

THE POSTULATE OF GAME

A lecture given on
10 January 1957

This is Thursday the 10th, January 1957. And this is the seventh ACC lecture. The subject of this lecture has to do with the same material I've been talking to you about, which is games condition, no effect on self, and so on.

A fellow electing himself out; a person elects himself out of the human race. He elects himself out and he is elected out by various means, and after a while, why, he just goes down on the dynamics. Well now, in view of the fact that he is in agreement already that he is part of all these dynamics, then an election out of the dynamics brings about a circumstance whereby he is denying his own agreements. In other words, he is forced to violate his contracts.

The contracts, you could say, are the eight dynamics. "I will be faithful unto..." across the boards, you see? A thetan basically is an individual, and then he makes these contracts across the boards. And one fine day, why, somebody elects him off of one of these things. Well, that's a breach of contract, which means a denial of his own word. This is the decay of ethics. In view of the fact that he's agreed to be part of this big game all up and down the dynamics, a denial of that agreement reacts seriously upon him.

Now, what I have just told you is a disentanglement of a great many misconceptions which are held in the Himalayas and in many schools of thought and beingness. People have never before looked above these eight dynamics. They hadn't even delineated these dynamics, and they'd never looked above them.

They conceived that a person was -- get the factuality here that they thought took place -- was only a part of an allness. Got the idea? You've heard this expressed many ways. "We aren't individuals really; we're all part of a big spinning pool of something or other." And you get somebody to run a whole-track series of incidents, he'll inevitably come up with the explosion of the big thetan, of which he was a part. You see? Everybody comes up with this one.

Big thetan -- there was a great big thetan, you see, and it blew up, and now he's a chip off the old block, you know? And everybody comes up with this one, but nothing could be less factual. That whole idea of the big thetan and "we're all one" and the "oneness of everything" and "you are everything, and everything is you," and that sort of thing, is simply an observation of these series of agreements which evolve into the eight dynamics. And a person then believes that these series of agreements called the eight dynamics are fact, and that is the fact, and that is the composition of the universe. No, that isn't the composition of the universe; that is merely a series of agreements made by an individual.

Now, having agreed to do something, the individual is made to deny his own word. He backs out someplace. Well, it makes him feel bad, makes other people feel bad. And they protest against this, and they say this shouldn't exist, this shouldn't be. And this fellow is then -- well, he goes downscale. See? He says, "I can't keep my word."

Actually, a thetan is a very ethical being. His ethical sense is tremendously high. It couldn't be otherwise. It's a rather pathetic thing the way a person gets into a trap. He gives his word. You see, he agrees to be part of; he's there. And then only by his own ethical sense does he continue to be in that trap. It's quite interesting.

It's an interesting rebuttal -- very interesting rebuttal against the concept, such as Plato's, that all men are bad and some are worse and some are worse than that even, and some are politicians. I mean, it goes way downhill. Plato's ideas concerning this are fantastic.

Well, only after a person has broken his word with an agreement does he go bad, you might say -- does he react badly. Now, a thetan can at any moment reassert his own individuality and separateness from everything and anything. He does this every time his body dies. He says, "I'm no further responsible for that," and there he goes. Doesn't even remember it. That's the way he normally tackles the situation in this day and age. Actually, he loses the mass and he loses the agreements above that mass-terminal idea. You remember the Reality Scale? [See the Reality Scale in the Appendix of this volume.] When he loses the mass, why, he also loses the agreements that held him to that life.

There is an exact instant at death where a person will attempt to complete all cycles of action. If a person is given some kind of warning, and if he is not in such bad shape that he can no longer control his body -- he can control his body somewhat then, and he has a little bit of warning -- he'll just work like mad to finish off some of these cycles of action. And right next door to that instant is the abandonment of all of them.

Well, all right. When he abandons them, he feels bad. He agreed to do certain things. It now becomes impossible. He no longer has a body to push around that people will talk to, and so on. And he backs out. And he feels so bad, he actually goes right on downscale -- boom. And that accounts for your forgetfulness.

But he can do this. That is what is interesting. He can do this. He reasserts; he becomes an individuality; he doesn't become part of a swimming pool of nonidentity. He doesn't step off into a buttered-all-over-the-universe situation. He becomes himself.

The only thing wrong with a thetan is truth. It's very fabulous. The only thing wrong with a thetan is truth. Everything that is wrong with a thetan is a harmonic on being a thetan.

