

## **AGREEMENTS AND POSTULATES OF THE EIGHT DYNAMICS**

A lecture given on 8 January 1957

[Start of Lecture]

This is what, the 8<sup>th</sup>? This the fifth lecture?

January 8<sup>th</sup>, 1957, the fifth ACC lecture of the 16<sup>th</sup> Advanced Clinical Course.

I had several things to talk to you about, but first and foremost of these things is, you might say, a popular pitch.

What I talked to you about yesterday with regard to „*no effect on self, total effect on somebody else*“ is, of course, immediately pursued by this interesting conclusion: That if you want people to be good to you, you'll have to be good to people. If you want to be well, you will make people healthy. If you want people to be alive, you will make them live. If you want people to be kind, you'll have to be kind. Now, if you want people to be destructive, you will have to destroy people. If you want people to be unhealthy, you will have to make them ill.

That each consequence follows through like this, then: If you want to be unhealthy, make people unhealthy. If you want to be unhappy, make people unhappy. If you want... Just Q&Q, you see? If you want to feel half dead, go around and kill somebody.

Now, this is not the overt act-motivator sequence. You will easily get it confused with that old phenomenon, but that old phenomenon is quite old and quite true and quite subordinate to the material I'm giving you at this moment. Sounds almost platitudinous, and it sounds Pollyanna-ish -- very sweetness and light to say, „*Well, if you want to be happy, you'll have to make people happy.*“ But it isn't the overt act-motivator sequence which is involved. Something else is involved, much more fundamental.

There are eight dynamics. A person is all of them. He can't exist on the first dynamic. So no effect on self, of course, moves the first dynamic away from the remaining

seven -- by postulate, which postulate doesn't stick. That's one postulate that won't stick.

We're going to move dynamic four out of the eight dynamics, and after this we will have no dynamic four. It just won't work, see? Not while you're going on in a world which has walls and planets and suns and space, which has people and things. All of these things perforce say the eight dynamics exist, you see? And then somebody, within that framework, says one of these dynamics is now going to be nonfunctional. Well, he has pitted his postulate against the remaining seven postulates. And with one postulate, he thinks he's going to overthrow the entirety of all postulation that has ever taken place. He can't do it. It's just not one of these possibilities.

At the same moment he is in agreement on seven dynamics, he takes one dynamic and says he's going to disagree concerning it. You get this impossibility?

It's not because he's lacking in power; it's because he has done something that doesn't match itself on a scale.

For instance, he's postulating from a position below agreement on all other dynamics. See, all of his agreements add up to eight dynamics. Now, while still agreeing on seven, and not really capable at this time of postulating these in or out of existence, he adventurously postulates one out of existence and says, „*Well, there's going to be no effect on that one anymore.*“ And someday he has lumbago. Well, that was that postulate. He tried to move one dynamic out of existence and, of course, this was not then successful.

Now, it's true that he could postulate into existence any number of dynamics, or postulate them out of existence, so long as he did not remain in agreement with them.

So, if he's going to live in this universe, and he's going to remain in agreement with all of these agreements, and then he's going to make an exception to his agreements, he'll find out that exception won't work. And so he gets into difficulties.

And this is a more fundamental phenomenon than the phenomenon of the overt act-motivator sequence. But when this phenomenon becomes more complicated and goes into flows and particles and spaces thoroughly, then we get the overt act-motivator sequence: You do something to somebody, and you feel something has been done to you.

Now, I'll give you an example. I have a chap, over here a few blocks away, who was at one time a quite competent professional man. He recently wrote a book which attacked, without remedy and with great thoroughness, the United States government. He attacked it with a thoroughness, without any remedy, without any idea of doing something, and not being on its side at all.

It's all right to attack something because you are going to do something about it to make it a little more efficient or a little better; you do have remedies for the situation. You see, that's a constructive approach.

It's quite another thing to have a totally destructive action. See? Totally destructive. And this book was totally destructive - - sufficiently destructive that it doesn't even sell.

But he wrote the book, and since that book has been published, [he] goes around under a tremendous cloud of „*being attacked by the government*.“ You see, that's just open and shut.

You talk to this man: He has become useless as a professional man, to a marked degree, because he can think in no other terms than being attacked. Now that he has done this action of making a destructive attack upon the government, why, he himself is destroyed. That is the more fundamental look, you see?

He doesn't consider himself part of all this. He isn't just part of all this, trying to complain or straighten up all this. He stepped out of it, said, „*No effect on me*“; we include the first dynamic out here, and we attack a third like mad. Now he's totally convinced that he's under attack. He isn't, but he's totally convinced he is.

