VIEWPOINT STRAIGHTWIRE

A lecture given on
3 May 1954

And this is a lecture on viewpoint Straightwire, a process which is very simple, very easy to use and has continuous advances.

This process is not mixed with other processes; it's not part of any Standard Operating Procedure; it's not part of anything that you would do ordinarily; it doesn't particularly apply to one case level or another case level. It is an independent process which in itself is very simple to administer. It can be, I suppose, self-audited, but I wouldn't advise it offhand.

The formula of this process is: all those definitions and Axioms, arrangements and scales of Scientology should be used in such a way as to bring about a greater tolerance of such viewpoints on the part of the preclear. That's a formula. That means that any scale there is - any arrangement of fundamentals in thinkingness, beingness - could be so given in a Straight-wire that it would bring about a higher state of tolerance on the part of the preclear.

To make this more intelligible, you should understand what a great many preclears are doing and why an auditor occasionally has trouble with one preclear more than another preclear. A great many preclears are being processed solely and entirely because they are unable to bring themselves to tolerate an enormous number of viewpoints, and being unable to tolerate these viewpoints they desire processing so that they can fall away from them and not have to observe them. And the auditor is auditing somebody who is in full retreat, and Scientology is being used to aid and abet the retreat. By taking the charge off of an engram, the auditor at once gives the preclear something in the way of a change of viewpoint, in that he erases something so the preclear doesn't have to view it anymore.

Well, as you can see, this is a weak direction - he erases something so the preclear doesn't have to view it. In other words, what the auditor is doing is to some degree holding in question the ability of the preclear to tolerate viewpoints.

Time itself may very well be caused by an intolerance of past viewpoints. A person doesn't want viewpoints in the past, and so at a uniform rate he abandons past viewpoints. And when he no longer is following this uniform rate but is abandoning them faster than the uniform rate, he starts to jam in terms of time and becomes obsessed about time, becomes very hectic, begins to rush time, push hard against the events of the day, feels that he doesn't have enough time to accomplish everything he's supposed to accomplish. And this falls off on a very rapid curve to a point where an individual will simply sit around idle, fully cognizant of the fact that he doesn't have enough time to do anything and so doesn't do anything, but knows he should be doing something but can't do anything because he doesn't have enough time.

This is idiocy itself, but is the state in which you find a great many preclears. Time is a single arbitrary which entered into life, is well worth investigating on the part of an auditor.

Now, an unwillingness to tolerate viewpoints will cause a jam in time. The fewer viewpoints which an individual will tolerate, the greater his occlusion and the worse his general state of beingness is. As I said, an auditor can remedy this in various ways. He can erase locks and engrams, and by erasing them make it possible for the individual to tolerate the view he finds in his own bank. Or, an individual can be so processed, as in exteriorization, that he can be caused to go around and look at various things and find they're not so bad.

Now let's just take the mean between these two and realize that a person who doesn't exteriorize is a person who does not want an exteriorized viewpoint: he does not feel he can tolerate an exteriorized viewpoint. He may have many reasons for this, but one of the main reasons he will give, of course, is that somebody may steal his body and so forth. In other

words, here you have a tremendously valuable viewpoint which he's liable to lose if he exteriorizes.

But, viewpoints then must be scarce, viewpoints are obviously too valuable to be used, and this comes about by viewpoints becoming intolerable.

Let's take somebody standing watching his family being butchered by soldiers or something of the sort - Indians or other wild people. And he would go along afterwards so intolerant of this viewpoint that he would fixate on it. It's the fact that he refuses to tolerate the viewpoint which makes him fixate on it.

Now, the reason for this lies in the various agree-disagree scales in the Doctorate lectures: the fact that if you want anything in this universe, you can't have it; if you don't want it, you're going to get it. This is an inversion, and when this inversion comes about, an individual finds himself overwhelmed each time on whatever his own determinism is. If he starts to desire something, he will find out immediately that he can't have it. Actually, he himself will take steps to make sure that he can't have it.

The point is that you have an inversion: when he wants something to flow in, it flows out; when he wants something to flow out, it flows in.

Now, there's nothing more pathetic than watching a psychotic try to give up any material object. I processed a psychotic just on this basis: trying to make them give me or give up or throw away one possession, such as an old Kleenex or almost anything - just try to make them give it up. No, no, they just won't do it. The material object is there, they clutch it to them, and I swear that if you handed them an adder, wide-mouthed and fully-fanged, they would clutch it to their bosom. Anything that comes in, they immediately seize, and that's that.

Now, you as an auditor are trying to make somebody give up something. In essence, you give up a compulsive viewpoint. Well, every time you ask them to give up something, they're liable to hold it closer.

