and they're born out of a pretense. And therefore, because they are born out of a pretense and then became factual, you'll find people, whenever they have assumed an untrue datum, are getting very serious about the truth of something. And the harder they insist that something is true, the surer you can be that it's not. They might not know that it's not true, but basically if you followed the reasoning all the way down, you would find it fallacious.

Man is continually representing to you that he owns a body, and he doesn't: He steals one. And Freud was looking for guilt. Do you want to find some guilt? Just look that one in the eye for a moment. The very thing he owns with, he stole and he knows he

stole. And somebody comes along and grabs him and throws him into the clink or something for having run off with a couple of teaspoons from the local manor or something, and he goes into a complete fit. Why does he go into a fit? He thinks he's going to be tried for his basic crime in this life -- which is the theft of one Homo sapiens, which is kidnaping.

The FBI (that's Federal Bureau of Infamy, in the United States) - - the FBI has made it an electrocutionable offense to kidnap anybody. You would have found, with the publication of that new law, a dive -- had you been able to measure it, or had you measured it -- in the mental health of the U.S. You would have found these two things doing a simultaneous action: the mental health and security of individuals in the U.S. doing a dive, and the publication of a law making it a capital offense to kidnap a child. Why? Everybody kidnaped a child. And they know they kidnaped a child, that's why they stood around and say, "Isn't it terrible! He ought to be killed! He kidnaped a child!" and "Oh, that's awful!" Because you see, the fellow who yells loudest in the crowd is of course asserting the fact that he above all is not guilty of this, because he is being very reprimanding on the subject. So watch that fellow who yells loudest in the crowd on such a thing as kidnaping, such a thing as hanging, and so forth. You could take him off quietly and you would process him, because you'd find that incident right there on whatever he's protesting against with a screaming fit. This tells you that sometime on the track I must have been a psychiatrist, doesn't it? Well, that's right. I was.

All right. Therefore, evaluation of data and conditions and situations in the MEST universe would seem to be frail somehow. The evaluation of data -- the evaluation of justice and injustice, good and bad, right and wrong -- would seem to be subject to a certain frailty of logic. And it is.

People have remarked that there is no sexual custom anywhere in the world that has not been praised someplace in the world as the thing to be or do. There is nothing immoral in the world which is not thoroughly moral someplace else in the world. There is nothing moral that is not somewhere immoral. What are we dealing with then? We're dealing with flows.

Now, as you go across this subject you will find that these reverse actions are always coming in and upsetting the situation, because it's unpredictable. Sometimes they are not reverse and sometimes they are reverse, and this becomes very confusing to people.

Well, the biggest confusion there is, is "There is reason." That's a big confusion, "There is reason." Everybody gets convinced there's such a thing as reason.

Why? The MEST universe is chaos. It is essentially confusion. And the fellow is protesting all the time about the fact there's confusion, there's confusion, there's confusion, and let there be reason, there must be reason. He's of course holding out for something that doesn't exist in this universe, on the level that most people exist on. You see? So that's one of the first lies, that in this universe there is reason. And you are going to worry yourself into an early demise if you think your preclear has a reasonable case or that reason can finish off his case.

We have in the Qs and the Logics the basis of reason above the level of flows. The second you go into the level of flows you get into the area of unpredictable reverses, and immediately chaos ensues. Energy goes backwards, or when you want it to go backwards it goes forwards, and people use this and that's called engineering. You use the impulse of energy to do one thing to make it do something else, by letting it do that one thing; and that's engineering.

You take this river, and this river wants to run on down the stream and you want to dam it up. So you take the strength it's using to run on down the stream, to dam it up. You use what it's trying to do, to make it do what you want it to do. And that trickery and prestidigitation with a slipstick and the bulldozer is called engineering. You find out that this energy does not want to be trapped, so you make it trapped in order to untrap itself suddenly. That is a condenser. Anything you find out that something doesn't want to do, you can then make it do it too. That's the study.

An engineer can nail this down because he's dealing with pure energy forms. He's dealing with pure chaos. And he can pilot his way through a reasoning level on pure chaos, and it looks very reasonable to him. That's because he knows it's chaos, and so he can make the chaos predictable and make it behave. He's going on a bunch of agreements, you see. He's going down to the level of a whole lot of agreements about this stuff, and all he had to find out was, What was the principal thing agreed upon?

It gets interesting. You use the strength of the river to dam the river. You can get very classy about this, by the way, and you can use the strength of one river to dam up another river.

You can use life to bring about death, any time. Take secret-police work. They always take the livestlooking girls they can get a hold of in order to bring about the early and quick demise of political enemies. Nice, big, beautiful reverses. You going to look for reason in this? No, don't bother.

