

„CRA“ TRIANGLE

A lecture given on 23 October 1956

[Start of Lecture]

I'm going to talk to you about ARC, a subject that has been with us since July of 1950, and which until the last three weeks was hiding something from us. It isn't ARC; it's CRA.

CRA is the right way to say ARC. The psychiatrist says it with arc -- electric current, and so forth. Now, if you try to audit first with A and then with R in order to get C, you'll never establish C.

If you show an affection to an angry man, you're liable to get clobbered, because A is not the entrance point of the triangle. And we find out that the triangle is not quite parallel; A, R and C are not quite parallel. Always, when the triangle is drawn, C is the lowest point, R is the intermediate point and A is the highest point. Although the distance between -- vertical distance between -- C and A may be almost imperceptible, nevertheless the triangle is not a straight line, it is not a horizontal line; it is slightly tipped. And C is lower than R, and R is lower than A.

In order to enter a case, then, you enter it with C to obtain R and then you achieve A.

Now, this, of course, if it's true of auditing, is true of life. This becomes terrifically important: C to get R and then you attain A. C simply to attain A („*Don't you love me anymore, dear?*“ or something of the sort) is doomed to failure. Doomed to failure. But C to establish the existence of R is, if done right, successful. So we have C as the entrance point of any problem condition or auditing session. R, as the monitoring point that has to be established, is established by C. And the final result is A in some form or another.

Now, the very funny part of it is that if you run -- if you wanted to put somebody in fear (let's just talk about Black Dianetics for a moment), if you wanted to put somebody in fear, the easiest way to do it in the world would be to run C-R-A. You would

interfere with the C in such a way as to destabilize the R, and then you would achieve a misemotion. Don't you see? So that if you actually destabilize C in some fashion, you would then attain an unstabilized R, and you would then attain, of course, some misemotional result. In this way, it would be plotted just exactly in the reverse. You would have to start at C with some communication, don't you see? There'd have to be some factual communication, and then you would downgrade R and then you would downgrade A. It would run like that. All right.

But when you use C to establish R, you then achieve A. And here's a great oddity: The triangle run with Black Dianetics is not very successful. It's very difficult to make somebody worse. It's one of the hardest things in the world to do. That is why the psychologist believed implicitly that people couldn't change; he couldn't make them worse. That is unfortunately correct. I mean, it's not even a joke. I mean, this happens to be a fact.

But the moment that we assume that a person can be made better, they then change. This is one of the wildest things you ever wanted to examine. So if you use C, if you just plain use C in some -- even a sloppy fashion, R of some kind, better than has existed, will occur. See, just any kind of C will permit some kind of R to occur, and you will get some sort of A resulting. Now, if you start on this course with C, then you will achieve R and then attain A. But the funny part of it is, is you -- this is a sort of trap actually -- you can't help but attain R and A if you begin with C.

If you were to speak to a little boy on the street, you've started the whole reaction going, don't you see? If you use communication, you get the other two.

All right. Now I want to tell you some of the great oddities that exist in the world. Can I tell you about some of these great oddities? This is very interesting. You know all about the world, and so forth, but it has oddities in it. When you drop R out, you drop A. So if you do C without R, you get A low.

Now, let's look that over carefully. If you do C and there's no R, you get a lowered A. Let's look this over again. No, it's worse than you think, actually; it's much worse than you think. Works this way: Although physical pain and unconsciousness accompanied by compulsive exteriorization is the definition of the engram for which we are looking, and which is the one that gathers locks, what locks does it gather? What are the important locks? Now, the Dianetic definition of an engram is a moment of pain and unconsciousness. Understood in the definition is that it's a mental image picture containing a record of a moment of pain and unconsciousness. Now that is the full thing.

Scientology has a different definition for an engram. The Scientology definition for an engram -- you'll have to know this -- is a moment of pain and unconsciousness and compulsive exteriorization contained in a mental image picture, unknown to the pre-clear. I'll go over that again because it's a precision definition. It's a moment of pain and unconsciousness and compulsive exteriorization contained in a mental image picture, associated with, but unknown to the pre-clear That's the Scientology definition of an engram.

Now, you're going to run into this in teaching such things as Over and Under, in auditing preclears on such things as Over and Under, so you better know what this thing is. This is quite interesting.