And that is a condition that we know of as paranoia. And he is not insane, because that would be this carried to a complete degree, but that nevertheless is the actual mechanics of this thing which does become insane paranoia. Somebody has included himself out, included himself out, you see -- „*No effect on me*“ - - and then he has done things to others all along the dynamics until, finally, one day it recoils.

Well actually, there are many mechanical manifestations. The explosion of a black screen -- or the existence of a black screen in the first place, and then its explosion -- is simply the sequence of the flows reversing. And that is overt act-motivator phenomena. The fellow has a black screen in front of his face. He's protecting himself from something. He's saying, „*No effect on me while we're having a total effect on something else*.“ And he puts up a screen to make sure this takes place, and then he never knows that whatever was on the other side of the screen has now walked away. And that's gone, he'll never see it again; but he thinks there's something on the other side of the screen, so he dare not take the screen down.

One fine day, he puts up just one too many beams against this screen; he says, „*No effect*“ again, and the screen blows up. An interesting phenomenon, because every once in a while you have some preclear have an explosion in front of his face. Some of you, I am sure, have had preclears have this. Well, that's just one of those screens blowing up.

He's said violently, now, on the sixth dynamic -- because energy is simply a sixth-dynamic manifestation -- he has said, „*No effect on me*“ in processing to such a degree that it blew up the no-effect screen. That's all that happened. It went boom!

You actually get these people -- they feel like firecrackers or something had gone off, or a stick of dynamite has gone off immediately in front of their face. It's quite upsetting, some of these energy phenomena.

Well, now that is your overt act-motivator sequence, by which we really mean „*flows and particularities of energy patterns*.“ You'll see that work.

Now, you could express the other one I'm talking about -- this one of the eight dynamics; including one out -- in other terms than energy patterns. Now, that'll work on agreements, it'll work on postulates, it'll work in any other way. The fellow is agreed upon the existence of eight dynamics, he is in a universe amongst people, and these eight dynamics are functional. And it must then proceed that every time he sets one of them aside, having agreed upon it thoroughly, why, he's been unsuccessful. He is still part of the eight dynamics -- the one dynamic is still part of the eight dynamics; the second dynamic is still part of the eight dynamics, you see?

Although he said he set the second dynamic aside, he didn't. He set it aside, he said, and then butchered it. The rest of the dynamics: He said, „*Well*,“ he said, „*sex hasn't anything to do with anything. My sexual conduct and actions have no bearing on the race at large.*“ See? „*How I carry on here is of no importance.*“

And now he says, very directly, „*The people of this country mustn't continue*,“ (speaking of a third-dynamic phenomenon).

He moves up into the fourth, and he said, „*The race should stop. There should be no further continuance here. No more survival for this race*,“ and „*Yow, yow, yow, yow, yow!*“ More or less Schopenhauer's Will and the Idea; the only thing you can do about life is to stop it.

And then one day, why -- just forgetting the presence of the ladies here he has a pain in his groin and he's impotent. Well now, how did that happen?

You see, he was living with the human race, and he included himself out. He was living with a race which depends on the second dynamic for its continuance. He didn't ever hit at its procreation. He simply hit at its continuance, of which the second dynamic is a manifestation.

Get this guy as a preclear. He says, „*Never had anything bad to do with girls. I never got any diseases. I read all the hygiene books when I was a kid, and so forth, and I just haven't any idea. And it must be something physiological.*“ Well, tell him to go get some goat glands installed, or process out this phenomenon of „*no effect on the second dynamic*“ while total cessation is being postulated for the third and fourth.

All right. We have a fellow, an interesting chap in England, who did a great many things to the organization. He kept uttering lies. Every once in a while we have somebody start printing a magazine in which he sets forth bald facts, you know, none of which are facts. And he keeps going at the most remarkable state of glibness.

And we always find out something else is interesting about these magazines: that the person who prints them doesn't have enough money to print and mail them. You take his salary and income, and his salary and income doesn't match his magazine bill. So you have to look around, and find somebody's financing him. Well, there's just some kind of a pitch involved in this sort of thing. And yet they represent „*the truth*,“ they say.

Well, all right. This fellow kept attacking, attacking, attacking, attacking, and he went on attacking. And one day somebody in the British organization -- unauthorizedly -- wrote him a proposal that he give all of his material to the London office to be

checked and edited before its publication. In other words, that would just be the end of any such torrent of abuse, and four or five other things of equal idiocy -- as far as he was concerned and his campaign was concerned. This just would have folded up.

He had attacked the organization so often that the organization had become total authority. So that a suggestion from one of its staff members, as a private suggestion, was then accepted by him in terror.