Reason ceases to exist the moment that flows begin. And here you

have a creature who is subsisting on energy, and you look for this character to be reasonable. And you protest that he's not reasonable. Why protest? Just assume he isn't reasonable, and then go ahead and bail him out of energy. And he will become reasonable.

That's a very short statement, but what chaos is, is energy. Energy is chaos, and that chaos very early falls into strange and unpredictable patterns. And so you can take an overall pattern and control it somehow. Can even make the chaos work for you. An engineer does that.

The chaos of a gas maintains an even pressure on a gas bag. That's interesting isn't it? I mean, the gas is going in all directions and it's hitting particles of gas that are hitting particles of gas, and it's just traveling in all directions; and so he looks at this and he says, "How can we -- how can we make some sense out of this chaos?" And the only way he can make any sense out of it, is the fact that it will exert a pressure interior in a container. And he uses it that way. He gets, then, an equilibrium of forces, simply by insisting that all the chaos be uniform. And in such slippy little ways, he slides in and does things with energy.

Well, you're not going to do things like that with your preclear. He's an energy unit, only you're trying to bail him out of being an energy unit, you see, because he's not really an energy unit. And as long as he continues to be an energy unit he will continue to be unstable, chaotic and upset.

You can handle energy in the MEST universe with engineering principles, but don't try to keep your preclear in the area of energy if you expect him to get well. Bring him out into the area of postulates.

What's wrong with the IV and the V, and particularly the V? (This is what characterizes the V.) He's dug in on flows. He deals with flows, dispersals and ridges. Everything he's trying to do somehow or other gets connected up with flows, dispersals, ridges -- that is to say, condensed energy -- and the more that energy condenses, the worse off he is. And he's trying to live with this stuff, and he's trying to subsist on this stuff, and he's trying to make this stuff do what? Predict reason. He's trying to make this stuff summate into reasonable things. He's going at the bottom level of unreason and trying to bring reason out of it, and because it won't work he gets worse and worse and worse.

Now IV: a IV-level case is characterized by the fact he's using energy, even in thinking. He thinks with energy, he wants stimulus-response levels, he wants automaticity like mad; but he's still trying to start things.

And a V is using energy even worse and things are much more solid on him, but we can characterize him first as he's very deeply dug into energy, and what's he trying to do? He's trying to stop things. Whatever he thinks he's trying to do, he's trying to stop things. And we have an overall law applying to technique and that is to say, whatever is happening with the preclear, make him do it more so and then cut it down and bring it under control. If he's trying to start things, make him start lots of things and make him start them going more and more and bigger and bigger and then slow him down slightly, and then make him do it more and more and then slow him down; and then all of a sudden he will be able to bring things to a stop. We have taught him to stop things. He's high enough up, then, so that he will go on out through the top, and he will be able to stop what he has started.

Your V can't start things very well, but if he starts things, if things do get started, boy, he'll sure try to stop them, somehow or other; because even though he tries to start things they wind up with a stop. But when he tries to stop things he finds them starting. He's right there in the middle of reverse flows. When he wants to start things, why, they stop on him, and when he wants to stop things they start on him. He's still very reasonable about this. He still is reasonable; he conceives that this is a reasonable idea.

Now therefore it tells you there's a little band between these two arbitrary divisions of a IV-level case and a V-level case which is a start-stop: a fairly equal band which is using flows.

Yes, your IV will descend down far enough to where for a little while he'll be successful in thinking with flows. He's also successful a little bit above IV, but that success is very short-lived because the use of flows is downwards on the tone scale. The use of flows as thinking things and so -- is downward.

Now you can't use much GITA on a V, because a V is trying to stop things. Therefore you want things to move into him? Uh-uh. They'll stop. Or if he tries to stop things, they go off and get very erratic. So one of the first things you want to do is teach him there is a stability and that something will work the way he says it will work. And this will be a great deal of relief to your V-level case. Something will happen because he says it'll happen. You see, he's pretty well stopped believing that. He's using energy and he thinks he is energy, and he's very thoroughly dug in to it, and he's very accustomed to saying "It'll go right," and it goes left; "It'll go up," and it goes down. And this is the way his life kind of runs. He'll say, "Well, I suppose just because I want the thing is the best reason why I can't have it. Just because I don't want it, I'll probably get it." And that's true, that's true. Thinking with energy and so

forth, why, he's experienced this countless times. The reversal takes place. He'll say, "I want to be good," and the first thing you know he'll find himself doing something that's bad. And he'll say, "I'm not supposed to be doing this." That's all right, he's doing it, isn't he?