Now, there are many processes - there are a great many processes. There's all the Standard Operating Procedures, and oddly enough in good hands they all work. There's Universe Processing; there's Advanced Course Procedure; there's Creative Processing, on and on and on and on; the tremendous, tremendous amount of technique which can be applied with good sense to a preclear.

There's enormous numbers of Straightwire. There's old-time Straight-wire, the most basic Straightwire there is, which by the way is better than Freudian analysis. It's a marked advance on Freudian analysis, the first Straightwire we ever had, which... We notice that the preclear is afraid of cats, so we say, "All right. Now, let's recall a time when you were afraid of cats." "Now, let's recall somebody who was afraid of cats." "Now, let's find a time when somebody said you were like this person." That was, to some degree, its formula.

Just Straightwire, and you sprung apart these valences very gently. However, it required a great deal of good sense on the part of an auditor. An auditor now and then would become a Straightwire expert and by just asking such searching questions and causing the individual to recall certain things, he would bring about a great deal of relief on the case.

Why did the relief take place? The individual has been going along in the full belief that he could not tolerate a certain viewpoint. And the auditor has come along and demonstrated to him that the viewpoint was in the past and therefore is tolerable. There's, in essence, the fundamentals of such Straightwire. You get key-outs on this type of Straightwire.

Well, there's that process which is: get the individual in present time so he isn't looking at the past. That's a goal of a great many processes. Another one is: wipe out the past so he won't have to look at it or experience it.

We have in Viewpoint Straightwire a very, very new type of thinking in this. This is a new type of thinking. This is not to be confused with what we have been doing for the... lo, these many years. It hasn't any connection with it. You should think of this as something entirely different, because it has an entirely different goal than any process you ve ever done on a preclear. It takes the benefit of exteriorization and reduces it to Straightwire. We get an individual to race around the universe and look at things, observe things, experience things. That's Grand Tour and that sort of drill, and reduces it right down to Straightwire which is done interiorized or exteriorized. One simply goes on the basis that the preclear is in the state he is in, because he is not tolerating many viewpoints. And the entire goal of the process is to bring him to a point where he will tolerate viewpoints. That's all there is to the process. The key wording of the process is, "... you wouldn't mind."

All right, let's give an example of this. Why do I announce this as something important, something new, something that is very useful to you and so forth? That's because, as I told you a few days ago in a lecture, there are many varieties of viewpoint. If we were to take knowingness and squash it, we would find we were first getting into space, which would be perception. We have to "perceive to know." Now, if we condense that, we find out that we have to get "emote to know." The person has to emote. We squash perception and we get into "emotion to know." Now, if we squash down and condense even further emotion, we get effort; and if we condense effort even further, we get thinkingness; and if we condense and package thinkingness, we get symbols (as an example of this, what is a word but a package of thought); and if we were to condense symbols, we would get actually the wider definition of a symbol - we would get animals.

It's very strange, when you think about it. You're probably thinking about it in terms of a viewpoint of a body, if you don't see that clearly. But the definition of a symbol is a mass with meaning which is mobile. And that is a symbol. And of course that is an animal, too. An animal has certain form which gives him certain meaning, and he is mobile.

And if you see that thinkingness condenses, then, into form, you will understand art, just in so many words - a very simple thing. You have thinkingness condensing into symbols, in other words, ideas are condensing into actually solid objects. And when these are mobile, we have these symbols, and when these symbols are observed, they are found to line themselves up with other symbols and take and associate - associate with one and another and take things from one another - and you get eating.

That's a big band we're covering in there. That's the whole business from "I have an idea about a form, in this space and matter, and I'm going to get it all together, and I'm going to make this mass together." Well, the second we've done that, something has been created. Now, don't expect that thing which has been created to create anything, because it won't. So, it is a thing which isn't creating and therefore must subsist on an interchange of energy, and we get eating.

Now we take eating and condense it down - that is to say, let's make food scarce and let's make it very hard to get - and we got a condensation, you might say, which completely escapes time itself. And you go outside of time and get sex - that is to say, the outside of present time and you get future time, which is sex. An individual goes right straight off the time track between eating and sex, and there's nothing will float on a time track like a sexual engram. They just float all over the time track; they don't nail down at all; they're very mobile. Believe me.

And the individual, in eating, starts to slide out of present time by this token alone - and most people are terribly worried how are they going to eat tomorrow. And when they reduce this down to the reductio ad gastronomy, you get to a point where "I can't solve the problem of eating tomorrow, so, therefore, I'd better just leave it all up to somebody else and slide in on the genetic protoplasm line and go up the line a little bit and get a form and be another form." That's the best way to solve eating, is just to live tomorrow. And maybe tomorrow there will be more food.

