

## **TIME TRACK**

A lecture given on 6 November 1956

[Start of Lecture]

Thank you.

I want to talk to you a little more about the mechanics of the track.

People have time tracks. Time tracks stretch from here back to when. They also could stretch from here up to then, couldn't they? They could. Matter of fact, many people think they do. Now, the anatomy of a time track is of extreme interest, since it is a mechanism by which a thetan seeks to defeat time. I'll go over that again very slowly. A time track is a mechanism by which a thetan seeks to defeat time and recover the havingness which the automaticity of time repeatedly costs him. Follow this?

Pocketa-pocketa-pocketa; there goes time. The walls now are not the walls then; the walls then are not the walls now. Boppeta- boppeta-boppeta.

Fellow gets married, loses a wife. In the final analysis, what cost him a wife? Time. He hasn't got her, he did have her; that's that. Obviously, the villain is time.

Fellow buys a new car, runs into a D.C. or a London driver: no havingness. What cost him a car? Time. Fellow was rich, now he's poor. What cost him his wealth? Obviously, time. Obviously. He had it, didn't he? He can remember having had it. He hasn't got it. Therefore, the wealth was in the past, so he was cost wealth by time. Quite obvious.

Fellow has a beautiful game going: He has a planet with everybody in revolt. Beautiful game. People getting shot in all directions. Electrocardiograph catches up with him -- he has spoken from the heart once too often -- and he has no beautiful game. Gone, all that lovely confusion. What cost him that? Time.

Time is an agreed-upon consideration by which we get rid of the things we don't want. Time is an agreed-upon consideration by which we inherit things which we

don't have yet. Time is a beautiful consideration and is, of course, the heart of motion. Motion is simply motion; time is time. We record the postulate time by the change of position of particles in space. We record time by the change of position of particles in space; that's all. That's all we do.

We could say that time is the change of position of particles in space, but that's not really true. That is the mechanical definition, and as such it does process in the field of mechanics; it does process in the field of mechanics. But of course, above the field of mechanics, we have the entire field of postulates, and all these changes of position in space -- all they are is a proven record of the passage of time.

Not only is the postulate time there, but we have convinced everybody that it is there, and then we prove it by changing the position of a car from A to B, and we say, „*See? Time has went.*“ Time is basically a postulate or a consideration, as all things are, and that consideration came into being in order to produce motion, randomness, havingness, a game and other such basic considerations. But weaving through all of these other considerations we do have this one consideration of time.

Now, it would be possible to have without time. That is the one single exception in the field of mechanics. And so a thetan tries to defeat this as the last-ditch effort. And he makes a time track, and he has pictures on the time track, and these pictures are the shadows of what has happened.

Now, actually that is an inverted universe. That is not his own universe, usually; that is the universe he has created by taking pictures of the stuff as it has gone by. And that is a time track. The time track is the last vestige he has of his own universe. All he has left of his own universe is an ability to make a picture of other things that have been made. Now, that is the final analysis of what a time track is. It is that mechanical activity of taking pictures of what already exists and storing these in some orderly or disorderly fashion in order to have yesterday -- at least have a picture of what has gone by. That is what most people call their own universe.

Now, that is quite an interestingly dim shadow of an actual personal universe. That's pretty dim. A personal universe would be one in which one made the space and made the beings, made the walls and the floors and the planets or anything else he cared to make. Only I don't think anybody would be so silly these days as to make planets. That seems to be a rather strange activity; very aberrated.

But the time track which you see in the preclear's (quote) „*own universe*“ is the last vestige of that universe, and as he goes down the hill toward never-never, this too disappears. Our most ordinary glimpse of a person's own universe, then, on this planet at this time, is simply an inspection of his time track. Now, that time track consists of a series of pictures of another universe that he does not consider entirely his. Well, this tells you that that is a very interestingly dim personal universe; but nevertheless we do have this time track.

Now, everything that has happened to him is recorded on this track, and all these happenstances, in picture form, form a permanent record. Now, we at one time thought that they formed only a permanent record. They do not do this, actually, en-

tirely. There is another thing that this time track is seeking to do which is far more important to the auditor, and that is, this time track is an effort to retain the havingness of yesteryear. That is more to the point than remembering. A thetan can remember; this is not very difficult. But to get some havingness that is transportable through time, the thetan takes a very straightforward action: He takes pictures which he hopes some day he can make adequately solid. And so he has a time track.