For instance, the total Freudian idea of a detached viewpoint is simply somebody operating out of a moment of pain and unconsciousness and compulsive exteriorization, associated with, but unknown to the preclear. Mental image picture -- that's it. Now, you see that? Now, naturally this picture, unknown, cannot be pegged down anyplace on the track and so, incapable of pegging it down because he doesn't know what it is, he then has this interesting factor: the picture is floating and he's in an exteriorized state, so he sees everything from an exteriorized viewpoint. You follow that?

The symptom of operating out of an engram, then, is never to be able to occupy the viewpoint which one occupied when he took the picture. He takes a picture of a car. He stands out here and he looks at an automobile, he turns away, he has a mental image picture of a car. But he sees his body looking at a car.

Now, this is a fascinating thing. This would only occur under two circumstances: One, if the fellow was exterior, and that was the picture he took -- but let us say that the fellow was not exterior at the moment he took the picture of the car; he just stood there and he looked at the car. And he was looking right straight from where he was. But now when he looks at the picture of it, he hasn't got that picture at all; he's got a picture of himself looking at a car. Well, that's because his viewpoint is removed from the body, and all pictures are being viewed from the spot where he compulsively exteriorized during a moment of pain and unconsciousness.

The totality of Tone Scale today contains an enormously important discovery, just as important as this anatomy of R which made this other observation (CRA) possible -- the anatomy of R I gave you yesterday: Solids; no terminal but solid lines; well above 2.0, agreement; above 22.0, by postulate only. All right. Now that is the anatomy of R. That's very important. Into our laps has fallen, somewhat earlier, a tremendously important datum, which is the anatomy of A.

Now, we've known the upper-scale anatomy of A, but we didn't realize that A went into „*perceive*“ All perception is, is high A. All knowledge is, is high perceive. Quite interesting. A gets solid.

Now, we suspected this a long time ago, back with Effort Processing. We knew that A went down into effort. But where else does it go? Well, it went far enough and was obscured enough that I made several miscalculations on techniques. I would see somebody get apathetic when he was run on a technique, and would then abandon the technique because I conceived that he was going downscale. It's rather surprising to you to be told that Separateness was a superior technique to Connectedness, and then to have me come along somewhat later and give you an SLP 8 which says nothing on Separateness but talks about Connectedness only, as a technique. That's because the person run on Connectedness became apathetic. They became upset and so on.

What wasn't established was this: the jump-off point, the El Caney that precedes San Juan Hill, had just not been attained here at all; hadn't been attained even vaguely.

The point is that lack of memory, lack of knowledge, lack of emotion, is all below apathy. And one of the first symptoms attained by a person who comes upscale is to become apathetic. In other words, you move a preclear up into apathy.

Now, when a person disappears out of his head at the end of his life -- you know, he just goes -- he really disappears only if he's below apathy as a thetan. In these later centuries, everyone has been more or less apathetic concerning bodies and so forth; this then became standard and usual. In other words, a person died, he went out of his head and he said, „*I couldn't care less*,“ and went on his way. See? That became the usual. The norm. Hah ha! It isn't. It's a very unusual circumstance.

Why don't people remember the lives they've led? Because they led them. as a thetan below apathy, of course. You don't get memory below apathy. It's as easy as that. Now, you can shut memory off with a postulate if you want to, but you don't get memory below apathy. That's all there is to that.

And so you start to process somebody and he begins to feel awfully apathetic. Pat yourself on the back, he's on his way.

Now, you can, of course, drop him into apathy. You can pull a terrible boo-boo on him of one kind or another and drop him overboard and so forth, and he gets to feeling worse than he felt. Well, don't confuse these two things. If you're auditing a person smoothly and well, and that person doesn't remember his last twenty lives in full detail, you can expect him as a thetan, sooner or later, to feel degraded and apathetic. And when he feels degraded and apathetic, he's just starting on the Tone Scale as we know it.

Now, it's a funny thing that since 1952 we've had the minus scale. We've known all about the minus scale. There it sat. Had never taken a look at it; never really inspected it. I could not conceive some of the circumstances that went on in the minus scale. That's all. And one of them is the inability to experience an emotion.