Now, of course, with a IV and with a V, with a VI, with a VII, you have people deeply immersed (you might say) in energy, who are obeying energy instead of energy obeying them. We have dropped below the level of good control. They are more controlled than they are trying to control, but because they are still alive they are trying to control still; they have not given up. Not until VI does the fellow really start to give up. And when you hit VII, he has given up but he's still alive (and of course he's mad as a hatter at VII).

Now, the solution to your IV and V is contained in the phrase which you will find in the chart book: Cure him of using flows for anything, that's that. I mean, we summate the solution and any technique existing for IV's and V's on just that line: Cure him of using flows.

Well, we do this in several ways. The first way with a V that we use is to show him that something will happen because he says it will happen. And that, by the way, will be a matter of considerable interest to him. You will be amazed how interested a person will get if he'll suddenly discover that something simple happens just because he says it will happen. And you just get him up the level and working until something does happen just because he says it'll happen. And that is a black spot -- Black and White Spot Control. You get him up to a point of where he says there, "A black spot will now appear upon the wall," and, so help me, it does.

Now, he can get to this point in several ways. There is another method. You tell him to get the idea there's somebody else standing out there putting a black spot on the wall. And he can very often get it once removed when he can't get it himself. And then once in a while he can mock up somebody out there (this vague concept, hardly a mock-up at all) and say, "Yes, that person is now putting a black spot on the wall, because I can see it." Mm-hm, mm-hm, that's great, that's great. Well, if he can mock up a concept of a person who's putting a black spot on the wall, and he knows they're doing it because he can now see it, he can see the black spot, can't he? And he can also put the black spot on the wall.

Now he wants to be able to turn a black spot on and turn it off, and you want him to be able to turn a white spot on and turn it off. You want him to be able to enlarge and decrease a black spot, enlarge and decrease a white spot. He can get these things

very conceptually at first and very thinly, but if you keep drilling him, you will get this tremendous point of relief on his part. Something happens just because he says it is going to happen.

You'll get these fellows going around and they'll get quite an attitude of contempt, by the way, for the MEST universe when they first discover this. It's very interesting to watch. They'll be walking down the street and they'll feel a little bit low on something or other, and all of a sudden they'll say "Bang!" and they'll put a black spot on the side of a bus or something of the sort. It's there. They turn it off again. Very pleased with themselves. Something happened because they say it'll happen, and nothing interferes with it. Now there is a big jump, and there is the break of the case on a V.

Now there's very many things that you can do with a V to bring about a better state of affairs. Some of the techniques used in IV can also be employed on V, but less useably.

You're trying to get him over using flows. And one of the ways to get him over using flows is to show that he doesn't have to be controlled by flows. The basic attitude of a V could be characterized as follows: He wants to be valuable, and he wants people to think he is valuable. How valuable can anything get? Solid.

Now a V along the criminal track down along the line will go the opposite way. He wants to get as really valueless as he can get, which is practically the same thing. And how valueless can anybody get? Solid again.

At the bottom of the scale, just as at the top of the scale, this whole idea of value is simply an assigned adjudication occasioned by a postulate. In other words, value is something that's decided by somebody saying something is valuable. That's all. Somebody can come in, and he could -- he could probably train a whole society, from one end of the society to the other, to believe that lumps of coal should be worshiped.

There was one fellow down in Rome convinced people one time that money should be made out of iron. They had no medium of exchange because they couldn't cart these iron coins around; they were too big, these huge iron coins. That was the medium of exchange. He wanted to cure them of using money, so he made money too heavy to be transportable. And of course the economics of the little community fell to pieces and it fell to pieces and everything fell to pieces, because he was still trying to exist in the middle of a community which demanded a medium of exchange. In other words, he was trying to make somebody continue to exist in the middle of energy without using energy. This is silly.

Just as it's silly for you to take a V and try to patch him up with flows. You're trying to get him off from using flows by having him sit in the middle of a society, a community and people who use flows.

Theta Clearing is the answer to this. That's why it makes so much difference to have somebody get outside and, with Step II, begin to use postulates. This bails them out of it. This picks them up out of it. So you want the directest, most beeline route you can get, from Case V bogged down in the middle of flows, to making a postulate -- making postulates and living by them instead of by flows.