The more he has said, „*No effect on me*,“ you see -- the more he has said, „*No effect on me I'm going to attack them, but this doesn't attack me*“ -- the more wrong he was. Well, if you're looking into this for any complications here, don't. Because it's an awful simple phenomenon.

He just said it would have no effect on him -- from a position on the Tone Scale where he couldn't have levitated a match. See, he's in agreement with all dynamics; he depends on his hand to pick up anything that's picked up. He couldn't pick up anything.

What's this? This is a total agreement on a human body. And from this position of the Tone Scale, his postulates, of course, are not functional, merely because he's staying in agreement with everything. Why, he says, „*No effect on me!*“ Well, all the time he was attacking somebody, he was attacking himself. Not because one individual cannot extricate himself from the universe -- that is not true. An individual can extricate himself from the universe, he can be an individual. But he does have these agreements, and when he violates them, he only apparently does so. The agreements are still there and they still manifest themselves in all directions. Got the idea? So all it is, is a lie! „*No effect on me*“ becomes a terrific lie.

This fellow was attacking himself all the time he was attacking the London organization. He was attacking his family, because only what we were doing could have solved some of his insurmountable domestic difficulties. And subsequently, some Scientology processing has, to a marked degree, resolved those domestic difficulties, you see? But he was attacking this, which could have helped his family, you see? He was attacking this, which was helping the British nation. He was attacking something which was helping man. And he said, „*I am no part of man. I am no part of the British nation. I am no part of the family. This isn't going to affect me.*“ Oh yeah? Oh, yeah?

Just the postulate is the „*Oh, yeah.*“ See, this fellow is attacking himself! See, the eight dynamics are still there. They're the monitoring postulates, you might say, and they're still there, they're still functional. The communication lines are still up. And he says, „*Now, this part here, dynamic one, isn't going to be attacked, although dynamics two to eight are going to be attacked.*“ And it was the lie that he had moved dynamic one aside.

Of course, every time he attacked, he attacked from one to eight. Simple.

Now, an individual who is in agreement with the universe and dependent upon it, has made his agreements in all directions, picks up a gun and he shoots his fellow man. And then he wonders four or five years later why he has headaches. How could he help but have headaches? He shot somebody through the head! It isn't mystic! It isn't mystic in any degree; it is so plain he's just liable to miss it all over the place.

Now, the public aspect of this is you go out and say, „*Do unto others as you'd have them do unto you.*“ You see, that's a public aspect. That's part of Christianity, which was part of Buddhism, which was part of older philosophies than that. It's first heard of, I think, in Chaldea. „*Do unto others as you have them do unto you.*“ A nice platitude, and we just kick it aside and so forth. It's a rule of life; it has had a certain workability. And somebody'd say, „*Well, that's religion,*“ and so forth. Well, what I'm telling you isn't that postulate. That is not what I'm telling you.

I'm telling you a much more fundamental truth, in all of its scientific ramifications. And it isn't a platitude. And if I have any message for you about that at all, it is the fact that we can prove it. It is not a platitude, but it is a working mechanism. It's functional.

And we are concerned with working mechanisms simply because they work. And we are concerned with life and its counter activities. And if we are, we'd certainly better understand that one right on down to the ground.

Now, if you want to control yourself, you'll have to control other people. Right? If you want to be properly communicated to, you'd better properly communicate. And I do admit that it'll sometimes take you a long time to get through, just in the workaday world.

You've got Mr. Jones, and Mr. Jones is having a horrible time. You come in, you hang up your hat and you say, „*How are you this morning Mr. Jones?*“ Mr. Jones says, „*Humpf.*“

Morning after morning you come in, you hang up your hat and Mr. Jones says, „*Humpf.*“ Well, remember, he's not in session.

So you get discouraged after a while. And one morning you come in and you say, „*Humpf.*“ Well, you are reacting! And that is reactivity, and that is of the order of the overt-act phenomena, see? -- motivator -- overt-act phenomena. See, your reaction. Get this: An unthinking response is the response of your body, your mind, on a Q&A, stimulus-response basis. In other words, you're just letting life run.

Well, there's another thing you can do which is very superior to just letting life run, and one morning coming in and saying „*Humpf.*“ And that is, to come in the next morning and hang up your hat, and say, „*Good morning Mr. Jones.*“ And have Mr. Jones say „*Humpf.*“

Now, your capability is actually factually measured. It sounds very silly, because we're talking about something that could be passed off so easily. You could tell anybody on any street corner this data, and he would agree with you 100 percent, and he wouldn't in the least know what the hell you were talking about. See? He would agree with you because he has no evaluation on this, he doesn't see the order of importance relating to this. All right.