Now, what about the longshoreman who goes down here and he's lifting a box, and his partner drops it on him and he smashes his foot. And he stands there and looks at his smashed foot, and hauls himself up to the dressing station or something of the sort, and argues with the fellow that he ought to be permitted to go back to work. He could be in one of two circumstances. One, he could be so high toned that he wasn't affected by it, or he could be in the minus-zero scale. And if he's in the minus-zero scale, he doesn't feel it as pain. Do you follow me? That's one of the random phenomena I have always known about and which was never explained in the work which we were doing. A person who is very low toned is seriously injured, and you can't persuade him to go get patched up, or he won't get patched up or so on, or it doesn't hurt him, or he doesn't notice it. Because I've seen drunks do this. I've seen drunks be all cut to pieces and then fail to take any slightest heed of the circumstance.

And one of the things you could conclude was that this fellow was awfully tough. No, no, wrong conclusion. We finally know what he is. He's awfully minus-scale. He actu-

ally does not experience. He doesn't experience. Now, you get the idea? He moves through life without experiencing. And that is the chief characteristic of the minus scale. Do you follow that?

Now, you have to know these things because you're using, today, a very powerful weapon. And that weapon is communication. And its next level of action, straight above, is reality. And the next level of action that occurs is affinity. What affinity? Well, affinity goes from the minus scale, right on up to „*know*.“ That's the Affinity Scale. It's the whole thing. The whole thing. Communication and reality are really subordinate to the Affinity Scale -- they really are -- because people monitor their existence by affinity. Livingness is best expressed in terms of affinity. And yet how do you ever find the front gate to this Affinity Scale? Well, the middle gate is R and the front gate is C.

But how carefully do you have to do C in order to change R? If you do C well, you can change R. If you change R, you can change A -- and we don't say for better or for worse. That's all, see? You use C to change R. You use R then to change A. Well, C, then, has to be begun well until an R is attained. And then one is handling C and R at the same time, at which time he changes A, and now he's handling all three and, for the first time, could be said to be in ARC with his preclear. He's handling all three levels. But how long does it take to get in ARC with a preclear? It takes as long as it takes you to firmly establish C so as to achieve an R, so as to attain an A. And that is the route. Now, this is the workable route in auditing.

Naturally, at this stage the thing you have to know the most about is C. But you can't know anything about C unless it's what you're trying to do with C. What you're trying to do with C is establish R. You can't know too much about R unless you know what you're going to do with R. And what are you using R for? Well, you're using R to establish A. What is A? A is livingness, degree and grade of.

Living is a third-dynamic activity for the most part. And a person ceases to live to the degree that he falls out of this third dynamic. He can fall all the way down the dynamics, you understand, and lose, but the one that we see most of and we find most simple to handle is, of course, the third dynamic. So that we're dealing with a third-dynamic operation in an auditing session.

Well, therefore, the individual must be proceeding from somewhere around the first dynamic. And you get him to stretch his first dynamic, by auditing, into a third dynamic. When you achieve this you're doing fine. One of the easy ways to do this is to cross the first and the sixth, which gives you a kind of third dynamic. It brings people into present time. You cross the first and the sixth dynamic, do you see that?

Have him spot walls, spot walls, spot walls, spot the floor, spot the ceiling. Have him walk around the block and notice things until he feels better. That is the „*Take a walk*“ that anybody could do. Well, that's crossing the first and the sixth. And it's an odd thing, that you cross the first and the sixth, that you get a reaction on the third.

Now, no matter what you cross, where, amongst the dynamics, you still get in some way a reaction on the third. Third apparently is the pivot around which the universe

swings. It's pretty hard to tell somebody this who knows there's nobody in the entire world except himself. Pretty hard to tell him this and have him utilize it in any fashion.

But let's take a broader look here at the third dynamic, and we see that a person could have a third dynamic to the degree that he would be cognizant of other life. Just that, just other life. He knows other life exists. In other words, his third is as big as he is aware of the existence of other life. Right? That's how big the third dynamic is.

Now, it's better to be scared to death by a snake than never meet one. It's quite interesting. It's a quite interesting fact. It's better to be jumped on by a bear than never to have seen one.

But let's look at this other thing that I told you was so horrible, now that we've covered that little ground there. This is really interesting. We do a C and we drop out, almost in its entirety, R. And we get the phenomenon with which we are very well acquainted: How bad it is over there. „*It's all bad over there*.“ Now, how does that phenomenon come about?

Now, here's the engram, and that phenomenon -- „*It's all bad over there*“ -- does compose the locks. The locks on top of the engram are not necessarily associated experiences. They are associated thinkings. Considerable difference here. Not associated experience; those aren't locks. The major locks are those which omit R on the same subject.