Your V when he becomes -- I guess fascism is probably at about the bottom of IV, as a step, and probably the top side of a V. But it's on the criminal track. You see, we could -- we could have two tracks going down there, you see? You have the people who are trying to be valuable and the people who are trying to be as invaluable -- I mean as valueless as possible. And they'd both be the same-level case. So don't get upset about this. That's why your V, if he tries to be very good and tries to be very valuable, often considers himself very degraded and no good. And why your criminal, like Pretty Boy Floyd or some such character, will suddenly say (He's a famous criminal; he shot cops and things, and became therefore very famous. About the only way you can get famous anymore. Anyway -- unfortunately.) -- in prison at the last -- the last interviews that he granted, he was still telling people he was just a good boy trying to get along. One of his tricks, by the way: He found a couple of lovers sitting out in a car and so forth, and he shot them both dead. No reason; they weren't even armed. But he was a good boy trying to get along, you see? He believed implicitly he was a good boy. Yet his actual motive, in everything he did, was to demonstrate to society he was no good to it at all -- a liability to it. Now, of course, because a V is on flows, this would bring him to believe that he was a good boy.

Now, a person who's trying to be good at Level V, and knows he's trying to be good and do good things, will believe what? That he's no good and that he's actually a liability. And that's about the first thing you'll find out about a Case V. If you start plumbing around inside of him, you will discover that he is totally convinced that he is degraded and no good and that he's not doing anybody any good; and if he really does anything, it will all wind up harmfully anyhow. But he's trying to safeguard against it somehow.

Well, that's the basic characteristic of flows. He tries to be good: he's bad. And you see this very heavily at Case Level V. The worst thing you could do then, really, is to keep this fellow

believing that flows are valuable. And one of the first mistakes you could make is to show him that good results resulted from processing out flows, that flows could be used to process something out. This shows him that flows have a value.

I see from your faces we missed this one on Creative Processing. That's why Creative Processing takes such a terrific precedence when we start to get down to particularly Case Level IV, V. Oh boy! Because if you start running incidents, you can run a few incidents without getting into trouble; but the next thing you know, you've educated your V into believing what he already believes and what you should have cured him of: that running flows back and forth is of value to him. So you've shown him a new way where flows are valuable.

And you've taught him then to be more aberrated than he is, because you've taught him that flows should be used. In what? Processing.

Of course I missed this point coming up the line, so don't you look so surprised and hurt. It was something which turned up only when this later material began to turn up. I don't think it did anything harmful to people particularly, but it pinned a few V's down right where they were on the track: V. Because you start processing a V, and you start processing (quote) "real incidents"; it really isn't processing (quote) "real incidents" (unquote) that upset him. It's flows.

You've shown him flows are valuable. And he believed this all the time, and you've just confirmed this. And how are flows valuable now? They are valuable because they can be used to process out the incidents which he is -- well, for heaven's sakes, those incidents consist of only one thing: energy deposits and flows. So, you see, you've shown him that the incidents are valuable.

Now, he'll instinctively go in this direction because he really is living at this level. He's living at the level where he wants to use energy. Energy is terribly valuable, but energy controls him. He thinks by eating something or other, or something of the sort, that this energy resulting therein is going to do him a lot of good. He'll live in terms of energy, energy, energy, energy -- input of energy. Now he's gone over the thing; he doesn't believe now that he puts out much energy. He thinks any energy he uses has got to be put in. It has to be put in first, and then he puts it out. And there is his conviction.

Now a person can have this conviction, by the way, and not be a Case Level V, but if that's the case, he's still young. "It'll catch up with him," he said gruesomely. It will, too. That's your deterioration of your youth. Beautiful wide-open case at 15, occluded as the dickens at 25. Of course, at 15 he had the

concept already that he had to take in energy in order to have energy, in order to use energy; and in order to get anything done, including thinking, he had to use energy. And that's the conviction that catches up with a V and makes what we're calling a Case Level V. He's convinced of the necessity and the value of energy. And he's convinced of value. Oh, is he convinced of value! He will very often be a complete expert on the subject of value.

You go down here and look at the expert who is the expert down at some big cloth establishment downtown, and you will find: "Who is your expert now on the value of costs of goods?" They'll take you and introduce you to a V, just like that, bang! Inevitable.

You go down to the big house and you ask (I mean the penitentiary) -- and you ask, "Who is the best -- who is the best authority down here on breaking and entering? Who really ever made a specialty, good specialty, out of breaking and entering? Or who became a fence?" and so forth. And they'll take you into a cell someplace and introduce you to a Case Level V.

Value. These people are value-happy. Really! It's gruesome because, you see, that value is a pretense. But we have an overall picture of what valuableness is. Value can be something very solid or something expansive. And an invaluable thing (We have a precise definition of this. I hope you'll -- hope you'll note this very carefully.), something that is not worthless, but something which is negatively valuable, something which you just don't want under any circumstances, is either very expansive or very solid. I want you to get that very carefully. Something which is terribly valuable is either very expansive and wide open or very solid. And that is differentiated between something which has -- which has a negative value, which is a liability and so forth. Now that liability thing is quite different. It is something which is very expansive and very solid, either one of the two.