You come in, you hang up your hat, and you say, „*Good morning Mr. Jones,*“ and Jones looks at you. First time this ever happened, you know? You go on into your office, see?

You come in the next morning, you hang up your hat. You say, „*Good morning Mr. Jones.*“ And he looks at you and he says, „*Good morning*“ You go in and hang up your hat.

The next morning, and you say, „*Good morning Mr. Jones.*“ Mr. Jones says, „*Well, good morning! How are you?*“ Fascinating.

Now, there were two things you could have done: One of them was simply to get a stimulus-response action in Mr. Jones, to a point of where he would respond the way you were responding. You got the idea? Just a mirror image. See, you laid enough engrams in on the subject of „*Good morning Mr. Jones,*“ that he eventually associates you with the words „*Good morning Mr. Jones.*“ See that?

All right, that was all that the world of psychology ever learned about behavior. It began and ended with that stimulus-response mechanism.

Now, they went further than that. Their behavior pattern said that if you had gone over and punished him into saying good morning, he thereafter would have said good morning to you. Completely improper conclusion. That good morning, if it is a stimulus-response good morning, isn't worth listening to -- any more than a little wind-up toy is a better singer than a nightingale. All right.

The other action -- see, action number one, stimulus-response -- the other action has to do with the dynamic-response action which I just talked about. You've all of a sudden thrown this fellow into a higher response, but it is an analytical response. It is a response out of livingness; it isn't a wound-up-toy response. Now, that's what you're doing as a Scientologist. You are eliciting action and manifestation on an analytical, rational, thinking, ARC, understanding level. Got that? Entirely different than this other stimulus-response mechanism.

Now, the second you move somebody up like that, you start doing these things rapidly. You stop depending upon the reactive phenomena and you start using this other phenomena, which is simply this: „*I am thee, Mr. Jones.*“ Boom! See?

And we have this fascinating thing occur: We have somebody who is in good shape -- this is the other mystic, mysterious phenomena - - the person who is in good shape seems to be able to elicit an analytical response from somebody much more rapidly than a person who is in bad shape. Why?

Well, the person who is in bad shape is doing it on a wound-up- toy basis, you see? And the person who is in good shape does it on a rational, analytical, understanding, awake, aware basis. And the person who is in very good shape could come in -- Mr. Jones has not been known to speak to anybody for the last fifteen years when they entered in the morning, except to say „*Humpf.*“ Fellow in good shape walks in the first morning, hangs up his hat, and says, „*Well, Mr. Jones. How are you, Mr. Jones.*“ Mr. Jones looks up and he says, „*Well, how are you.*“

Now, how many dynamics are you willing to be, see? How much of life are you willing to take responsibility for? How much of existence can you embrace?

All this expresses itself most vividly, from a processing level, on „*What are you willing to confront?*“ If you're totally willing to confront Mr. Jones and everything he could say, do, so on -- you, you know; not a response; not your mock-up or something of the sort, but you are totally willing to confront him -- it is inevitable that Mr. Jones will respond to you with a cheery „*Good morning*“ And the rest of the office help will sit there and say, „*No!*“ And then they, all of a sudden, will respond to you and say good morning to you too. And then forget that it was so remarkable for Mr. Jones to be around.

Therefore, as long as you play around with these little, tricky, gimmick, wound-up-doll, psychology-type phenomena, you will get results; but you don't get the grand slam and the Kohinoor diamond, see? That is not included as part of your bounty. So you get just little dabby results, you see? Somebody gets over a broken leg a little faster, or something like that. Why?

Well, you're probably processing him because you don't want him to have a broken leg. All right. Fine, you don't want him to have a broken leg. Well, that's quite a different thing than you not being able to confront a broken leg, and you are processing him because you can't confront a broken leg. You get this shifty, tiny difference there? You're processing a broken leg because you can't stand to have people have broken legs, that's all. See? You can't confront his broken leg. Well, boy, in that response mechanism, then, you are responding, you are reacting. „*Leg is broken*“ means you have a broken leg, means you don't want a broken leg, means you must process his broken leg. You get the idea? And that'll wind you up in the soup.

And we get this psychoanalytic phenomenon of way back when. See, we've shaped up all of their phenomena. We've discovered their phenomena for them, actually.

But it was in this area that they were looking for phenomena. They thought everything was response. In psychoanalysis it's an old saw that if you cure somebody's headache, you'll get a headache. Now, any practitioner of psychoanalysis knows this. Why should you get a headache? You created a no-headache! You created a head that didn't ache. And you're going to get a headache? Oh, no you're not.