Now, I spoke to you the other day and told you how the games conditions were all lies. Well, no-games conditions are all truths. Quite interesting, isn't it? You look down the no-games-condition lists in *Scientology: Fundamentals of Thought* or in the *Washington Briefing Bulletin* [See the list of games conditions and no-games conditions in the Appendix of this volume] and you'll find out that every single one of them, he is. This is what's wrong with him: he is what he is.

One of the big tricks that everybody plays on everyone is to say, "Well, you have to be what you are. Don't try to be anything else." Well look, if you don't try to be something else, you aren't. Just as there are no other problems than other people's problems -- there are no problems of yours; you have to misown a problem before it can be a problem to you -- so it is also true that a thetan, without postulating himself into some form of beingness, isn't.

Now, he does have awareness, does have knowingness. He does have the capability of remembering. He has tremendous capabilities. But to say that he is something -- by which you would mean, he has an identity -- no, this isn't true. He has to invent or assume an invented identity before he has an identity.

Now, he's in pretty good condition, because he's in a game condition if he does this. But he objects to being in a no-game condition. That is probably the only difficult thing to understand in the entirety of Scientology philosophy: how a person does object to not being in a game condition. That's a difficult thing to understand. Very markedly so. Just why he finds it so difficult to sit on cloud nine and not even whistle Dixie -- just why he finds it so difficult to do this is a question, because he can reassume his own individuality. And that own individuality is, of course, your first Axiom. The capabilities of it are your second Axiom. The highest purpose of it is your tenth Axiom. But that tenth Axiom is the hard one to understand.

What is this that causes him to be so anxious? Why does he have to have a game in the first place? And that question we really can't answer. You might say it's just the nature of the beast, but that's sort of getting rid of the whole problem without doing anything about it, you see? Just why I wouldn't know, I wouldn't know.

What is this anxiety he has to be “part of” when it’s obviously so bad for him? Well, of course, he goes on a theory that nothing can hurt him, because that is the truth. That is the truth. Nothing can hurt a thetan. Nothing. And that is the truth, so that’s what’s wrong with him: no effect on self.

So he runs this truth into any other situation. And as soon as he does this, he’s in real trouble. Why? He is pretending, or he has contracted to be, something else. And then when he says “no effect on self,” he is denying the thing, and he’s cheating. Why? He is reassuming his own individuality which is to say, he is a thetan. He isn’t playing the game then.

He’s saying, “No effect on self.” So he isn’t playing the game. He’s being a thetan. So one is torn between these two considerations, that the game must go on (the game has certain lengths and breadths, measurements, thicknesses and identities and various other considerations), and the truth, which is that one is what one is, and unless he invents something to be, he isn’t being anything.

So here he is. He assumes by a wide agreement -- invents, pledges his word, makes compacts and assumes this broad agreement we now call the eight dynamics. And then, one by one, he falls off of these things. Well, he’s to that degree cheating.

Now let’s take a wider look than just a thetan dying and reassuming his identity. There it has become impossible for him to continue. And he has this, to that degree, in his favor. It is not possible for him to continue a game without a body, which requires bodies, you see? Game requires bodies, he hasn’t got a body, so he can’t continue the game. Well, he can’t be responsible for that, can he?

Well, that is the thetan’s answer to breaking a contract: He’ll hold a contract until he conceives it to be utterly impossible for him to do anything else. He will remain father of a family or a teacher, or something else, until it becomes impossible for him to do anything else. He will remain what beingness has been assumed. He’ll retain that -- until by his consideration it’s impossible for him.

Well, death itself is manufactured out of that. He’s stating another truth. He said, “I’m not responsible for any of this.” That’s absolutely true. He has no real responsibility for it, and it’s not important. That it is important, that he is responsible for it, are both lies. But remember, he’s given his word to be responsible for them. He’s given his word to be. He’s given his word to stand fast to these eight dynamics. So having done that, given his word, to say “Now I am not responsible for them” is a breach of contract. It’s a denial of self.

So you get the picture of a thetan playing a game for a short time, and then not playing a game, and playing a game and not playing a game, playing a game and not playing a game; we get our dwindling spiral. Because every time he agrees to play this game -- or play a game -- every time he agrees to do this, he sets up a liability or potentiality out of the consideration that he must not break his word.