Of course, because there isn't any such thing as value. The whole value is what you assign with a postulate. So value's got nothing really to do with it, but you will assign -- you will find your preclear assigning on those two bases. Something's either got to be very expansive or something's quite solid in order to be valuable. And something to be dangerous or invaluable or a liability has to be either expansive or solid. He has no differentiation between a solid thing as a negative value and a - - he's agreed with other people that diamonds are valuable and that something or other isn't valuable. And he's made quite a cult out of this, you understand, that something very solid -- he's got names of various things.

If you were to pick up a savage, however, and bring him in (who

hadn't been educated along these lines) and show him all these items and say, "Which is valuable?" you'll get the same reaction as the Filipinos get whenever they show them a movie. You show them an American western movie. They set up these little screens out there in the boondocks, and the Filipinos come from all around and they look at these movies out there in the open air, and it's very perplexing to Americans who go around -- used to go around and take these movies around and show them, because they always cheered the wrong man! They had no good evaluation on this situation at all. Nobody had educated them into this, you see? You have to be very careful about this. You have to tell people, "Now look, this is valuable and this is not valuable," and if you repeat that often enough they'll eventually agree that this is the case.

Now there are some things which are valueless because they're scarce. You know, "There isn't enough of something or other, so therefore we don't use it. We use something else. It would be very, very nice if we could use something or other in the manufacture of something or other but it's too scarce, and therefore this other will do just about as well so we use that." We could say, "This commodity is terribly valuable because it's so scarce, and that's why it's so very valuable is because it's scarce." And the other is, "This just has no value because it's scarce."

I mean, of course you should get about this time about how reasonable a V is. You see, they have to be educated into the valuation. Now, if they're educated into these valuations, one will get them one way and the other will get them another way and Rrrrrm. They'll get going backwards and forwards.

Now, in order to obtain something valuable, a V will very often obtain something not valuable. Or if he gets something not valuable he'll tell people it's valuable, or if he gets something that is valuable he'll then realize that it's not valuable at all. He has this peculiar manifestation almost at every turn: Anything he acquires he finds to be worthless as soon as he has it himself. That is to say, he just decides the reverse about it. He goes out, he would -- he practically kills himself shoveling coal or writing, copying letters in a nice, tight hand or something of the sort, doing something antipathetic to him in order to get a little pile of money. And when he gets this pile of money together it's just so -- he was doing all this just so that he could -- he could buy a big Roodybile. And he gets this Roodybile, and you'd think with all that work put into it that it would of course -- of course he gets it, it doesn't matter what condition this Roodybile is in or anything else; he knows that he doesn't want it and it's no good.

Value keeps shifting on him. Well, of course it can shift,

because something that isn't there can always change. There is no such thing as value in a MEST object. There is opinion of value of a MEST object. And your V's got it pegged in terms of flow.

Now, therefore I hope that sounds very unreasonable to you. I hope all of that sounds completely unreasonable to you because if it sounds nice and unreasonable that if you work for something and get it, why, then you'll find it very valuable for a moment - - just before you put your hands on it, it's very valuable -- and then it becomes valueless. Or you've tried to keep from having this thing all the time because you knew it was dangerous, and then after you get the thing, why, you know it's very valuable. "Yeah, well, there's a good reason why I have this, it... uh, it's very valuable, they're very hard to get actually, and so forth and uh..."

You'll find some people doing this with disease, by the way. They tried to keep from getting this and they tried to keep from getting it, and they worried about it and worried about it, and then one day they get it. And then they say, "Well, it's all right because I draw a pension for it," and they have a vested interest in this illness, something of that sort.

A person will do that with engrams. He'll say, "Well, I have to have these engrams because that explains why I'm..."

But the amount of logic which is employed at the Level V to explain the unexplainable is wonderful. They use terrific quantities of logic. In fact, most of the philosophers have been V's. There is nothing quite as specious as logic based on flows. You can prove anything by them.

Ten thousand knights go down to the Holy Land and get killed in a crusade. To prove what? That ten thousand knights can go down to the Holy Land and get killed in a crusade, of course. "Well, it's because the Holy Land is valuable." Why is it valuable? "Well, there's so much land there and there are jewels there." People around right now write resounding books and say, "The crusades really took place because of the riches of the Holy Land, and nobody was inspired by any motive whatsoever except to grab some of the land and some of the jewels which were down in the Holy Land, and that was the real reason for the crusades; that's why the knights went down there."