Now, how would you omit R on the same subject? How would you go about it and do that? You'd read about it, that's what you'd do. You'd go see a movie about it, that's what you'd do. And you would never, under God's green earth, approach the subject as an R. You would skirt it carefully via nothing but textbooks. Got the idea?

There you've dropped the R out. But where's the A go? It goes down. Inevitable. Now, it is fashionable these days to think that battlefields filled with dead bodies are bad. That's a fashionable thing to think. We all think that. We're perfectly aware of this. We think that to such a degree that we consider it the truth. That's because we've heard about too many battles, We've heard about too many battles. Now, if we'd never heard about a battle but simply fought in a few, all we would have would be the experience of having fought in a few and the R is right there -- the dead bodies, the bullets whizzing around and so on.

This was always something which was quite amusing to me. I used to think about this as very peculiar, very peculiar. I used to think there was something wrong with me because if anything had to do with action or combat came along, I didn't find the circumstances very intolerable. And this was inexplicable to me until I found out that I considered battles I had never been in ghastly! And I didn't think any of the battles I'd ever been in ghastly. See, I didn't think this was a bad thing. I didn't even vaguely associate this as a bad thing. Submarines are something you fish for. They're slightly larger than other kinds of fish. And airplanes is like duck hunting except the duck can shoot back and you have some motive to shoot down airplanes -- to stop their propellers; enough significance.

I'm afraid I have that to this day. I'm afraid I do. I look up at airplanes and lick my chops and what wouldn't I give for a .40 millimeter. It got to be a sport. No more than that. But boy, there were some battles that were fought with airplanes, and there were some bombings, and there were some other things that happened during the war that were just too ghastly for words! Until I finally realized that I hadn't attended them.

Now, give you some idea like this: the reality of battles does continue after the fact. Now, I heard about something the other day that made me feel rather bad. I dropped the I-76 or the Imperial Japanese Navy Trans-Pacific Submarine down into the mouth of the Columbia River, dead duck. And it went down with a resounding furor. And that was that. I never thought about it again particularly except to get mad at all the admirals I had to make reports to because of this thing, see? This was one out of seventy-nine separate actions that I had to do with. And it had no significance, see?

But the other day I was kind of tired, and my dad suddenly sprung on me the fact that my submarine had been causing a tremendous amount of difficulty in the mouth of the Columbia River. Hadn't thought about this thing for years. Of course, it's all shot to ribbons, this thing. It's got jagged steel sticking out at all ends and angles, and it's a big submarine! It's a -- I don't know, about the size of the first Narwhal that we built. And the fishermen coming in there and fishing are dragging their nets around in that area, and it's just tearing their nets to ribbons -- they've even hired a civilian contractor to try to blow the thing up and get it the devil out of there -- and has evidently been raising bob with postwar fishing here for more years than I'd care to count. All right.

The moment I heard about this I felt contrite. I like fishermen; they're friends of mine. And the next thing you know I was asking my father for the address of the fishermen's association up there to write them a letter of apology. I want to call something to your attention. I never wrote any letters of apology to the Japanese navy. Here are dead men, see? Dead men. Three hundred dead men involved in that thing -- big crew, big sub. They got wives and children and... And I should, you see? I know the Japanese people, and I like them and so on. And that really should cause remorse, you see? But the remorse is all on something I heard about, you got the idea?

If you look that over for a moment you will see that it's completely idiotic. The actual function of slaughtering off a bunch of people and messing up a bunch of machinery and so forth -- that actually is quite an overt act. No faintest quiver. But that I would tear up some fisherman's net that I hadn't even met, you see, this -- contrition -- this is an overt act. Oh, is it?

Now, I'm sure you have material like this that you can look over similarly. Quite amazing. It's quite amazing. When we look it over carefully, we come to grips with reality. Well, reality is fine. But the reality you read about is for the birds, because there's no R there. Got the idea? No R.

You should understand this very thoroughly because it tells you that a television set will sooner or later... It's better than nothing, you know. It's better than nothing at all, but it tells you that sooner or later it will practically cave in the initiative of young

America. The motion-picture screen -- the amount of depth and mass of a motion-picture screen is not even measurable. You couldn't even weigh it on the tiniest scales -- the amount of mass that is actually contained in the picture. Of course, there's the mass of the screen. That's fairly slight. It's measurable, but it doesn't make up for all the cities you have seen on motion-picture screens, now does it? Well, then, what goes in on top of an engram? Another similar experience? No.