And then he lets other forces break his word for him. See, he doesn’t break his word; he makes other things break his word. “The bullet came from nowhere.” “I don’t know how I lost that body.” “It was a perfectly innocent glass of milk. After it was drunk, I did notice that it had a thick scum of arsenic in the bottom of it, But here I lie, dying.” Here, as the body kicks off, “What could I have done?”

Now, listen. Now, let’s get wicked. Now, let’s get mean. Let’s get critical. You mean to say that something which has the potentiality of total knowingness can’t sense arsenic in a glass of milk? Mmm. You mean to tell me that somebody who has the basic ability to predict the entire future didn’t know that the space that body was occupying was also going to be occupied by a fast- traveling bullet?

A thetan makes a great deal of fetish about this. He says, "Well, I don't know sometimes. Sometimes there is a sixth sense. I just have a feeling like a..." Well, there he goes. There he goes. He's making a continual alibi. And he's saying, "There goes my responsibilities. There goes my responsibilities. I was overwhelmed."

Now listen, confidentially, how can a thetan be overwhelmed? No mass, no other meaning than invented meaning, no wavelength, not even a location in space -- and he can be overwhelmed? Now, just a minute. That's a paradox! It isn't possible! Ah, but it must be possible because it happens all the time.

So, under what category comes that possibility? Just under one category, I'm afraid. The category of "postulated to be so, by the person." Ah, we run into this all the time auditing people. A fellow hurt his hand. You audit him a little while on hurting his hand, he suddenly remembers postulating to hurt his hand. We run into this rather continually. Very often in rendering assists to people, this postulate that this accident was going to occur restimulates and runs out. You've all seen that; had some notion about that.

For instance, we have somebody right now who is bound and determined to go to jail or get himself hanged, or something of the sort. Every effort to do anything for this person has wound up in naught. Why? Well, he's postulated it's going to exist, it's going to happen. And nothing has undone that postulate. You see this?

Now, that's what we call an obsessive game condition. The insistence -- unknowing insistence -- upon a sequence of events. That's an unknowing games condition. The individual has gotten himself into this trouble and he says he's not in this trouble.

Well, let me assure you, that if you make a postulate and then say somebody else made it, or it was the Fates, it's not going to erase. The whole principle of misownership looms before us at this moment. The proper authorship of a postulate or a mass must be established in order to totally vanish that mass, which is quite fascinating.

Misownership. You could actually run people on this sort of thing: "You remember a nightmare that you had," or something like that, "when you were a child?"

And the fellow says, "Yeah."

You say, "Well, get the idea that you never created it."

The nightmare will reoccur in three-dimensional color in the auditing session. Quite interesting, isn't it? With this one proviso -- this one proviso: that he did mock it up.

Now, if you told him to get the idea that he didn't author that nightmare, and he hadn't authored the nightmare, it would go all to pieces and you wouldn't see any more of that nightmare. Why? Because it's simply other authorship than self. That's good enough to assign authorship.

But let's say the fellow did create the nightmare and you get him in the auditing session to say that he didn't -- boy, it just becomes stronger and stronger, and more and more persistent, and more and more persistent. Why? It's very simple. He's misowned it.

Now, you tell him "Now get the idea that you mocked up that nightmare when you were a little kid," and zzzt, bong, thud, and that's the end of that nightmare.

He dreamed it up to locate himself. (This is why people dream, by the way. You might be interested in this.) Body goes to sleep, the individual is not oriented, he feels lost, and so he mocks up some areas and circumstance to supplant body perception. That's a nightmare. That's a dream.

Once in a while, a fellow will throw himself a curve by knowing something is going to happen in the next few days, and he will give himself a portent. Back in Greek times, they almost drove themselves insane with these portents. It got up to such a silliness that we read in Plutarch of some fellow who was being attacked on the field of battle, and troops were going down all around him, but he would not give the signal for his own troops to attack -- although they were in overwhelming number to the enemy; the enemy just went on attacking -- until this commander had managed to shoot a bird and examine his innards to find the propitious moment and will of the gods to attack. And he finally did get a good augury out of a bird and issued the signal to attack. And his troops then did attack and, of course, carried the day -- because they were there about three to one over the enemy. Just why he wanted an augury, we don't know. But he really, I suppose, did not want to assume the responsibility for giving that signal. So he said the gods did it.