Other people say, "Well, no, that's wrong, it's really -- it was a high and something-or-other motive and they went down there for some other reason and..." You know, men will get -- if you see two men out beating each other up, they normally started to beat each other up on that basis. It was some kind of an assignment of value on which they were disagreeing. They were disagreeing about that, and what they disagree about is something is valuable, and

somebody else says it's not valuable. One guy says, "Now, this is logical," and the other fellow says, "This isn't logical"; and the joke is neither one is logical.

So, your V will do this: he will come in and give you -- you can always recognize a V; you do not have to worry about recognizing the bad-off V -- he comes in and gives you the computation of his case. Right there, you know he's a V. His case is "logical." Oh, bull! It's not logical. Never was, never will be. That's what's wrong with him, is that his case is logical to him. "You see, it's all because..." and so forth.

Freudosis worked along this line. (That was a disease they got in 1894. It was a new disease that came in: Freudosis.) It worked because somebody was willing to take the responsibility for assigning value. And they said, "Look, it's all sex. There it is."

And they said, "Thank God somebody's taken responsibility on an authoritarian level to say what's wrong, and it's sex. Gee! Boy, that's wonderful! That's really great."

Of course, we occasionally suspect that it isn't quite true, but that's the best reason in the world then to get in and fight like mad to prove that it is true.

Authoritarian material has a tendency to close lines of investigation. And a closed line of investigation doesn't go anyplace, any more than any other closed line. And that primarily, because you had such a terrifically assigned value to a computation, was why Freudian psychoanalysis didn't keep going. And it should have kept going, it should have kept developing, it should have kept advancing, because they had some basic mechanisms which were true and which were workable. And if they'd just gone on without insisting on assigning the value and said, "We've got some mechanisms, some functional material, and this functional process has produced here and there this result. Now if we just look a little harder and find out why this result keeps getting produced," they would have found out that the functional operation of it will produce results, because it disabuses people of assigning values.

Somebody has been nursing close to his heart for years the fact that he bites his fingernails. He doesn't want anybody else to know this. And one day he says to somebody, "You know..." By the way, they will do this with you on another subject. You'll see a preclear and he'll have a haunted look in his eye and you'll process him for a couple of sessions, and all of a sudden he will blurt out this horrible confession. And then he'll be perfectly free and relaxed and relieved about the whole thing.

You wonder why this took place. It's because you didn't smack him.

He's known for years that his assignment of value was that this is so horrible that if he ever let it loose he was going to get smacked, that's all. If people knew this about him, it would just ruin him. And all of a sudden here is a human being that knows about it suddenly, and nothing happened; so he can change his value on it. Up to that time he didn't put it to proof to find out whether or not it had a value or didn't have a value. So he puts it to test. Does it have a value? No, it doesn't have a value. So he's relieved, that's all.

Now, where you get, then, value assigned heavily in terms of activities, in terms of this, in terms of that, or value assigned heavily to objects, or value assigned heavily to types of energy, you're unfortunately looking at a V. And he's going to get logical about his case, and that's what you've got to cure him of. I can't say that too often.

Your V is characteristic. He'll -- sometimes you'll get a V who will walk in, and he will have five or six typewritten sheets which he will give you. And he's thought all these things about his case since the last time he saw you, and you're supposed to read all those things. And then the next time you turn around he's thought up all these things about his case, and he's decided it's something else and he wants you to read all those and he... You try to keep up with that sort of thing; well, let's look at its common denominator. What's wrong with the fellow? What's wrong with the fellow's logic? Logic is association. He's associating too closely and he has to make something logical which isn't. If it occurred to him that it was not logical, he would probably at that moment be cured -- that actually a condition of illogic could exist, he would be in much better shape.

Now think of that for a moment. The concept that a situation without explanation can exist will snap the logical sequence of a V. So non sequitur Creative Processing will do it, just Self Analysis on and on and on and on; and you'll eventually find him starting to get these non sequiturs. Of course Self Analysis, line by line, is non sequitur. It is not logical. It breaks connections. Mock-up to mock-up, there is no reason between the two mock-ups. And you'll just eventually destroy this even flow of nonsense he's calling logic. You'll just shoot it full of holes, and it interrupts; and after that he's not logical about it, and so he's better. And he'll get up the tone scale and you can snap him out of his body.

The reason he is in his body is assignment of value. He has assigned so much value to this body that he couldn't possibly

exist himself, because he knows he's no good, but the body's good, but he's the body. What's more illogical than that?