This is by the way, such a thoroughly easy thing to perceive that a simple test will demonstrate this. Now, let's take a look at those countries of the world which breed faster and harder than other countries of the world. And we find India and China. And we find that these two countries have the greatest food scarcity. Now, we could say, "Well look, they have the greatest food scarcity because they keep breeding people and that eats up all their food." No, no, it's the other way to: They eat up all their food and so they breed like mad.

And this can be tested with an animal. If you starve an animal, an animal will procreate faster. If you were, for instance, to give any family of Homo sapiens a carbohydrate diet, with a very, very low protein diet... And by the way, this would be, you'd say, terribly unconducive to the production of, well, estrogen, androgen. It's true, it would be very unproductive to it, but if you give them a high carbohydrate and very low protein diet, the next thing you know, they'll start to get very anxious about breeding. You're telling them in essence, right where they can understand it - in their stomachs - that they are unable to obtain enough food today and so must eat tomorrow. Therefore, you get countries of the Western hemisphere, which are very heavily starch-dieted, and you'll find out that these countries are the most anxious about breeding and about tomorrow. Why, no reason to stand around and prove this for hours - it's just the Know to Sex Scale and you get condensed knowingness. "I don't know how I'm going to get along today, so therefore I'd better breed like mad and appear tomorrow and maybe I'll know then" is about the last ditch.

Well, if you notice this, death must come in this band above sex. And the person presupposes his own death, to indulge in the protoplasm line. See that? And so we get people like Schopenhauer and The Will and The Idea and so forth, closely associating sex and death. And we get certain animals and insects and so on, which so closely associate sex and death that they accomplish death when they accomplish sex.

People always - particularly fear merchants who come along - they always like to tell you about the black widow spider. I don't know why the black widow spider is such an attractive beast to some people, but its apparently so. I notice that it exists mainly in California - Southern California. Lots of black widows down there. And most California girls, if you get into any kind of a discussion on the second dynamic at all, will sooner or later inform you that the female black widow spider eats its mate after consummation of the sexual act. I don't know why this is, but well, it's probably Californians. Anyway, the main thing is here is, actually, when you go down this scale - although it doesn't belong on the scale - you'll find death just before sex. In other words, it goes: Know, Look, Emote, Effort, Think, Symbol, Eat, Death, Sex. See, only Death doesn't belong there. But just shows you where this mechanism comes in.

Now, beingness might also be on this scale somewhere. Beingness might be on this scale, and if it were, you would have a tendancy to look for it up toward the top. But the truth of the matter is it's all up and down the scale. And there is no beingness like that beingness at Symbols. And you'll find most of the human race having been made into a form, that is, a mass which is mobile, has meaning - a mass with meaning which is mobile (that's a body, that's a word in a dictionary, that's a flag flying above a building, it can be moved around and so forth). You'll find out that they indulge very, very heavily in being symbols.

Well, you'll find people around being sexual objects too. So that this scale sort of interlocks on beingness. A fellow could be some effort and actually we don't find beingness up at the top of the scale at all, we find it down there pretty low on the scale. So when an individual has gotten to a point where he has to be something, he's practically out the bottom.

Now, that controverts to some slight degree something I said many, many weeks ago on this. But if you remember many weeks ago, I said beingness didn't belong on this scale. Beingness is an activity or a condition and you might as well throw it onto the scale. So I just threw it onto the scale and didn't discuss it further. Further discussion examination would have to put beingness at least at Symbols. A person becomes things at that level. So if you find a preclear madly being his name, where is he?

All right, now let's look this thing over even further and find out that there's - I told you the other day - some different kinds of viewpoints. Well, there's something you might call a "know point" - k-n-o-w point. That would be senior to a viewpoint, wouldn't it? An individual wouldn't have any dependency on space or mass or anything else, he'd simply know where he was.

Now, there'd be a viewpoint, which is a perception point, which would consist of look and smell and talk and hear, and all sorts of things could be thrown in under this category of viewpoint. But ordinarily we simply mean at that level of the scale, looking. But you can throw all the rest of the perceptions in at that level of the scale.

Now, we go down a little bit, and we would get something called an "emotion point." It would be that point from which a person emotes and at which he is emoted.

And then there would be something else called an "effort point." And the "effort point" would be that area from which a person exerted effort and that area into which a person received effort.

And we'd go down a little bit more than that and we'd find we had a "thinking point." And there, of course, we get figure-figure-figure. The person is thinking there, not looking.

And we go down a little bit further than this, and we get into - from a "thinking point," - we just get a "symbol point." And there, really, properly, we get words.