Now, the Greeks were very complicated about this. They had gods for everything. You always had some god you could consult. Well, they had to work hard at this whole proposition of misownership of responsibility, so as to get responsibility fixed. To bring responsibility into beingness, they had to work hard at it, because anyone has to work hard at it in essence.

Now, it's a funny thing that a thetan is not really responsible for anything. He is not really responsible for anything. He's only responsible for things he says he's responsible for. He's got to say he's responsible for something before he's responsible for it. You got the idea? Or he's got to agree with somebody who says he's responsible.

Above the level of mocking up the universe, there is no responsibility. Even after you've mocked something up, there is no implicit responsibility unless one says there is. And when you talk about responsibility, you're talking about ownership. You're also talking about authorship of the situation or the mock-up. And isn't it funny to look down at the other end of the spectrum and find out that insanity is extreme irresponsibility. In other words, a thetan is insisting upon his own state to such a degree that he now can't insist on anything.

Anything that is wrong with a thetan, is being a thetan. Evidently, he can't stand his own beingness to some degree, because it isn't. It's an odd, odd little paradox. As I say, that's the one philosophical paradox: Why can't he stand his being -- ? Why can't he sit on cloud nine? What does he have to do things for? Why does he have to charge around, getting into this and getting into that? What's this all about?

Well, we can tell you what it's all about, except just that one little, tiny item. We do observe that he does do it. So our philosophical concern is possibly nonsensical. It's perfectly observable that he does enter into games and he won't stay out of them. And having entered into one, he denies himself, he denies his own postulates and agreements, the moment he withdraws from it. And when he withdraws from it, he goes bad -- as far as the remainder of his environment is concerned. That is the dwindling spiral.

We see that in Dianetics and Scientology. Every now and then, some person comes in and offers his help. Well, they never realize that everybody is busy, everybody is working hard, and so on. And there isn't anybody around that instantly, fully, to this person's satisfaction, accepts that help. He dramatizes this. He really dramatizes an old denial of the game. Nobody refused to let him help, you understand -- it's just nobody convinced him. And having offered his help, he then backs out. After that he feels bad about Dianetics and Scientology. Why?

It's a dramatization of having given one's word and postulates and considerations to be part of the game, and then withdrawing from that circumstance. Got the idea? I mean, just that action has happened to him so often that the moment he approaches us, right then, something starts to kick him out. Got the idea?

It can get so bad that the thought of offering help is the thought of having it refused. The thought of offering help is the same thing as having no ability to help. That compounds into the feeling of helplessness which one often feels. One enters a game, he's going to do something

with the game, and then something comes along and kicks him out. And that is the cycle -- it's the game condition and no-game condition, the game condition, no-game condition. It just goes between those two things: a game condition, no-game condition.

Now, which one do you process? Well, you'd be very, very foolish to process a no-game condition. You going to process the basic nature of a horse? This is silly, you know? There isn't anything there to process.

The only thing that is in existence which can be processed, really, effectively, is the series of games conditions, which is this action to enter the game, action to enter the game, action to enter the game.

Now you say, "Withdrawals from the game -- how about those?" Well, they run out just under this same heading. Action to enter the game inevitably carries with it the connotation that one will leave the game. "Don't stay in games forever": No thetan ever seems to have postulated that. He doesn't seem to have any understanding of this at all. Every game he enters, he enters forever.

Why does he enter everything forever? Well, that's the nature of the beast. The thetan is the survivor; the universe and the game are transitory. They're very temporary.

You look at this MEST universe and you say, "Boy, is this MEST universe surviving." Oh, no. That's not true. It's falling to pieces and caving in. It is a flicker of an eyelash in the life of a thetan. The entirety of this particular universe, from the moment of its creation to any possible end, would be, compared to the lifespan of a thetan, the flicker of an eyelash.

I'll give you an example of this, a very good example. Look-a- here. I want to show you this. I'm going to pick up this ashtray and I'm going to set it down again. There was an impact of that ashtray hitting the table. Can you recall that impact? You can, huh? Oh, it still survives in your memory. Well, is it still impacting here? No. Boy, you better get this point but good. Who's the survival kid, then? You? Or that ashtray in this MEST universe, huh? Who's hell on this subject of survival? Hm? Well? Let me ask you that colloquially and crudely.