Now, if you took a headache away from him, if you processed his headache because you couldn't confront a headache -- and you say, „*That's a horrible thing for that fellow to have. My, I'd hate to have a headache*“ (resist, resist, resist) -- run some stimulus- response processes, his headache erases, and all of a sudden: „*What's the matter with my head?*“ See?

You do this sometimes. You process somebody when you're tired; you don't know what you're doing. You say -- just reactively as the devil -- you say, „*Oh, my goodness, this person is sick at his stomach, and so on. How terrible that must seem,*“ you know, and give him a couple of commands to straighten it out. And you don't put it in an auditing session, or something of the sort. You walk away. And an hour or so later, you're not feeling very well and you don't want to eat. And you say to yourself, „*Now, what the devil happened here?*“ See, and you suddenly remember that you actually did feel a little bit sympathetic or upset about somebody who was sick at his stomach. Got the idea?



In other words, you couldn't confront it, and you didn't want to be it, so you eradicated it. You made nothing out of it.

Well, we know that processes which make nothing out of things do have an ultimate result. People temporarily get rid of things. A person has arthritis, you process them totally reactively because you can't stand the idea of this person having arthritis, and they process it out because they can't stand the idea of having arthritis; and we're a nice agreement society, all composed on the single basis that neither of us must have arthritis, and therefore we'll get rid of arthritis. And the arthritis goes, because the phenomena with which we are acquainted is sufficiently well understood, and processes match it to such a degree, that you actually could, almost with malice aforethought, erase that arthritis, even though you wouldn't dare face some arthritis.

So, all right. What happens? So a person is well from arthritis for weeks, then they get it back again. Wrong basis, wrong approach, wrong understanding.

We have to take this factor up: Is there anything bad from the viewpoint of a thetan? Is there such a thing as a bad condition or a sickness, from the standpoint of a thetan?

Now, I'm sure that Mary Baker Eddy tried to say something along this line. I'm sure she did. She said it was thinking right thoughts, and one mustn't think in error, and if one thought right thoughts, why, right thoughts would occur, and so on. She was trying to express something in this line; she probably had a great deal to say about it. And probably many of the things she said about it were quite intelligent. But the point we're making here has nothing to do with that -- beyond this one little factor: There is one right thought. And that is, there are no wrong thoughts. Now, that is almost as close as you could come to a totality of right thinking.

If you're really striving in the direction of Christian Science and along that particular pattern, that would be a successful method of approach. Why? Because there are no wrong thoughts. And that is a right thought; that is a totally unlimited right thought.

Now, you, to understand this completely, probably require just a little bit of a subjective experience on your part. There's a technique. It's a very old one; one of the more interesting techniques you ever had run on you or ran on anybody. You see, it's not a good process or technique because of this one factor. This is just not too good, because it processes a condition, and you shouldn't ever process conditions if you can possibly avoid it.

There's a maxim that goes along with that. It says: Always process terminals; don't process conditions. Avoid conditions. Don't monkey with conditions; process terminals.

You can always take a condition and apply it to a terminal, don't you see? Then you can process a terminal. If you process a condition, singularly and only, you generally get into trouble.

Well now, pain is maybe something and maybe not something, but is certainly a condition. And a condition is a condition. And if you process pain directly -- you're liable to get into trouble with your preclear if you process pain, because it's a condition, you

see? You upset his havingness. So wherever possible, you don't process jealousy or pain or being abstract, or something of this character, you see? You process something that is. See, you process a terminal.

You don't have somebody: „*Give me someplace where women aren't sick,*“ you see, so that you're... You'll have him processing the sickness of women in the absence of women, you see?

You'd have him mock up sick women if you were going to go at it like that. You put a terminal there, don't you see?

But this one has a limited proof, and is a limited process. And this test that you should run, you should have some acquaintance with, because you won't take my word for it. That, I am sure. Because it sounds completely incredible. That is: A thetan has a scarcity of pain. He likes it. It's sensation. But like all things, when he is prevented from hurting often enough and consistently enough, he gets to a point where, just like he'll do with anything else, he can't have it. When things become just so scarce, then he can't have them. And pain is in this category and doesn't disobey this law.

So a person who doesn't hurt and who hasn't hurt, but who already knows what pain is, gets to a point of where he can't stand pain.

Now, what is this „*can't stand pain*“? That means it's so scarce that he can't have it, so he's trying to waste it.

So you ask somebody to „*Waste some pain,*“ or you get this run on yourself. „*Waste some pain. Waste some more pain.*“ Now, you understand, it's not a good process for the excellent reason that it's a condition, see? It's not a terminal, and therefore it won't run very long. But it is a tremendous revelation.