Look, what is unconsciousness? Unconsciousness is a lost R. That is all.

When R drops all the way out, we get unconsciousness over on the affinity band. We drop out R and we get anaten over here. „*Out of sight, out of mind*“ is about the crudest explanation of that. Out of sight, out of mind: the way some fellows conduct their love affairs. See, it's out goes the R, and A becomes unconscious.

Now, supposing the R is formidable. Supposing it's a dentist with a dentist drill in this hand. That's a formidable R. And [one] doesn't wish to confront this R. And so where does he go? Well, he has two places to go. One is anaten, and the other is out of his head. And the incidents we're interested in is where he did both. Because he lost the havingness of the body and he lost the havingness that was right in front of him because its significance... Significance and havingness are two different things, you know? The significance is additive to havingness, and havingness acts as a sponge to significance. So the havingness that was in front of him, then, was unbearable as far as his consideration went, so he was denied that havingness which pressed him (and his body) into unconsciousness -- if a body ever goes unconscious; if it's ever conscious -- pressed him into anaten, and then made him shove off and get lost.

Now, that is a monitor of a very formidable confrontingness. In other words, that R is quite formidable that would make a person do this -- although I find out that simple exteriorization is one of the easier things that a thetan in fairly good condition does. Somebody shoves a picture in front of his face and he goes twenty feet back of his head. Somebody surprises him suddenly, he goes over on the other side of town. You know. He's in good shape compared to the existing norm. He's in terrible condition compared to the condition he should be in. But he at least can shove off.

Now, how about the fellow lower on the scale who simply has to stand there and grit his thetan teeth? See, he can't leave. He can't shove off. Well, he's in worse condition -- so that to him, an exteriorization becomes a dominant fact; that he exteriorized and lost that havingness of the body is something from which he almost cannot recover. You get the idea? He just feels that. If he were to lose this body now, that would be the end of him. He would not be able to get or retain another one, or something of the sort. In other words, he's dead in his head; he's stuck confronting the universe at all times, too far below apathy to know that his next emotion above apathy would be „*scared to death*.“

I took a chap one time who was very apathetic and coasted him up and down the time track -- and I mean the whole track -- until I found an instant of emotion. I was working on the idea that you had to find where emotion has overpowered the individual -- which is not really a correct premise; emotion is the symptom of having been overpowered is the correct statement -- and as we coasted him up and down the track, we

hit a moment of terror. Of course, the terror was easily explained. He and his pal were a couple of scouts for another tribe back in Stone Age times, or something of the sort, and they were captured, and he lay there and watched his friend being eaten up.

Well, I know now that this incident never happened to him; that he made a picture of it happening when somebody told him about it. If he'd been there it wouldn't have been aberrative. Got the idea? But he got enough fear off of this to make the couch legs chatter against the floor. And this wasn't an unbalanced couch; it was a heavy couch. And one end of the couch was actually leaping up and down on the floor, bdrdrdrdrdrdr, like that, he was shaking so. I never saw a man shake quite as hard as he shook.

Well that, of course -- having an incident of that character in the bank -- would rather discourage one from confronting certain types of reality. Most of the incidents which are aberrative are laid in by something like a Fac One camera. They're laid in by: „*We don't mock things up around here -- the place was getting too cluttered -- we use engrams. We use facsimiles only. There's a pile of them over there, go take one.*“ This sort of a thing really exists on the track, by the way.

A fellow gets a facsimile which has no real R to it at all -- see, it's not heavy, the mass isn't there -- and he gets the idea of it, and having gotten the idea of it, he tries to find enough R to compensate for it. Got the idea?

Unable to find the R, he then falls in some lower position than he should on the A scale. In other words, you can scare somebody half to death by giving him something to read. But if you took him out in actuality, he wouldn't turn a hair. He'd probably meet the situation nicely.

In many men the idea and question of „*are they brave?*“ is quite dominant. We consider amongst men that a certain level of courage -- or used to consider this -- a certain level of courage was desirable. And many a young man begins to worry about whether or not he's afraid. He wonders how he would confront certain situations. His fear of being afraid is quite heavy. He is afraid that he is a coward. He is afraid he will not match up to a situation once he confronts it. Well, why is he afraid of that? He hasn't confronted it, that's why. That's all.