All right, we'll do another one here. I'm going to hit this table with my knuckles. Do you remember the blow? Is the blow still happening? Not in actuality, is it? Well, my knuckles still tingle a slight degree. Something around here thinks it's still happening. Who thinks it's still happening? Livingness. A livingness thinks that is still happening. That's because time itself is a lie. Livingness has to postulate time, or time ceases.

But let's look at it much more broadly and factually than this, and find out that we're the survivors; this universe isn't. Yet this universe looks so strong, so substantial. And a body looks so weak and so insubstantial. A body looks so weak. I mean -- knock it off in a moment. Couldn't knock off the Empire State Building that fast, could you? Ah yes, but that body has been going along a track for an awful long time, associated with livingness. That Empire State Building will be there for half a century and that'll be that. Not even the flicker of an eyelash in the length of span of a body. Hardly the lifespan of one body, the Empire State Building, considering that men live about sixty, seventy years. The Empire State Building will have been built and will have been torn down, probably, in the lifetime of any one person.

Skyscrapers are made to last about twenty-five, thirty years. After that they become very antiquated. Yet that's a man-made structure. "Well," you say, "this little rock that sits up on this mountain here has just been sitting here for billions and billions of years, and it will just go on sitting here for billions and billions of years."

Our old friend, Lord Dunsany, wrote one about -- I've forgotten; preposterous names in this story -- but it seems like we're all part of some giant's dream, and Skirl the Drummer is drumming. And as long as Skirl drums, the giant will sleep. And we're part of the giant's dream. And Skirl has to keep on drumming, because if he stopped drumming, why, of course

the giant would wake up. And some fine day, why, maybe Skirl will stop drumming. And that, by this story -- of course, that would be that, as far as our existence is concerned.

But it would only be that if our existence was totally predicated on another responsibility than our own. Our existence happens to be totally predicated on our own responsibility. We're responsible for being here and we're responsible for being alive. And the only quirk that occurs here is that we give our word to be part of this vast agreement called the eight dynamics, and then having given our word, and without saying we're changing our word, we say we have been forced to break our word.

In other words, we made the agreement and something else made the break. So the agreement, then, must continue. And that is how you get a survival of an agreement and a survival of a pattern of life. That is how that is done. One himself makes the agreement "to be part of" and something else breaks that agreement. That's what he says, and that's the way it jams up.

A thetan always enters a game forever. Here are these transitory games like MEST universe, and he entered this game forever. He can't enter it forever. It's not going to be here forever.

All right. If that is the case, then, he's telling himself a lie. He's saying, "Well, I was a good boy and I tried to help and I tried to do everything, and they came along and they kicked me out." Look, he must have had to have consented to be kicked out. Somehow or another he must have gotten tired of that game and said, "Let me see if I can figure out a way to get kicked out of it now."

And sure enough, if you trace some soldier down carefully on the whole subject of his wound, you'll find out that he just got tired of soldiering, that's all. And if you had a whole army that was tired enough of soldiering, you would have a whole army of casualties. They do interesting things, these armies that get tired of soldiering. They get butchered.

The army of Vandals that had been under Genseric had been triumphant over the entirety of Rome. The only outfit that really sacked Rome. They even took the gold roof off of Palatine Hill. They stripped that place. They had gone down into Africa and had a foothold there, and they came on across and they finished Rome. Yet those Vandals, within the lifetime of their own chief, who had become quite old, were attacked by Belisarius's horse archers; they didn't even fight! They stood around and wept over the sad fate of their comrades. And this handful of troops under Count Belisarius just killed them all. Well, they were tired of being soldiers. That whole outfit had gotten very, very tired of being a soldier. And they'd gotten so tired of being a soldier that it was better to assign responsibility to Count Belisarius, you see, than to go on fighting. Quite an interesting state of affairs.

The only army I know of, by the way, that actually just stood on the field in battle and held its swords in its hands, did not surrender, did not cry for quarter and did not fight, and just stood there to be cut to pieces. An almost complete determination to be chopped up. Happened in about 580 A.D., down in North Africa, around Tunis. Fascinating, you see?

Now, how could a person get into that frame of mind? Well, he could say, "I'm tired of the game." And then he begins to look for an agency that will knock him off so that he won't have the responsibility of withdrawing from the game. So it's always another agency. And people are going around looking for their own executioners. When they get tired of a game, that is what they do. And they will elect you an executioner, or me or somebody else. But they are electing executioners -- a phrase, by the way, that I occasionally have use for, because it becomes apparent to me every now and then that somebody has chosen me out as his executioner.