And below that we get an "eating point," and below that we get a "sex point."

If you considered each one of these below Know as an effort to make space, a great deal of human behavior would make sense to you.

Let's take an individual trying to make space with words. He's simply trying to make space with words. Words don't make good space, and so an individual who tries to make space with words sooner or later gets in bad condition.

Now, let's look at another one, much lower than that, and a person who's trying to make space with eating - of course that's inverted, isn't it?

And then there's the person who is trying to make space with sex. And boy, that's really inverted. That goes both ways from the middle.

Of course, part of the eating scale... the lowest part of the eating scale is excreta and urine. And people will try to make space with that. Dogs are always trying to make space, for instance, that way.

Now, then there are people who try to make space with effort. This is the use of force. This is Genghis Khan riding out and slaughtering a bunch of people - he's trying to make space. You notice the space had to exist before he could ride out anyplace.

And we go up a little higher, and maybe you've known somebody who tried to make space with emotion.

And we go up a little higher and we get the way you do make space, which is by looking. Actually you make space by knowing. If you just knew there was some space, there would be some space. That would be about all there was to that, so it's so simple.

Now, that's an effective way to go about it. And looking is another effective way to go about it.

And when we get down to emotion, boy, that's getting real ineffective. People who try to make space with emotion don't get very far. And that's literally, actually, figuratively, any other way

you want to look at it, they just don't get very far. You can't make much space with emotion. It's too condensed and it kicks back and so forth.

And then there's the individual who makes space by working hard or by pushing hard or by exerting force. In other words, there's quite a little bit of band there, you see, to the effort band. And you'll find out they don't get very far either, but they get less far than people who try to make space with emotion.

And now, we get into the thinking band. And people who try to make space with thinking, boy, that is about the awfullest activity anybody could engage in, is trying to make space with thinking.

And of course we get down to making space with symbols. This is a nation trying to fly its flag all over the world and so forth. And, it doesn't make much space.

Then we of course go into eating. And an individual by offering things to be eaten, such as a cattleman - you know, he offers things to be eaten - he's inaking space with cattle. And a fat man, of course, is trying to make space with food, so on.

Now, when we get down into sex, of course, if an individual could breed fast enough and far enough and that sort of thing, why, he'd wind up with all kinds of space, he thinks. And of course he winds up with no space. This is the most condensed activity you can get into, sex. If you want to see somebody's bank all short-circuited and jammed, it's certainly short-circuited and jammed on sex. But remember, we're looking at a gradient scale that runs from Sex right straight on up through to Know. And anybody comes along and tells you sex is the only aberration there is, laugh at him. Say, "Yes, that was how we entered the problem. We found out that people were loopy on the subject of sex, so then we examined the problem. And having examined the problem for many, many years, discovered that sex was part of a gradient scale of human experience, which is an activity of trying to make space."

And people try to make space in various ways. And when they get down too low, why, on the sexual scale, they're abandoning life. When they get into sex they're abandoning present time life and trying to get some future going on the track, and that throws them all around the place, because sex is really a cave-in. It's the effort to have an experience externally. You know, pull an experience in.

Well, if you look at this band up and down, you'll see that it inverts here or there. So, it gives you the doggonedest, most enormous number of Straight-wire questions, when codified correctly, that you'd ever want to ask anybody. The basic questions would reduce this thing, first from just the standpoint of viewpoint of the whole scale.

And there's where you'll catch your preclear most ably. You just take viewpoint of the scale: viewpoint of sex, you see and viewpoint of effort and so forth. And you would ask a question like this: You'd say, "All right, let's give me some effort you wouldn't mind observing," "... type of effort you wouldn't mind observing," "... a type of sex you wouldn't mind observing," "... sexual activity you wouldn't mind looking at," and so on and so on and so on and so on. You know, ... some eating you wouldn't mind watching," "... some emotion you wouldn't mind observing" - just as quiet and mild as that.

Now, the systematic questions, as you go into the line, would run like this: "Now, give me something you wouldn't mind knowing," "...something you wouldn't mind looking at," "... an emotion which you wouldn't mind observing," "... some effort which you wouldn't mind observing," now "...some thinking which you wouldn't mind observing," and now "... some symbols which you wouldn't mind seeing," and "... some eating which you wouldn't mind inspecting," and "... some sex you wouldn't mind looking at."

Well, that's the simplest way to phrase these questions. But as we go on from there, of course, these questions can get much more complicated, because we simply interweave every single part

of Scientology and get the individual to pick out some kind of a viewpoint by gradient scale which he wouldn't mind observing or wouldn't mind experiencing.