But he can become so plowed in with this worry, about whether or not he'll be able to confront life or angry men or something of the sort, that he actually gets quite upset and can make a thorough, chronic coward out of himself. How? Well, he never has the mass or reality of what he's confronting, so he always attributes it other things, and he's always sorting out this with various hypothetical situations and his reaction to them.

Now, let's get a much closer -- not necessarily closer to home, but a much easier thing to assimilate. What is this thing called first-night nerves? What is this thing? It's a -- the theater -- it's a phenomenon that every actor seems to experience. Now, there he is; he walks on the stage; he's had his dress rehearsal, and he's had everything. And he has to be prompted where he would never have to be prompted ordinarily. He has to be braced up to the audience and braced up to the play and they fan him between

scenes and they throw tantrums back of the wings, and it's quite a scramble. What is this all about?

Well, they have been acting to a no-audience, and sudden acquisition of an audience furnishes no gradient of R. They are actually without an audience for a long time between plays, while they're rehearsing and so forth, you see? And they get used to not having the audience, and when they have the audience, this is again too much R, you might say. That's all it is. It's just the existence of audience. First-night nerves then are occasioned by a person leaping from no audience to audience, see, suddenly. That's all.

If you think you're slipping as a speaker, or something of that line, why, just go out and find some people and talk to them. It's as easy as that. And if you went and found too many people too suddenly you would have too much R, which would depress you on the Tone Scale because it's unacceptable reality. See, it's unacceptable mass. And it being unacceptable mass, you have a tendency to drop below an optimum point. Its unacceptable mass. After you've done this for a little while though, you find out the mass becomes acceptable and you go right on and you talk quite well.

It isn't true that actors lose their ability. They lose their audiences. See the difference? An actor, by the way, is in an interesting no-game condition continually -- continually. The audience can have his body. That's a no-game condition. He's letting somebody else have. A game is preventing somebody else from having. He has to give his body away to the audience all the time. And they become quite frail. Professional athletes and athletes in general, actors, public speakers, public officials and that sort of thing, suffer physiologically simply because of this breach of game conditions. They are letting everybody have the body. Everybody can have the body. Got the idea?

The only thing that compensates for this is a lot of bodies they can have. And when they get the idea they can't have these bodies, why, we fall into a no-game condition. In other words, the speaker cannot -- or the public official, or the actor -- cannot have live bodies, and yet they can have his body. Now, that's the reverse of a game condition. A game condition would be, a total game condition would be: They got no bodies at all. They got no bodies, you understand? And the fellow before them got all their bodies. See? Audience got no bodies, and the actor got all bodies. That's an exaggerated absolute game condition.

In view of the fact life runs on game conditions and not no-game conditions, we see then that somebody could get into a state of mind where he had no audience, but the audience could have his body, and he would then become very frail physically. Actually, truthfully, he'd become frail. That's why presidents are always getting sick, and why the frailty of the professional athlete...

If you were around professional athletes very long you would be amazed. You would say, how could these china dolls run around this diamond or out on that gridiron? How can they do this? How can they put a spike to that track? -- because these are sick men. And the coach is always running along behind them, or his assistant, with the arnica and the tape, patching them back up, patching them back up.

If a National League baseball team went out at any time with all members in an average condition of health, the coach would drop dead. This would be unheard of. His havingness of bruises and sprains would be reduced to zero, and it'd be fatal.

Now, what's this got to do with the preclear? The only thing it's got to do with the preclear is the R of the situation must be present.

Now, what's the preclear's A? Well, the preclear's affinity is what gives him the idea of R. Now, when you get somebody concentrating on solids, you get space reducing. And when you get somebody concentrating on solid communication lines but no terminals, of course, you have no space at all. Space becomes occupied totally with comm lines. So you have somebody running out of space, and the definition of affinity is the consideration of distance. That is what affinity is: a consideration of distance. And if affinity is a consideration of distance, somebody who has run into solid communication lines of course has no distance. Don't expect him to have any affinity. He does have, but we call it the minus-zero scale. It's totally numb -- numbness -- and that is his affinity; forgetfulness, numbness, can't do it, and that sort of thing.

Well then, that level of affinity on the minus-zero scale runs across then into these solid comm lines. Now, when the comm lines disappear and there's no space there either, oh my, that's that. Now, the solids are gone, terminals are gone, solid communication lines are gone: we have attained the bottom of the Affinity Scale. There's no space there either. Well, if they're all gone, then what do we put in its place? Something that isn't all gone. Do you see this then?