His time track, then, is a mechanism by which havingness is sought to be recovered, not a mechanism by which one seeks to recover memory. If you understand this thoroughly, you will see the exact role, then, of the time track in processing. It is a havingness consideration, not a memory consideration.

When we asked people, in Dianetics, to run out engrams, we were actually giving them back havingness. For one thing, we took the perceptions out of an area and let him covertly handle a situation which he had not been able to handle at the time. Then we brought him up into a state of mind of believing that he could handle this situation if it occurred again. And having brought him to this state of mind, we were rather astonished to find out that he could handle such a situation when it occurred again. That was a big bonus for us.

But the erasure of an engram did not consist of the destruction of the masses contained in the track. One simply sort of wore down the perceptions a bit. The masses were still there; they converted. You can increase anybody's IQ by throwing him into birth. We all know from Dianetics that birth is a very aberrative action. Then why should his IQ increase simply by throwing him into birth? That is because birth is primarily an incident, an engram, which is held because it is a piece of yesteryear and because it has havingness. And the havingness is more important than the consideration of significance. One would rather have the mass contained in that picture than the pain in it. In other words, one is perfectly willing to lay aside the pain in an incident if he can have the havingness connected with it. It's quite amazing.

Now, we have the old DEI cycle. That actually is CDEI: curiosity, desire, enforce, inhibit. And this is the cycle of lost havingness. This is the cycle of -- look a little higher -- retained havingness. This is the cycle of havingness not yet obtained. It's the CDEI -- curiosity, desire, enforce, inhibit. And when it goes out the bottom, it hits inhibit. Now, there are harmonics on that. As you go below, you'll find these things inverting, and all sorts of curious phenomena occur because this cycle repeats itself. It is a cycle rather than simply a straightforward scale.

Curiosity: How does one get into the trap? He gets curious about it, of course. If he sees enough in the trap to constitute just havingness -- no more than that -- if he sees... „Ah-hah,“ he says, „*I wonder what that is over there? Oh, that's -- might be some mass connected with that. Here I go. I want it.*“ The next point is, one says, „*I've got to have it,*“ and then one says, „*I better not have it,*“ and he is trapped; and that is the cycle of being trapped. CDEI.

Now, we find that phenomenon repeated repeatedly upon the time track: CDEI, CDEI, CDEI. So this is not only a record. That is the least important thing about it,

that it is a record. That is really the least important thing -- from the auditor's standpoint, I assure you.

You may think this is a little bit difficult to grasp if you yourself have made people well by simply altering this as a memory record. But remember, you didn't always make somebody well by altering his memory record. In other words, we don't have a whole approach to the entire thing when we say „*a memory record*.“ Yes, the memories in this are quite important, but other things are more important than the memory.

Now, therefore, we have this memory record which can be used as a memory record but which is basically a havingness bank-mass. If you chase somebody's time track all the way back, it would open out from the time track which you see -- a record of the environment -- and would become some vestige of his own universe and then would become his own universe. In other words, somewhere way back along the track, he departed from something that was pretty good called his own universe, and he went into this universe. And then we see more and more and more that he only copied what he saw. In other words, he was obsessively in communication with a universe that was held in agreement with one and all.

Now, the CDEI cycle begins at the moment he departs from his own universe: He's curious „*What would happen if..*“ And if we just wrote that on every tombstone that was out here in every cemetery, we would have the only truthful inscription present. „*Dear and loving mother of twelve mourning children*“ -- usual inscription. „*Departed from his beloved business and family*“ -- another inscription and so on.

We look these over; sometimes they're dramatic. Like, there's a couple out in Columbia, California that are very dramatic. And one of them says, „*Killed by a..*“ -- this is not a direct quote -- „*Killed by a sniveling skunk that also tried to cheat him at cards.*“ And the next grave to it says, „*The sniveling skunk.*“ Erected by his brother -- the first man's brother. It's very interesting.

But those things are not necessarily truthful. But if you put it on there „*CDEI*,“ you'd have a truthful record on every tombstone. Got it? CDEI.

Well, actually, one departs from the standpoint of „*I wonder what would happen if..*“ or „*I wonder what that is,*“ to go into „*You know, that's pretty nice,*“ to go into „*I've got to have it,*“ to go into „*It isn't obtainable.*“ „*Make it scarce*“ is another motto that goes along with this.