The next thing you know, why, you're going „*Ssssssswwwup-sswwwup. Oh, you mean somebody in the agony of a sprained neck? That's pretty good. Oh, somebody with total inflammation of the head. Oh, that'd be good. Sss-wwwup!*“ A thetan has an appetite for pain, has an appetite for discomfort.

You come along and you process some preclear so he'll get over it. And what have you done? You have simply aided and abetted the scarcity of sensation. And having done so, you'll find out that he will try to get it back.

Now, if you're a real ornery auditor, you can always process him so he can't. You have compounded, however, a felony. You have taken it away from him and fixed him up so he can't get more. It doesn't make him happy. And many a preclear is made very unhappy by having his illness taken away from him.

Now, it's an oddity that this too had been observed. This was observed about 180-90 years ago, has been repeated many times. A practitioner can hardly help but observe this, it happens so often.

Somebody comes in, he gets treated, he was feeling terrible, and he goes away and he snarls about you. This happens sufficiently often that the healing professions, each

one of them, has this as an observation: That there is nobody quite as mean as somebody you've made well. They have various ways to express it, but it all comes down to this basis of „*pain is something*“ And of course the thetan's motto is „*Anything is better than nothing*“ And pain does not avoid this at all. We've known this for years, by the way.

I'm not giving you very new, shiny, bright material, but I am giving you a new value on it. All right.

You could probably make this run a lot longer by putting a terminal there. You could say, „*Waste men in pain*,“ you see, and have him waste men who hurt, and so on, and it'd run a lot longer.

But you're liable to get it mixed up so that it isn't quite a pure experiment. And the purity of that experiment is simply wasting pain. And the preclear is liable to think that he wants the men; he's liable to get confused on it one way or the other, see?

And there is nothing quite as revelatory to discover as „*a tasty bout of medieval torture is just the thing for a quiet Sunday afternoon.*“

Now, our business is life! Our business is not a synthetic existence! Don't, please, as an auditor make this mistake of believing that we stand for some synthetic life form or conduct pattern. We do not. We have life as our view. And life is life, and there are no pitches in all this. I mean, we observe life, and life is as it is; it isn't some other way.

And somebody comes along and says, „*Well, life ought to be ..*“ Well, very well. You can say „*One particular race ought to be..*“; or „*One particular area of conduct should be..*“; or „*In order to maintain human relationships, such and such conditions should exist*“ -- those things too are observations, and they are quite true. But this is not true: „*Life should be..*“

You can always say, „A game of checkers should be...“ „*But when we say sweepingly, „All games everywhere should be..*“ we're getting off the edge. See?

Somebody laid down the total pattern for all games -- that were thereafter to be played with no other pattern than this, because it was wrong to play them in some other way -- he's just laying down a complicated new game, don't you see? He has not discussed games at large; he's made a new game out of games. And we must not do this in Dianetics and Scientology. Life is what it is; it is composed of what it is composed of.

And that clear view, that isness attitude, is in itself an entertaining way to live. Just try to maintain isness while everything around you is not maintaining isness, and you have violated the eight dynamics to a sufficient degree to get your randomness.

Hence, you could go be a hermit and get tremendous randomness. You'd say what possible randomness could there be sitting in a cave on a mountain, eating goat cheese? Busiest people you ever want to meet are hermits. Everybody comes from every place to see them. They won't permit that violation to exist if they can possibly help it, and as a result, the eight-dynamic principle again applies. One dynamic has selected itself out, and the remaining seven try to make sure that this doesn't continue. You see this?

Now, it is possible for one to achieve a broader view of life than he has. It is also quite profitable in terms of action, randomness, behavior, ability, understanding, ease of living, and so forth. You can obtain a better view of life than you have -- so long as you continue to view life.

Now, I can get you, always, a better view of some synthetic composition which has nothing to do with life, see? That's fascinating. I mean, you invent something new and view it and show other people to view it, and so on. That's how universes are made. It's one of the oldest thetan games there is. You get a totally synthetic bunch of restrictions, purposes and freedoms, and you get everybody to agree on these, and you've got a brand- new game -- brand-new. You're not viewing life; you're viewing a new product of life.

It is very, very easy for a group of practitioners to invent some synthetic substance which they say is sickness or which they say is aberration or which they say is this and say is that, and then get everybody to view it. And the first thing you know, people will agree that this is it.

Freud, for instance, has been very triumphant in this. He's gotten the second dynamic so isolated as an „*only cause*“ that he has changed the pattern of sex life of our generation. He's done it very, very well.