Can you draw those scales in your mind now? Can you draw the Affinity Scale? Goes from way up above 40.0 on down to about 22.0, on down to 2.0, so on -- just on arbitrary numbers.

In its entire length at the top, it includes this interesting thing called total knowingness. Not obsessed total knowingness. He knows everything there is to know -- if it's there to know he would know it. That's total knowingness. And we go down from there and we get into perceive. And we get the phenomenon of perception and all the phenomena of perception, which was where Dianetics was aiming a great deal of the time. It's quite a very high level action. And then that drops from there into all of the various emotions in their proper categorized scale, and that drops from there into effort, and that drops into solids and then solids go into these figure-figure manifestations, don't you see? Figure-figure means nonextant terminals. You know, it drops down through these „*possibilities of*“

Can you recognize sex as a solid line? In the textbooks on -- it's quite amusing -- the textbooks on cytology always characterize the... they sometimes say a solid line of protoplasm proceeding through time, see? They can't seem to cognite that it gets chopped off, and it's actually a series of terminals, see, from where I would look at it. And the way I would look at it theoretically would be that it was just a consideration. See, that's the various levels. Or we'd say we agree that this sex will exist before we mock anything up. Well, that's careful of it.

All right, now, you see that line? Well, it goes from way up there. You just put your Know To Mystery Scale parallel with that, and we find -- down along with the Mystery Scale -- we find what I'm calling the minus-zero Tone Scale. See, it's real poor. And a person who doesn't care, who can't experience, it doesn't hurt him -- this kind of an attitude -- can be depended on to be in that minus-zero scale.

All right, now let's move over to the R scale. Let's take another look at the R scale, which parallels this. But remember the R just goes a little tiny bit lower than the Affinity Scale. We don't draw a parallel line from a point in perceive to something to perceive through, see? We would draw it just a little bit of slant. Perceive, the ability to perceive, is slightly higher than the actuality or reality of a perception. You got that? This is obvious because the reality of a perception could exist without the ability to perceive it being present. And that condition which I have just described to you is the basic condition on which auditing depends.

The perception is there to be perceived but the ability to perceive does not exist.

All right. Then we get that whole Reality Scale. And it goes from way up, nothing but postulates, and then into agreements and down somewhere about halfway through the agreement scale and so on, we're getting a tremendous dependency on space. And what we actually get is space as a fact. It's a fact, space is. It's not an alterable fact. It just is there and we don't have anything to do with it at all. We get such things as in science -- of astronomy -- we have these theories of the expanding universe and all sorts of these things having to do with space. Space is being treated and observed as *„a separate phenomenon with which I have nothing to do.“* Got the idea?

The consideration of that space is the affinity at that level, by the way. Look over on the affinity band and you'll find consideration of distance is the definition of space. But right here on this we just -- in reality, we just have the fact of space. Now it goes on down -- space, and now we get solids. And now we get some solids of one kind or another, and then we get solid terminals. Significant solids, we now start to go into. We get significant spaces, and then significant solids, and then that gives you terminals. And then the terminals start to disappear, and from the terminals disappearing, why, we go down into the lines becoming solid. And after the lines have become solid, why, we get the lines disappearing too, and you have paralleled now the minus-zero Tone Scale in the affinity panel.

Well, where does C parallel this? C parallels it only as a described state of relationship between R and A. At any one of the levels you would describe the relationship between R and A and this would give you the definition of C at that point. It's too simple. It's too hard to look at. I don't even ask you to grasp it. It's just too simple.

C isn't a fact, see? C doesn't have a solid. You see? Get the idea? C is best defined as the consideration of interchange between two livingnesses, modified, of course, also between a solid and a livingness. That's your first to sixth, you see? But to draw a C scale and then say this part of C is solid and that part of C is not solid and so forth is not possible, because you're dealing with the R scale. So to describe C at any one of these levels, you have to describe the R and the A. Got the idea?

C is just the consideration of the interchange; the consideration of the ideas, the consideration of this and that between two living entities. Now, that is C. And it establishes R. That's a funny thing but it does establish R. But it can't be described without describing R if you're going to describe it suboptimum. Now, the only thing that's wrong with this scale or trying to talk about it at all in terms of C is that you're going down from optimum communication into less-optimum communication. So we simply ask the R scale, what is real R here at this pc's level? What is R? We approximate that and we attain C. Got the idea? But now we've got C, and by getting C then we can move over into the R scale and then we achieve A.