So we see that the time track itself -- that part of it with which we are concerned, which begins after departure from own universe -- begins with this CDEI cycle and then oddly enough does something else: itself, as an entity, follows it. It follows the cycle, as an entity. It is now a specialized piece of havingness. And at first we're curious about the time track, and then we desire the time track, and then we've got to have the time track, and then we better not have it. Got that?

Well, a reversal of this cycle will return to anybody the time track. A Remedy of Havingness, per se, will simply return to somebody a lot of time track. Time track untangles, then, on havingness. It doesn't untangle very well on memory alone, but it does untangle on havingness. If you ran something on this order, you said -- this is a „*bad*“

process, by the way. It's not a bad process; it's just mediumly workable, you know, hundred thousand times as good as anything they had before but, you know, not much good -- you said, „*You looking at a picture? Good. Copy it, copy it, copy it, copy it, copy it, copy it, copy it, copy it.*“ When he finally got so he could copy the picture rather easily, you would find out that he would have some more pictures. And then you say, „*Take a look at that. What have you got there?*“

And he says, „*Oh, so-and-so and so-and-so.*“

You say, „*All right. Copy it, copy it, copy it, copy it, copy it,*“ see? You'd eventually get him a time track. Eventually.

But the time track is booby-trapped. The CDEI cycle not only runs at separate portions of the track at its beginning, and for the track as a whole, but runs in particular types of incidents.

Now, it'll rather amaze you to believe that pain is a fantastically precious possession to many people. And yet you can have a thetan waste pain, and he will after a while realize that he really wants pain. And it's as easy as that. It's one of those easily demonstrated things.

Now, you reverse this cycle with havingness remedies. Now, the first mechanism of that is wasting. The second mechanism is shoving it in and throwing it away. The next mechanism to it, of course, would be to just continue a Remedy of Havingness, and you'd find it'd go up to C. Eventually a person would get curious about it.

Now, he won't get out of the trap unless you remedy havingness long enough to get over the point C. You have to get him over his curiosity. If he doesn't get over his curiosity, he dives back into the trap again by simply running the cycle forward which you have just so carefully run backwards. You got it?

All right. The track as a whole responds to a Remedy of Havingness. That is its first and most interesting characteristic, to me, that it was a stored record of havingness. And the fellow would much rather have something than nothing. A fellow would much rather have anything, by the way, than nothing whatever; it gets that bad.

All right. Now, let's look over this. How about the fellow that you've taken a time track totally away from? How about this guy? Is he happy? No. Nope. Unless you restore his capability to create, that which he has is too precious to part with. You can take the significance out of it and you can let him inhabit more portions of the time track than he inhabited before, but there you've just about had it.

Now, a person who could occupy any portion of the time track was by definition, in Dianetics, Clear. He could occupy any portion of the time track at will, he was Clear. All right, that's that. Actually, what was going on in Dianetics to make a Clear was something else which was not at all observed at first: That was the fact the fellow exteriorized out of his track because he considered that the track was not vitally necessary to his continuous survival. He actually exteriorized out of the track, which is to say he could occupy any portion of the track if it had occurred to him to do so.

Now, let's look over this time track a little more factually here and find out it's a collection of mental image pictures which contain all perceptions (which is to say about fifty-four separate perceptions) and which contains a time tab and contains the capability of solidity. It is a record, it is discovered, which can be swelled up. You can have somebody make more havingness on a time track than he can easily handle. And if you do it in that fashion, you will give him back a track faster than any other way I know about. We're almost talking about Dianetic auditing now when I'm talking to you about Over and Under. This is almost Dianetic auditing.

But the key to the time track is that it did begin as a record when it only copied. That we consider really the beginning of the time track when somebody started to copy.

All right. Now, let's take the next characteristic of this track and that was that it contained a time record. That is very important. This says „*This havingness existed then*“; it says when the havingness existed, see?

Its next characteristic of considerable importance is an automaticity which closes off the past and future, and leaves the person with the present. This should strike you as very peculiar that people occupy present time at all. It is a very peculiar mechanism; it is very funny. In fact, it's so pat that it's something one becomes very suspicious about when he begins to research. Say, „*Oh, what is this? Everybody in present time? How incredible*“ Now, you just figure up the number of chances a person has of being in present time, and they are so remote that of course he is 90 percent someplace else. But why does he even have a body in present time? What is he doing in present time? This is the curiosity, not that he has a time track. That is a great curiosity.