Now, as we go on a little further from this, we find out "... some effort you wouldn't mind engaging in," "... some effort you wouldn't mind having leveled against you," "... some thinking you wouldn't mind doing, " "... some things you wouldn't mind thinking about," (better question) "... some things about you, you wouldn't mind people thinking," and so forth. In other words, you throw him into the centers of those viewpoints. As what? First as cause and then as effect. Which is, of course, then obeying the entire communication chain - C to E being the definition of communication: cause, distance, effect.

So, "Give me some people you wouldn't mind looking at you." And you'll finally get him down to "Give me some things, now, you wouldn't mind eating," and "... some things you wouldn't mind being eaten by." You see, cause to effect. Let's get the action involved in it.

But how complicated would you have to be with this Straightwire? Well, you wouldn't have to be very complicated. You can actually take the first lineup which I gave you, and just play that over and over and over and over and over, and you'll clear up the fellow's bank and turn on his sonic and visio. That's not an idle promise, for I've been working with this process. And at first, when I was using the process, it was so complicated that I rather despaired of an auditor using it, since it took into consideration the many considerations of the preclear. And finally just broke it down to a point of where it no longer took into consideration any of the considerations of the preclear, and so it became a simple enough process to put out and a process which could be used to advantage.

Now, you go over and over and over this, and the whole object of it would be to bring the preclear into a higher tolerance of viewpoints and, of course, this will eventually fish him out into having some space. You accomplish all the goals there are just by that highly permissive quiet approach. Now, if you don't think this will turn on some somatics, you're quite mistaken. If you don't think it won't turn on some aberrations, you're also mistaken. It's liable to turn on some very, very vicious ones. Because your preclear will immediately determine that you are asking him these questions in order to beat him into apathy, and his first acceptance of any viewpoints will be an apathetic acceptance. He will suddenly conceive that you're just asking him, "All right, I'll give up and abandon all the fight every place. And all right, so I will look at my mother. All right, I don't mind looking at my mother. I don't mind looking at my mother punishing me." You're pushing him right straight through the tone band.

Now, an auditor using this process shouldn't kick the bottom out from the preclear. And if he tries to press the preclear too hard and push him around too hard, he'll really produce this apathetic reaction. You're inviting the preclear to look at things which he ordinarily would find intolerable. And you're just going in there a little deeper and a little further and a little further and a little further, and you're just inviting him to do this and to do that and to look at this and do that.

And your goal is... Without directing his attention toward any specific thing (that's the one thing you leave alone with this process - don't direct his attention to anything specific; let him pick up what he picks up, good, bad or indifferent), why, you will find him eventually looking a red-hot electronic or an atom bomb in the teeth and saying, "Yep. Yeah, viewpoint of my town being wiped out by an atom bomb. Yep. Yep. Yeah, yeah, that's pretty bad, to be radioactively burned that bad. Yeah, I guess I could experience that." You just search a little further, occasionally, and ask him, "Well, how would you like to experience such a thing?"

And he'll say, "Oh, no-no-no."

Now, you'll find out that he will run into one which isn't on this scale - a viewpoint of aberration. People try to make space with aberration. And he will run into this sooner or later and tend to fixate on people who have made a lot of space with aberration. Particularly if this fellow is an auditor, he's liable to fixate on aberration and look constantly and continually for

aberration rather than to realize that 99 percent of living consists of nonaberrated conduct. It's the fact that a culture gets stuck on the remaining one percent which invites a person to plumb only into that one percent. But if he does, he's overlooking the bulk of living.

Just because you were part of a culture which had a taboo against touching banyan trees, would be no reason for you then to exclusively process the touching of banyan trees. Do you see that? If you went into the Mugwumps in Lower Catatonia, you wouldn't find very many customs which made good sense to you. So you would consider all these customs as aberrated customs, and you would be very likely prone to process out these strange, weird and fantastic customs. And these would demand your interest to such a degree that you would overlook the fact that even the Mugwumps are doing a lot of things which are a lot of fun, and which they enjoy doing, and so forth. In other words, if an auditor looks at aberration only as a part of conduct, he is not really clearing up the life of the individual at all. You want to get his attention off of aberration rather than to get it on it.

But people make space with aberrations. And an auditor tends to fixate on such people because those people evidently can make space, and certainly have made space in the past when there was no remedy for their aberration. They said, "Boy, is it safe to be aberrated! There's no cure for it."

Now, you've done a terrible thing. You've come along and told the fellow that he isn't safe being aberrated anymore, you're going to cure him. Of course, his primary impulse, if he really realized what he was doing, would be to knock you off. You're spoiling his game entirely.