And Krafft-Ebing and Havelock Ellis, and so on, when they phoned up their case reports -- because they never found in their cases any of the things they report. They just wanted something to report. They wrote something up. These are not honest men, by the way. They were men with a pitch! That's an awful condemnation, but they were also men with a thirst on the second dynamic. And I'm afraid their observations are not totally correct. Now, that's a very bold statement for me to make, but I'll give you an example:

„*When a kleptomaniac fails to steal something he always burns down the house.*“ That's right out of their textbooks. Direct quote. „*When a kleptomaniac steals something from a store counter, she always has an orgasm.*“ This totality of allness, you know, and its sweeping „*Jewelers never go anyplace,*“ „*All small boys wear square hats.*“ You see? And their work is sown with this sort of thing. And then you find them swapping case histories. And you will find parts of a case history have been taken up by another author of the same school, and has been reworked to make it look tastier. He claims to have reported this.

Some of the „*sexual monstrosities and behaviors*“ (quote, unquote) reported by Krafft-Ebing, Havelock Ellis, Freud, and so on (I don't say Freud was a bad reporter; he was merely a good press agent), do make interesting reading. But having erected this segment of the second dynamic, the process of selling it now took place, with the result that a culture, sixty years later, exists with these practices in it.

Now, somebody didn't observe life. See, they wrote up a bunch of figure-figure, and they constructed a synthetic circumstance here, where only the second dynamic was important. „*Sex shall triumph to the end*“ is, of course, the dramatization; just the postulate „*we must have sex.*“ And they took this -- and sex is the chief method of getting the time track covered -- and so they take this and they apply this allness to aberration,

and everything else, and they actually have managed to present this culture with a synthetic universe, which did not exist before 1894.

Therefore, all persons engaging in an investigation of life tend, to slight or great degree, to erect a new structure. It has been our contest in Dianetics and Scientology to erect that structure which resulted in the eight dynamics; which resulted in the existing world which you see about you as it exists! Not some other world.

So a postulate, agreed upon, became an Axiom, and the Axioms unfolded -- from two, right on down the line -- in a certain pattern, and various other ramifications took place. But always be prepared (not in the upper-level Axioms, but in the Dianetic -- not the Logics, but the Dianetic Axioms) to find a complexity which exceeds the complexity of life. When you get into these super complexities, you may to some degree color existence -- you see, because you're describing a complexity -- by faults in communication. Got the idea?

It's hard to express a complexity like a complicated Dianetic Axiom. (And there are several that are pretty complicated.) You express that, and instead of expressing that Axiom -- basic postulate, you see, behind it -- you express something else which, when it communicates, communicates something else to a person.

Now, from that fault you then erect, to some degree, a false structure, see? Hence, you find us continually avoiding these complexities, and talking only at levels which do communicate -- because they can't help but communicate, because they are very simple to state -- and to try to give them the assignment of importance which they ordinarily seem to have in life and its behavior, and which principles, if used in processing, do bring about a maximum result. Do you see this, then, is a simple study?

If you try to make it a complicated study, well, that's for the HCA. You got the idea? He can study a complicated study. First acquaintance with Dianetics and Scientology, he ordinarily erects a false structure, quite routinely. There are many parts of the structure which he receives and reconstructs and is restimulated in him, which are quite synthetic as far as life is concerned. And then gradually he gets over these things, and he gets them straightened out, and he's been at it for a while, and he's reoriented himself. And he finally grabs hold someday of a simplicity of some kind or another, and this illuminates him considerably. And when this happens, he's looking at life.

But one can say, for quite a while, it could be expected that a student, just starting in on such a subject, would not really at any moment look at life. They would look at the structure itself -- the structure of Dianetics and Scientology -- and they would say, „*Well, that's life.*“ Well, that isn't life. No, that is a communication concerning life. And eventually they come over. And one fine day, why, they look at somebody and: „*Ohhh! Oh! Yeah, that's what that person is doing. Well, gee. Wow!*“ You know? „*Gee.*“

As a matter of fact, Dawn and I did this on the telephone about two days ago. It was quite amazing. We hit a simple principle which evidently applied. But we had just published a new roster, and I was calling her to make sure that it had been typed and submitted to various department heads -- a new personnel roster, and assignments of duties, and so on.

Then she said such and such and so-and-so and so-and-so (who were persons who were normally off-comm-line) all wanted to know the same question. And this same question was their own immediate activity connected with this new roster, without any attention to anybody else on the roster with whom they all have to be in communication with.

One would have suspected that a person in good shape would have looked over the roster to see where people were, and that people in bad shape would have looked over the roster only to find out where they themselves were -- in a very limited sense, you see? All right. And this exact thing happened.

Well, that wasn't at all surprising -- we just mentioned that in passing -- till all of a sudden we both cognited at once on a very elementary thing that will sound funny to you until maybe someday you'll cognite on it.