So the consultation is primarily with R or reality. Our first consultation is with „*what is the reality of this preclar?*“ Well, that can be established by trying to establish C with him, which gives you another adjustment of what is R to him. And then we try some more communication and we get another adjustment of what's R to him. And finally we know what it requires in terms of R to establish C. Then we establish C with him at that point and then improve it.

But what do we improve? We improve R. Just as simple as that. We don't make him talk better. Get the idea? We don't make him talk better. That would be improving C. We never improve C. We merely improve R. We don't make him talk better We make him recognize the who-ness and whereness of the talkingness. Got the idea? It's quite amusing.

Now, if you're straining away at trying to communicate better with people, somebody sometime or another set you up with a little rat cage to run around in because you're just never going to do that. That is not doable. But you can say, „*How can I better establish the R amongst us?*“ and you'll find yourself talking better. You see, it's achievable, but in itself it isn't doable. Don't you see? By going on an excursion through R and making it very, very clear in your own mind what you're trying to establish, you see... You might ask yourself why, when everybody -- about the time of evening when everybody is drunk and the party is going by the boards, they break out streamers and confetti. Why do they break out these streamers, these paper streamers? Well, they've got to give them some more communication, you see? And so they give them a solid line, and they drop solid lines all over the place, don't you see? Hm?

Everybody has disappeared to everybody by this time. And they become very acceptable.

All right. Let's look this over, then, and let's recognize that there is no worry on your part about your ability to talk or do or act. Actually, your only concern in that field at all would be to, talking to -- my ability to talk to -- not your ability to talk. This is very different. It would be your ability to talk to. Now, that is a matter of concern. That is a matter of concern because what is the level of what you're talking to's ability to be talked at? See that? So all you have to do is establish the actual R of anyone you wish to talk with, and then as an expert in this line, of course give him the right R. And if you give him the right R, you will find not only can you talk to him, but he can talk to you too.

Now, I don't guarantee what he'll say. Unfortunately, the tone of his conversation is established at A, which is established by C and R. And if you talk to someone whose lines are totally solid, you're going to get an equivalent A. That word „*equivalent*“ is used very loosely.

But by improving the R you improve the A. How do you improve R? Well, you just move him up into a better reality at higher levels on the R scale, that's all. It's as simple as that. I mean, it's almost too simple to be talked about.

There is nothing wrong with your ability to communicate. See? You can communicate. But you have to separate out how you communicate to or at, and differentiate what receives it -- its ability to be communicated at, don't you see?

Now, there's a number of processes of one kind or another which do this. There's not much reason to stress them particularly. We've already been handling some of them. But it is an amazing thing, an amazing thing, that when people do not understand you, you just didn't have a level of R which was acceptable to them, that's all. But the funny part of it is that their ability to understand you is partly monitored by your assumption that they can.

So about the first thing you get rid of is the assumption that they can't. That's one of the first things to get rid of.

I have some of the most astonishing things happen in line of communication. I mean, I talk to some little kid or something like this and explain some vast, involved theory about something or other, and he says, „*Yes, yes,*“ and goes and explains it to his mother or his father or something like that, you know? It never occurs to me that he can't understand me. Yet somebody is trying to get him to handle a teaspoon properly and they're flopping completely. Well, what's the difference here? What's the difference? It's somebody's assuming he can understand it, don't you see?

So part of the ability to communicate is the assumption that it is possible. All right. Given that assumption, then, it is very nice to have the modus operandi of how it is done. And all you have to do is monitor the R involved and you'll find that an A takes place. But the A almost gets extraneous because it's simply the quality of the communication which is achieved. That's all. That's all it is. Do you see this possibility?

All right. Now, as we look over existence in general we discover that everybody is too sold on energy, everybody is too sold on space, everybody is too convinced about this and about that and about other things. They're too convinced of the horror and terror of their own bodies and engrams and all that sort of thing. So the conviction level on this is pretty high. So there also is a possibility on the part of the person to whom you are speaking, that there is a conviction that he cannot be spoken to, or that he cannot speak at, that is just as valid and solid as a wall. Do you see this? There's a possibility that this thing could occur. But because he thinks of it in terms of solids, because he thinks of it in terms of lines, terminals and so on -- presence of, significance of, missingness of, and so on -- it is always possible to reach him; always possible to reach him through the use of the R scale. Now does this make a little more sense to you?

All right, thank you. [End of Lecture]