All right, as we go over this Straightwire, we find out that many other items could be added into it. An auditor could use the ARC triangle. "Who could you like?" "What wouldn't you mind agreeing with?" "What could you agree with right here?" "What could disagree with you?" Just that. And you would get the reality and the affinity sides of the communication triangle.

Now, you could get fancier than that. You could get up to a point of "Who wouldn't you mind hating you?" "Who wouldn't you mind hating?" Because hate and so forth is usually a nonacceptable viewpoint.

But as soon as you start going out terribly wide with this and including all the other elements that you can think of and so on, it gives you quite a repertoire. But you had better not get too complicated because it'll stop producing results for you out there in about the third or fourth echelon. So you stick along with the ARC triangle, the Know to Sex Scale and primary principles such as duplication. "What wouldn't you mind duplicating?" "Let's look around and find something you wouldn't mind duplicating at the moment." And stick close to home, in other words, with such things as the dynamics.

Now, let's take this whole thing and run it against the dynamics. And we discover that we have a... In any one of the Know to Sex Scale, we have eight dynamics at every level. We have the effort of sex and the effort of God at the Effort band. You see, the complexities of life are made up from the fact that you have eight dynamics at each level of the Know to Sex Scale. See, there's knowing about sex, there's knowing about spirits, there's knowing about... This is all in the knowingness band. It doesn't necessarily... know about these things doesn't take you into the dip on further condensation - you simply know about these things, that's all. Perfectly at liberty to know about anything you want to know about. There isn't anything damaging about knowing.

And then we go into Look, and of course you can look at anything on the eight dynamics - so you've got eight dynamics there at Look. But remember that Look includes lots of perceptions, other perceptions, even though sound dives down to Symbols, see? Sound, hearing, the transfer communication of symbols goes way on down the bottom of the band there. Nevertheless, actually, it belongs in the field of perception which is at Look, see? Hear. Look, hear - these things go together.

The hardest thing there is to turn on in a case - lookingness turns on long before sonic, and sonic is the hardest thing there is to turn on in a case - because an individual will turn it off. So, we mustn't neglect in this Straightwire process such things as sound. All right, "What wouldn't you mind listening to?" "What sound wouldn't you mind making?" "What sound would it be all right for you to make?" so forth. "What sound would it be all right for you to hear right now?" And you pursue that course of questioning for a while, and you will find an individual's ears will hurt and pop and snap and various things will occur, and sonic is liable to turn on.

But of course, if you haven't hit the rest of the band, his sonic won't turn on. You see, you've got a lot of things there he's afraid of looking at and afraid of hearing. He's also afraid of other people hearing things. "What would it be all right for other people to hear?" So we could spread this all out onto a bracket, couldn't we? We, in other words, play this thing almost any way. There's almost an infinity of questions here.

We get emotion - of course, there's an emotional level from the first to the eighth dynamic. And quite in addition to that, there are about eight very, very specific emotions. So we've got eight dynamics for each emotional scale. Look how this plots out for Straightwire questions.

And we've got effort for all eight dynamics, and we've got all kinds and types of effort. We have the force - ideas of force. We have electronic, we have mechanical effort - you know, there's lots of them.

And the same way about thinking. There's all kinds of thinking. There's mathematical thinking, there's intuitive thinking and there's spontaneous thinking and telepathic thinking, and you could get very complicated if you want to.

Well, the funny part of it is, is that's what your preclear's brain is going to do the second you start asking him simple questions. See, he'll start racking around all over the place. And what you're looking at here is, if you plot these eight dynamics at every level on the Know to Sex Scale and then plot the eight dynamics on each corner of the ARC triangle, and if you were actually to arrange the Know to Sex Scale as a triangular column (you know, Know to Sex at each corner of the column, and that triangle, bottom or top, were the ARC triangle), you see there - did you get that picture?

Let's take ARC at the bottom - pretty condensed - and we take it and apply it to sex, see? And then we have agreement and disagreement about sex. And then we have - over on another corner, why, we have liking and other emotional reactions toward sex. And then we have at the other corner sexual communication. So that at each point there we could take the Know to Sex Scale totally in communication, Know to Sex Scale totally as it comes down the line in terms of affinity and the Know to Sex Scale totally in the form of reality, which is agreement. And we would have the nicest-looking column there you ever wanted to see. It's the ARC triangle gone solid on us, and we plot it in chunks on the Know to Sex Scale vertically. See, we just got a stack of triangles - a vertical stack of triangles - and they're all lying there flat. You see that?

Well, by the time we've pushed this around and drawn it around a few times and worked it around, we find out that, my golly, we're working with a jigsaw puzzle now which can be plotted almost in any direction that comes up with practically the same answers. And it interweaves and interlocks. And these interweaves and interlocks and interrelationships are the basics of the complications known as life and human behavior and animal behavior and any other kind of behavior. (Going to write a book sometime on behavior along all of the eight dynamics.)