This is not as an aberrated consideration on my part. They come in and plead with me to cut their heads off. Just almost factually. They start dropping work and considerations and any communication, balling things up into tight knots and messing things up in all directions. And it becomes obvious to me that somebody couldn't get that dull. They just couldn't get that dull.

They're tired of the game of life, is what they're tired of, not the game they're playing. The composite tiredness, you might say, on the whole track balls up and they look around for somebody who has a little strength, or something of the sort, who has a potentiality of being an executioner. And they bare their necks. They practically plead with you to kill them in some fashion, you see? They say, "Fire me." They say, "Throw me away," in some fashion. They say, "Do me harm." Get the idea?

This, carried to an extreme, is masochistic. Of course. But we're not interested in that extreme. We're just studying a normal reaction.

A fellow gets tired of his job -- working in some department somewhere; he gets tired of his job -- and he will start doing things then that will cause his boss to kick him out. I've long since understood this mechanism.

A fellow on an expedition, one time when I was a kid -- I was director of this expedition -- and right at the outset this person started to make blunders of magnitude, which were not part of his record at all. I came down the quarterdeck one day -- we were loading stores -- and he had just gotten through mischecking all of the stores to the degree of saddling us with one thousand cases of gallon cans of tomato ketchup. That was pretty good, huh? I don't know what we were going to use it for. Ballast? Somebody delivered that to us, and this person had done that.

Turned right around and found out that we had six inches of water in the bilge, which had been dry yesterday. And in a few minutes we had about fifteen inches of water in the bilge. The immediate consideration on the part of one of the mates was that we were sinking right alongside the dock.

So I pulled some water up out of the well, and I tasted it. It was fresh water. And this guy in charge of stores had permitted the water boat to come alongside, and under full, blasting pump pressure, carefully sealing the water-hose nozzle into our water tanks, had simply burst the ship's water tanks, which were then flooding into the hold. We would have put to sea and have been totally without water, except for maybe a keg or two in the lifeboats.

Just one thing followed another. About the fourth that occurred, I found out the only randomness that was going on on the ship was this person. Well, I was very young and very tough and very thoughtless in those days, so I actually did factually kick him down the gangway. Told him I never wanted to see his face again -- I'd blow his head off. Threw his dunnage bag after him.

He stood down at the other end of the dock and he mopped his brow with relief. His relief was so intense. His relief was so obvious that even in a moment like that I could not help but remark it.

So I asked some of the boys around. I said, "What was the frame of mind that fellow was in?"

"Well, he was scared to death. He's scared of hurricanes."

What's that got to do with it? Well, we were going to a hurricane country, and we might extend our cruise over into the hurricane season.

See, any way you wanted to compute it, the man was looking for an executioner. He wasn't trying to keep the ship from starting. He would have done much more serious things if he'd tried to keep the expedition from starting. He would have taken another course entirely, you see? He would have gotten our sailing clearances held up, which was in his power to do; he would have done other things. But he didn't do any of that, you see? He just made obvious blunders that nobody could miss! The tomato ketchup he left stacked in front of the quarterdeck, you see, not storing it as he normally should have. He erected an exhibit of all these thousand cases of tomato ketchup, you see? It was he who discovered the water was rising in the bilges, you see? He was begging for an executioner. He was afraid to go along.

All right. There's no essential difference between that and somebody working in an office who starts to make mistakes, mistakes, mistakes, mistakes, mistakes. The funny part of it is, he always calls them to your attention. Darnedest thing you ever saw. If a person is working in this direction, and the mistakes are really not because of incompetence in general -- I mean, the fellow just doesn't understand his job; a fellow can make a mistake that way. But these fellows will make mistakes and then advertise them to you. You'll get bulletins on the subject of "my latest mistake."

They're, to a slight degree or a great degree, looking for something to expel them from the game. See, they're tired of the game and they want to be expelled from it.

Now, they don't dare expel themselves from the game. I call to your attention that suicide is a crime for which you can be arrested. You maybe didn't know this, but this is true in almost every civilized nation. You can be arrested for suicide. If you ever commit suicide, do a good job of it. Otherwise, they'll throw you in a clink.

You see, it's even become punishable for a person to become the author of his own separation from the game. It's just not done. One invites himself into the game but must be invited out. So this, of course, doesn't wipe out the first postulate, and we have the dwindling spiral.