So he assigns value to all kinds of bodies; but he's very often in a condition where he can't mock up, so you can't play GITA with him and cure him of the scarcity of bodies and so forth with GITA.

Now there is another way of doing it. And this technique I'm going to give you right now in a general discussion. I said it's either very condensed or it's very expansive. Now, the bottom of the tone scale is, as we took at it, in actuality, viewed from the level of theta, solid. Whether valuable or invaluable or -- I mean, or worthless, the bottom of the tone scale is solid. Because what we've got there is not because that's logical either; that's an arbitrary assignment of numbers demonstrating a certain course and cycle of action. And when we use that set of rules with which to orient a case, we get a specific result; and that result happens to be an escapement from energy, and the handling and use and manufacture of space and energy by the means of a postulate. And that's what we're doing, you see? We're trying to get that, and there's nothing less logical than a series of postulates. You don't have to make postulates logical.

Maybe you have no reason whatsoever to have a white cat now sitting on the front steps with perhaps a sprig of holly in its mouth. You would find people come along and they would look at this white cat -- particularly if it was an inanimate thing, it was a statue -- with a sprig of holly in its mouth, assigning all kinds of reasons as to why we had a white cat sitting on the front steps with a sprig of holly in its mouth.

Now, if you put a blue bow on the tail, you would practically ruin fifty percent of the people who walked by; because it's got to be logical, and this is not logical. And if you named the place the Blue Ox and put up a statue of this white cat with a sprig of holly in its mouth and a blue bow on its tail, they'd go mad!

Well, only those would go mad who are immersed in energy. A little kid -- who isn't yet dug in on this subject at all, feels very free, he hasn't learned his body's terribly valuable, he hasn't been convinced of it and all keyed in, he's just keyed out for the moment -- he's walking by and he says, "Look, there's the Blue Ox and you'll know it because it has a white cat, and you'll know that's the white cat because it has a sprig of holly." He'll just locate by it, that's all. Or maybe he won't even bother to locate. You can't get little kids to locate anything for you. They're not interested in this psychosis. It's non sequitur.

V has to be cured of having to have everything reasonable.

Now, way, way up on the tone scale, along the level of postulates, you can hang together the track of agreements and things which led this into being. So every once in a while if you processed a V on logic, you just processed him with flows and ran out some incidents, you will get a sporadic result. Every few V's, you will get somebody who is suddenly in wonderful condition because you did what? From up here on the tone scale, you suddenly shot out from underneath him the train of agreement which led into his conviction that he has to use energy. And you just went boom! and this went to pieces and he's in wonderful shape.

Well, you will look at that case and you will say, "Now look, that case was about that level on the tone scale, it was behaving this way and that; therefore, every case which we have should behave that way. So therefore, let's process out this kind of incident in every one of these cases and throw away all the failures, and not took at those anymore but just take these selected successes."

Well, you see, there was a -- there's a higher-level thing here, and that is the fact, by shooting -- you did this accidentally. You cured him of using energy by shooting some sort of an agreement out from under him. You didn't cure him because you ran out an engram. Did you get that? That's different, isn't it? You cured him because you cured him of using energy. You just happened to hit the combination in the case -- which might be available in any case, only it doesn't seem to be by experience - - you just happened to hit this combination of agreements which led into his using energy; and it was available and it did unwind, and there it is lying out there in the open, and you shot it out. And all of a sudden he's using postulates again, and he's not using energy. He's in good shape; yes sir.

But what you did was cure him of using energy. And you used only one of the methods which is -- happens only every few cases. You just used the one -- one of the methods of curing him of using energy. You happened to shoot out this particular agreement, and that happened to cure him of using energy.

And do you got that one? Because you are dealing with a fellow -- now you would say offhand that if -- here's a fellow -- here's a fellow who is drowning, and you just throw him buckets full of stuff. And some of the buckets have salt in them and some of them have water in them and some of them have other things in them, but you just keep throwing him buckets full of stuff, you see? Well, if you throw him enough stuff with -- if you threw enough buckets of salt down there fast enough, the water would get buoyant enough so he couldn't sink. But you couldn't count on that; you might be throwing him buckets of water. And you're at

the make-or-break point in the case of whether or not you're throwing him buckets of salt or buckets of water. They're both clumsy ways to save a drowning man, both of them very clumsy, and you can't be sure whether or not you're picking up -- you see, you're at the break point of this case. This fellow's just right at that line. He's still able to use logic and get along, he's still able to employ energy and get along, he's still convinced that energy is good stuff and he still knows it's dangerous. And he's on all of this whole track of maybes, you see? Which way are you going to teeter the seesaw?