What's wrong with these people who operate on the first dynamic is that they don't have any third dynamic. Now, this apparently is one of these hideous... You know, I mean, that's so simple; it's so easy to look at. Well, we cognited on it, and I'll tell the cognition in just some other little line here. See, the cognition that took place was not exactly this cognition; that's just the words I'm using to relay it.

The cognition that took place was fundamentally this: That people who were having a bad time couldn't have other people. We had just beheld an example of it. And it gets down to a fundamental that this unit will be working with rather consistently, is that all aberration and insanity stems from a scarcity of people. And we cognited long and blue on this, because it was exactly the subject matter of some notes that she had just typed. All right.

Synthetically, we were looking at these notes saying „*scarcity of people*,“ see? That was synthetic; we were looking at the notes. And suddenly, some entirely disrelated action took place called a personnel roster. Had nothing to do with processing; just had to do with positions of people in the organization. And we found out at once that the people who had a bad time in the organization only asked concerning their own immediate posts and did not look anywhere else in the roster to find out where anybody else was. And it became apparent that a person who is operating totally on the first dynamic cannot, then, operate in a third-dynamic activity such as an organization, see? And that's why we have trouble with them in the organization. They can't have other people, so they aren't part of the organization. It's just a scarcity of people.

But we looked at this synthetic over here in the notes -- which were lying at that moment right on the desk -- over to this other thing which was life, and there sat the principle. We had an immediate view of this principle -- at once! We had just tested it without realizing we had tested it at all. I said, „*Why... Why, what do you know! This thing..*“ -- as stupidly simple as it is.

After you've reduced aberration down to the stupid simplicities - - you say, „*People get too scarce, and after that a person can't have any other people. All you have to do is remedy their havingness on people and they get well*“ -- you find out that this operated for the third dynamic too. So when you had people around who couldn't have any other people than

themselves, you had trouble with them on the third dynamic. Naturally. See, how simple! How simple. How elementary. Stupid! But it's out of these stupidities that people are made well.

There are 8,662 trillion „*everybody knows that*.“ See, there's this vast quantity of them -- 8,662 trillion of them, at least -- none of which are true. But every now and then, we discover a principle in Scientology which is also an „*everybody knows that*,“ and then we have trouble! Because it won't communicate. Can't communicate it.

We say, „*The cause of aberration is...*“ and then we say, „*Love thy neighbor*,“ or something like this. And the other person says, „Um... yeah, *well, everybody knows that*,“ and brushes it off. And he goes off down the street to get an ice-cream soda. He's just been told something that would tear him bodily out of his head, that'll put him into a position of being able to mock up Mount Rushmore in whole cloth, that isn't even comparable to having a genie in a lamp, and the guy says, „*Everybody knows that*,“ and skips it. It's not important, see? Got the idea? All right.

Well, the dynamics are a series of agreements which are held in common by a vast number of people -- beings; anybody inhabiting the universe. And when a person subordinate to these agreements decides to overpostulate one of them, he of course gets into trouble.

Pain gets scarce, so he decides that pain is a bad thing. He tries to take pain away from people. What happens? They get sick! Oh, they get sick because you took pain away from them? That's right. „*Enough pain*“ is the postulate above that level. „*There must be enough pain*.“ You're processing somebody who has the postulate „*There must be enough pain*“ on the basis you're going to wipe out all pain. And, of course, you have denied some part of the universe to this person, just as he denies a dynamic. Naturally, you just make something more scarce.

You are processing people who are subordinate to a great number of postulates and agreements, and until some of these things are taken apart, the person cannot make any headway at all.

The things which you're trying to attain with this person are terribly simple, but a tremendous number of agreements and postulates of various kinds, which we know of as the Axioms and other things, intervene between him and this simplicity.

And at any effort to attain simplicity, he is hit by complexities, and so he's confused.

At this simple level, a person who strikes his neighbor strikes himself. That is for sure, because his postulates read that way. You would have to get him totally over the idea that there were eight dynamics by making him totally aware of the fact that he thought there were eight dynamics, before you could bring him up above stimulus-response mechanisms. That's an interesting state of affairs, isn't it?

Well, one of the things he has to do is to get out of his body. His postulates are „*There are not enough people. People are scarce, and I have a scarce item*.“ Now, you're going to say, „*Get three feet back of your head*.“ Oh, no you're not.

You say, „*Well, just change your mind and decide there are enough people.*“ No, he can't. It's not that easy, because too many basic agreements tell him there aren't enough people.

In other words, there is a strata of agreements which have to be changed before a person can change the senior agreements, the dominating agreements, which are themselves simple.

Thank you.

Thank you.

[End of Lecture]