He says, "I want to be part of this expedition," and then he waits for somebody to tell him that he's kicked out. Does that undo his original postulate that he was going to be part of the expedition? No, it doesn't. He doesn't change his mind on the subject. He does an action, and he waits for somebody else to do an action, see? These, then, do not erase. And we get this unevenness which we see in the bank, and that is the unevenness in the bank.

The person invites himself in, but never invites himself out. That is why a preclear must be exercised in the direction of his own self-determinism. That is why he must be cause. Everything that has ever happened to him has happened sequentially to his having caused something.

So that if you run overt acts on the part of the individual -- in other words, causation, causation, causation, the preclear at cause, preclear at cause, preclear at cause -- you are erasing everything that preceded the somatics.

You see, he said, "I want to be part of this army," and the way he left it was to stand up in front of a bullet. He's got these two things jammed. He wanted to be part of, and something else must make him not-part-of, you see? He wanted to be part of, something else makes him not-part-of. Therefore, you run out the prior postulate.

Basic-basic on his being shot in the chest, we discover, is his asking to join the army. See that? And if he was drafted in this life, he asked to join the army sometime or another. He asked to join some army somewhere; that is the basic on that chain of his getting mixed up with armies.

I'll tell you this factually: That a person could not be drafted who had never made a bid to become part of an army. It just would not happen, that's all. Sounds mystic, but it's not very mystic. He never elected to join that game.

It's the weirdest thing. Some person can get a criminal past in restimulation -- the cops pick him up like that. In other words, sometime in the past he elected to be a criminal, now he has trouble with police. The proof of it is this: You erase his bid to be part of the game called "cops and robbers" -- you erase that bid -- and the rest of it folds up.

When you run a preclear at cause, you erase basic-basic on the sequence of events which usually terminated with his being kicked out by some other agency without his own determinism. You see, he asked to be there and something else asked him not to be there. Well, somebody else asking him not to be there runs out just by asking him to be there. You see, he

asked to be there. Run that out, and the sequence of events which proceeded from there show up in terms of somatics.

See, preclear at cause, preclear at cause, preclear at cause, preclear at cause, and all of a sudden he's got a pain in his chest. Why has he got this pain in his chest? This is the silliest thing he ever heard of.

"Well," you say, "it was because he resisted pains in the chest." Boy, that's a very short look. "Well, it's because he shot somebody in the chest." That's a very, very short look. Both of them are true, see? That's true. He had to have shot somebody in the chest before he could be shot in the chest and experience pain as a result thereof. So that's overt act-motivator sequence. And now you'll see more clearly that I'm not talking about overt-act-motivator sequence when I'm talking about the dynamics. You see? I'm really not talking about overt act-motivator sequence. I'm talking about the bid to be part of that game. And that is not an overt act.

See, overt act and motivators are perfectly factual. That's all true. A person, to get a pain in the chest, usually has got somebody else's pain in the chest, and he's inflicted a few pains in the chest. That's the game called "pain in the chest." But underlying any sequence of events which wind up with somatics and misemotions, you will find a bid to enter the game.

Can you think of going around with a lantern or something and finding a thetan? Hm? Do you think you could do this? Well therefore, it becomes obvious that a thetan had to announce his entrance into the game himself before anybody found he was there. That make sense to you?

Female voice: Yeah.

Nobody came around and looked him up.

So to run basic-basic, Dianetic fashion, you merely run preclear at cause. At effect, who cares? Anything at effect, but preclear at cause. And you run out these bids to enter the game, bids to enter any game. And then he starts moving out of the game because his agreement or postulate (which preceded the agreement) to enter it erases, so he's no longer part of the game. All he has to do is erase his bid to enter the game, and the game goes. You see, that was never erased before.

The way he tried to erase it was to get somebody to fire him, get somebody to kick him out, get somebody to kill him, get somebody to give him beriberi or something. You get the mechanism? He tried to make somebody else do it; to kick him out. But that did not erase his desire to be part of

You'll hear old men stand around and say nostalgically... about their romantic youth and how wonderful and romantic they thought it was at that time. And somebody said, "Well, I'm in the advertising game. When I was a kid, I used to think there was a lot of glamour and glory about this sort of thing, and I've become wiser by now." Well, he's become wiser. He's also become old. How'd he get old? Well, just too many of these things, that's all.