Well, as an auditor, if you were able to look at his whole track without stirring it up with questions, you could determine which side of the line he was on and exactly what you would do, and it would be a very neat operation, let me assure you. You'd have to do very good auditing, and you'd have to be able to see that track without stirring it up.

And every case, then, if you knew exactly what to knock out to break his chain of agreement on the subject of energy, bang! every case would snap up the line. And that would be on Standard Procedure 1950. But, boy, you'd really have to be an expert to get every one of them across that barrier and up that line. You would have to know what you were doing to shoot circuits out, and to do this, and to take just enough burden off of this case in some direction or another to accomplish this.

I hate to have to tell you that about Standard Operating Procedure 1950. It happened that there were a few auditors (unfortunately, myself amongst them) who were dealing with a Q factor: another factor that had something to do with this. In other words, you just sort of boot the fellow over the top.

You just pick him up with the energy or enthusiasm or something or other. And you could just grab guys by the scruff of the neck and bring them up into the -- above this level of being drowning in energy, you might say, drowning in objects and so on. You'd bring them up to a level of insouciance where they could act, possibly by your own attitude as much as anything else. So it was that factor floating around inside these techniques, and it was trying to isolate factors like this, which made it necessary for me to go on with investigation.

I knew what I could do. I didn't know what auditors could do, and it's taken me a couple of years more to find that out.

Now, therefore let's not deal with one of these techniques which requires such a level of (quote) "judgment" (unquote) on the part of an auditor, for the love of Pete. Oh, yeah, an auditor who is a real artist: oh, he can do this, yeah, sure, sure. Introduces enough Q factors and has enough sensitivity about the patient,

and does this and does that, and so forth. A psychoanalyst can do it, too. There are a few psychoanalysts in the world that keep the whole profession running. Why? Because they're doing things they don't know what themselves are doing. They -- people go in and they find this person there, and this person is in terrible condition. This person is going in and they see this psychoanalyst, and for some reason or other this psychoanalyst says "Mng-a-gark" to them and "Br-br-owp" to them; they feel fine, they go out and that's the end of that.

Somebody says, "Psychoanalysis works because look at Dr. Whumpwhump. He's got terrific records of cures!"

And somebody else comes along and says, "You know, you have to have a certain sensitivity, and the reason Dianetics works is -- the only reason it works is because Hubbard has a sensitivity, or these other auditors, just a few of them have sens..." That's true, that was true. That was -- when it was really working on a real rough case, and so forth, there was that extra balance factor was evidently needed. The understanding was there, and Dianetics never pretended to be anything else but an understanding of existence.

But the technique of application required a certain nneh. Doesn't now; it doesn't require that. It requires just a fairly direct approach. Technique of application, then, would lag behind proof of theory: naturally would.

So, let's took at your V, and he was the break point. Your V's didn't get well easily on old techniques. They required some real auditing. They required the same kind of auditing that psychoanalysis gave from their best practitioners: a certain magic flirt of the wrist that would suddenly make somebody well.

That doesn't mean psychoanalysis works, but it means that human beings sometimes work on other human beings.

Now, you're not -- with these Operating Procedures and in Scientology, we aren't fighting that factor. We've got that factor licked. We're working now with a very solid thing. We're working with a technique which, if it's relatively, mechanically applied to a case, will (snap!) break that case over the barrier into using postulates and living on postulates and not living on energy and objects. And we've got the techniques necessary to do that, but that's the break point at V. And so at V we have to do these techniques carefully, and we have to do them very thoroughly, and we have to know exactly what we're doing. We're trying to cure a guy of using energy, who, if we use energy to cure him of using energy, will usually dive to a lower level than V, and will go into VI.

So that's why you don't run incidents on V's any more than you can help, because sometimes they'll get well and sometimes they won't get well. And you don't want any such maybes existing in a technique. You don't want any maybes at all. You want to know that if you do so-and-so and so-and-so, then this and this will happen. And that is what? The most extreme demand that you can make of a technique, with the additional demand that let's do it rapidly.

We've for a long time been able to bail out V's, one way or the other. But bail them out fast, that's what we're interested in. And that's what Standard Operating Procedure Issue 5 Long Form is devoted to, is bailing out that V, and that VI who becomes a V, fast. And we want to get him out of the energyflow idea and out of using energy, and in this wise we'll get him up into a IV area and go on and get him up into a III, and get him up to a II, and get him up to a I.

And we don't want to have to expend eighteen thousand hours doing it. So I'll try to give you that technique in the second half of this evening's talk.

Let's take a break.

[End of Lecture]