It gets very interesting when you get to the eighth dynamic, you have God behavior. Then you have to, of course, take into account all kinds of things, such as what is the acceptance level of God, and so forth. It gets very amusing after a while when you start plotting out behavior, but you could get awfully complicated in this line. You could sit down and you could write ten fifteen-million-word books without any trouble whatsoever, tracing out numerous examples and so forth.

Well, it's so easy to get complicated, that why don't you leave that up to your preclear? And why don't you stay with these great simplicities, such as the corners of the triangle and the Know to Sex Scale. And you find out he's studiously avoiding the third dynamic, why, you take note of it sooner or later and ask him, well, what's something about groups he could agree with or he wouldn't mind experiencing; what kind of a group would he mind experiencing - something like that.

Just steer him a little bit, because he can get complicated enough. And your whole goal is a very simple goal. That's to give this individual some tolerance of viewpoints. Try to make him tolerate viewpoints, wider and wider, more and more of them, and he will start changing his mind. And that is the first thing that processing ought to do, is change a preclear's mind - process doesn't change a preclear's mind, it isn't any good at all. And that's one thing this process does, with rapidity! You say, "Now, let's... Some kind of effort you wouldn't mind looking at."

"Oh, effort. Oh-ah-oooh. Ohh, effort. Um... effort? What do you mean by effort?"

"Oh, well, you know, just effort. Putting... Somebody putting out some energy and so forth."

"Woo-oo, let's see." You get this kind of a reaction; you're liable to get a long communication lag. And then all of a sudden the individual happily thinks, "Ha! A dancer. I wouldn't mind watching a dancer. That's right, I wouldn't mind watching a dancer." Yeah, he's real certain now, he just wouldn't mind that at all. He has suddenly realized that effort was part of art. You've made him change his mind about effort, to that degree that now he recognizes that effort is an essential part of existence, not something you would ignore all the time.

The next thing you know, he will say, well, he wouldn't mind his mother doing housework - wouldn't mind watching his mother doing housework. And he'll think about all the complaining that he listened to when he was a little kid and he all of a sudden reevaluates this whole thing: "It served her right! Yeah, anybody that unhappy about something or other ought to close terminals with it."

Then he realizes that he himself has kept areas, even if they were only a summer camp and so forth, certainly clean and burnished bright - and maybe a compartment on a ship when he was in the service or something like that - he's kept that all duded up, and he's worked hard at this sort of thing and he begins to wonder a little bit just what the devil his mother was talking about. It was a small house, there was only a couple of kids, there wasn't too much work to do and all he ever heard about was how hard she worked. And now he's scratching his head wondering how this could come about.

Well, he's liable to hit one of these tracks of association and want to soliloquize for the next eight hours. You are not interested in consideration, you are interested in looking at and that's all you're interested in - you're interested in looking at. You want him to tolerate viewpoints. You don't give a damn for his opinion about a viewpoint. Because every time he starts to give you a bunch of considerations and stretch it all out and explain to you this and explain to you that, without suddenly damming his communication line but by expertly detouring him, get him to look at something else. Because there's... You don't want him in the think band. You just landed him in the thinkingness band. Instead of looking, now he's perfectly willing to think. And do you know, that he could probably go on thinking for the next 76 trillion years without getting anyplace with it. And that's a solemn and horrible fact, that thinkingness doesn't happen to wind up in solutions.

Thinkingness is based upon the fact that a person doesn't know, so he has to think about it. The solution depends upon the fact of his postulating that he does know, and then he knows. You see, in order to do thinking, you have to assume that you have to go through some kind of a process in order to arrive at an answer.

Now, there's another horrible thing that happens about preclears, is, you see, they have to have assumed an inability - assumed that they had an inability - before they have it.

Now look how this blocks processing. They have to assume that they can't do so and so in order to have it remedied. And you leave them parked there - I've gone into this several times, we didn't have a process which easily remedied it - but an individual has to assume he's sick before he can make up his mind to get well. The reason he's sick, basically, is in the postulate band. He's had to make a postulate that he's sick before he can make up his mind to get well. Now, if your preclear has had to make up his mind that he's aberrated before he can get sane, he's still riding on the postulate that he's aberrated. But he's still better off having made the postulate that he's aberrated so that he can get over his aberrations, than to coast along gibbering like an idiot for years and years telling everybody how sane he is. You see, he'd be crossed up there in universes - something of the sort.

Well, what does this do... this process do for universes? We have the three kinds of universes: the other fellow's universe, the preclear's universe and the physical universe. And what does it do for these universes?