He looks on himself critically in the past. It's another person, that person in the past. It's another being, the guy back there, that was interested in the advertising game.

Funniest doggone thing you ever wanted to do with auditing is to get somebody who has been in something like the advertising game and run him at cause on the subject of advertising -- his causing advertising, causing advertising -- you'll eventually run out his bid to be part of the advertising game, you see? The second you did that, you have stripped off the advertising game. Gone.

For him to continue his profession, it's not necessary for him to postulate that he's going to enter it. But having done so, he will enter it with all the shining innocence of a youth. Get the

The only thing wrong with a motion-picture actor, for instance, that caves him in along the track, the only thing wrong with him is that he has already entered the motion-picture field. See, he entered it. That is a done fact. And he will always run it as a past-tense fact. He'll say, "Oh, I came into pictures in 1936," he'll say. He never says, "I think I'll enter pictures!" Get the idea? "I think I'll enter pictures" -- he never says that. So he actually never runs out his having entered pictures.

So you run the preclear at cause, preclear at cause, preclear at cause, and some of the doggonedest things happen. Remember, your preclear that you're running is not only below agreement, but below mass. He's below mass and space, ordinarily, on any of these subjects. So you have to run masses and then spaces before you get into agreements -- all on the same subject.

So how would you get somebody entering the advertising game? Well, you'd have to get him to mock himself up doing something to somebody with advertising. See, you make it an Axiom 10 process. You have him mock himself up doing something to somebody with advertising, you see? Just mock up two bodies, you see? And mock each one up with those intentions, see? And just keep mocking them up, mocking them up, mocking them up, mocking them up. All of a sudden, a lot of other things will fly into view. Because you've remedied the mass.

Just remedy the mass on the subject of women for any man, or men for any woman. Just mock up one person, you know -- opposite sex. You'd change their lives all around. Why? The preclear is at cause and he's doing something, even though it's just a mock-up, see? He's doing something to something. That is the most elementary of these processes; it's just mock something up. We don't care what. Mock something up. As long as you mock something up, you're all right, you see?

Now, that's entering it in at the mass level. It remedies mass; his considerations change off into spatial considerations, which immediately go into agreements -- taking apart agreements. And when these agreements are taken apart, why, you'll find the postulate standing there. Usually it happens fairly rapidly, and the postulate runs out almost at once.

If you consider any activity that the preclear is complaining about to have been, at one time or another, a pleasurable activity with the preclear at cause, you will be reaching for his moment of entrance into the game. And that's what has to be hit. That's all that has to be hit, truth be told, final analysis.

You see, he entered lots of games, but he himself never left one. The motto of the thetan was simply "I've always been kicked out. I was sweet, young and innocent. And I made the bid to be there, and then they abused me and kicked me out."

Unfortunately, this is a common denominator of existence. It isn't just one person, now, I'm talking about -- or a special case. It is the sequence. He joined up and they shot him. See? He'll say "I joined up. They kicked me out. "

Well, he'll run "They kicked me out" forever. Why will he run it forever? Well, that's because it's never going to resolve on that basis. It just never can resolve. Why can't it resolve? Well, you're not running any duplication or Remedy of Havingness on the actual fact of his having joined up.

Now, his having been kicked out runs out when you run out his having joined up. See? So you always run the preclear doing things to things, entering things, being the cause point, other things being an effect, and these games strip off.

The "being kicked out" keeps kicking in all the time as a somatic, as pressure. Somatics. They just keep turning up. And eventually, he figures this out as an overt act-motivator sequence. But

that's a deeper look at the whole thing. You say, "If I do something to somebody, something bad will happen to me. Therefore, I'd better be a good boy."

Well, overt act-motivator sequence, you see -- he just starts to run out this sequence. He hits somebody. In other words, he's causative to any degree, and instantly he feels he's got a broken jaw. But he didn't get hit in the jaw, he hit somebody else's jaw, see?

Well, he restimulated his bid to enter the game, and that restimulated his being kicked out of the game. So people become very afraid of being cause. They decide they would rather be anything else than cause. "Eh, I'd better be anything else other than cause." And if you as an auditor agree with this attitude, you'll have trouble with preclears.

It is not true that a preclear caused everything that ever happened to him, but it is true that he asked for it.

Thank you.

[End of Lecture]