Well, any universe is essentially existent in the space created by looking-ness. See, any universe exists from the center of lookingness. So that if we speak of Mama's universe, it's the point from which Mama is looking - see, if we think of Mama's universe.

Now, we could take a terrific number of factors here that would complicate this universe, such as what does Mama say? What are her postulates, and so forth? And we get the space with the postulates. You see that? First she has to have some space, one way or the other, and then she has to put some postulates in there to have a universe. The basic definition of a complete universe would be some space which is tenanted by postulates. Postulates, of course, might wind up in forms of various kinds, might wind up in various conditions.

Now, you can ask yourself some day, why is it you see this MEST universe so well? And if you look around, you will discover that there are many people around who are so thoroughly interiorized into Mama's universe or somebody else's universe that they actually see Mama's engrams. And you don't have to go very far to investigate this. You take a preclear who is very badly interiorized into some other person's universe than his own, they will see that other person's pictures and not their own. Now, get that.

The fact that Mama made a postulate produced a visibility. Mama said, "There are snakes," and this individual then very easily gets pictures of snakes. But he himself can say, in trying to put up mock-ups, "There are flagpoles," and he doesn't get a mock-up of a flagpole. Curious, huh?

If Mama had said there are flagpoles, he would be able to see flagpoles. You see that? He must be running on somebody else's postulates than his own. So the manifestation of super-, super-, supervisibility, which is not the individual's super-, super-, supervisibility - you know, the individual, doesn't... when he puts up a mock-up he doesn't get this much visibility on it. You know, he has terrific visibility on mock-ups somebody else has put up, you know, like Mama's statements and so forth. You are looking at a condition there of living in somebody else's created space.

Now, what would you think of somebody who could look out here and see a factory chimney with great ease and yet couldn't mock one up of his own? You would suspect him of being in another universe, wouldn't you? Well, whose universe is he in? He's in the physical universe, that's the universe he's in. Its postulates are so strong and impressed upon him so strongly, that its reality is much greater than his own reality. Therefore we used to talk about - and in the book 8-8008, talk about - agreement with the physical universe. You can agree with it or disagree with it, but as long as its postulates outweigh your own postulates, you're going to have difficulty.

Now, there's a lot of complexity here that we needn't even look at. And that complexity, however, that we do need to look at - the part of it we do need to look at - is this: Look, an individual is in the physical universe and then he's reinteriorized, you might say, into somebody else's universe, such as Mama's. And Mama's pictures are very bright to him, but his own mockups don't exist. Oh, boy.

Now, the common denominator of universes declares for him that the physical universe is right there, you know? There is the physical universe. There it is. But he is not even in it. He has been in it and has to some degree... Well, you see, he was in his own universe, and then he got into the physical universe, and now he went into his last wife's universe and his mother's universe and he's in those universes. Well man, there's no telling what kind of a mock-up this individual is liable to get, if he gets any at all. Everything is kind of other-determined. If he gets any pictures, they're probably in a nightmare. He's running on somebody's declared statement that he resists all the time, and he goes to sleep and his resistance cuts down; the next thing you know he's in a full-armed play about something or other.

Well, when your individual is departed from the physical universe into Mama's universe, and so forth, on down the line, you've got this kind of a backtrack to walk with your preclear. He's got to get out of his mama's universe and into the physical universe.

Now, the only way he ever gets into a universe is by refusing to tolerate its viewpoints. If he refuses to look, he pins himself in the universe with his own energy and turns off the visio. There's two necessary steps here. He interiorizes by resisting - he goes into the universe by resisting the universe. A viewpoint he doesn't want is the one he gets. You see that? Because he's the only person really capable of putting out energy. So he has granted an other-determinism and, having granted this other-determinism, it backfires on him.

Now, let's look at this physical universe out here and discover that an individual has as much perception in it and of it as he will tolerate its viewpoints. And you're not going to get anybody out of Mama's universe, really, or out of the physical universe, until they can tolerate a viewpoint or an effort point or a sex point of any part of the whole darn universe. And when they will tolerate any point in it - any view, any effort - either as cause or as effect, they are then capable of withdrawing from that universe. Until they can tolerate all the various viewpoints of that universe, they can't withdraw from it.

So your preclear is going to think at first that you're just pushing him into apathy, because you're asking him to tolerate things. If he knows anything, it's this: that if he tolerates those viewpoints, it'll finish him. And that's the funny part of it: It is only by refusing to tolerate them that he gets finished.

So, the course and direction of this processing is to bring about the greatest possible tolerance for the greatest possible number of viewpoints.

Okay.

(end of lecture)