Well, it's factually true that thetans never go anyplace; but the havingness moves around. You see that? Thetan doesn't go anyplace; the havingness moves around. So actually a person goes out of present time to the degree that he considers himself havingness. I mean, it's just as simple as this.

In other words, there isn't -- you suspect this freak that everybody is in present time. Well, they aren't anyplace else ever. There is no other place than present time. It is only by the trick of becoming convinced that there is a time track, that there are masses, that one conceives whennesses. And when he is too thoroughly convinced of these whennesses, he drifts into them himself. Whennesses. When he drifts into these whennesses. why, he is drifting to some degree, with his perception right in present time, into a feeling that a whenness exists when it can't.

But this mechanism of „*out of present time*“ is just a little bit of a misnomer. It means he's got some havingness that doesn't belong in present time. Got that? Now, that's factual; that is correct. The other's not correct. He has some havingness which doesn't belong in present time.

Fellow is walking around in a court costume of 1320, see? We'd say he's crazy. Well, I don't know why you'd add that significance. He's troubled with too many already. It's just some havingness has been boosted into present time that shouldn't be there.

Therefore, as you accustom your preclear to havingness, you accustom him to having it in present time and out of present time. And you never did send somebody back on

his time track, but you moved his time track up to him. You got that? That was actually, factually what happened. But it talks better the other way, because everybody is doing that and that is more game. Everybody believes that he does this, see; that's more game, to go back into the past. Actually, all one ever does is move havingness up into the present. Got that? You see that clearly?

Now, in view of the fact that all things depend upon conviction and proof -- conviction and proof: It is proved to somebody so he becomes convinced. He has, already, a mechanism of conviction which permits him to be convinced. He has a mechanism of conviction which permits you to prove something to him. He says, „*At all times, if I do A plus B plus C, then it is true.*“ What does he mean by true? A lie, of course. In other words, this time track exists by conviction.

Now, what we did in Dianetics was quite fantastic. We picked up some convictions from way back when, to hell-and-gone back in terms of thinkingness, and we actually put people into a sensibility of something which they had been quite sensible of, and were sensible of no longer. That is to say they had once upon a time known they had had time tracks; they had once known all about this mechanism of synthesizing the universe in any given instant and storing it as records of havingness which could be expanded and so forth; and we realerted them to this mechanism. And they came around in a circuitous way and were able to take a look at this mechanism once more and were able to inspect it much more closely and find out more about it.

Now, they already had known something about it, so we actually moved them upscale. Just telling them something about the track, of course, moved them upscale. One of the things it did was show them that they had an available havingness of such magnitude that they probably never could run out. Now, that alone was a very heartening thing for anybody to discover; unless one, of course, was on the total inversion of „*I mustn't have anything*“ And that's the case we had trouble with. We showed him he had a track, we proved to him he had a track, and he, however, didn't get over hating to have one. So he was upset.

Now, this time track has some interesting incidents on it, that's for sure. And these incidents, however, we classify very crudely and bluntly as simply -- first title, first proper word is „*facsimile*.“ Any of these pictures we can call a facsimile. That is the whole thing. That is different than a mock-up. A mock-up is something that somebody creates; a facsimile is a copy of. Got that?

So there are really two types of picture on the time track, and one would be a mock-up or a creation and the other would be a copy. Now, of course, something had to furnish the energy for both, and that was done circuitously or directly by a thetan. So we don't have to worry too much about where the energy came from. The energy is common to both. And across this bridge of the commonness of energy, we can then take a facsimile and chew it up with mock-ups, because the havingness is from the same source. Follow that.

All right. The first thing then is a facsimile, copy of. Preceding that, in terms of time or ability, would be this other thing called a mock-up, a creation -- a word taken from World War II when they used to go through drills, climbing up and down the sides of

ships and doing and flying airplanes and so forth which weren't airplanes, and so on. It's slightly derogatory but it really shouldn't be. Nobody thinks of it as being derogatory or otherwise these days. A mock-up is simply a mock-up; that's that. That's passed into Scientology terminology. You couldn't get it out any more than you could get the word „*auditor*“ out.

The last thing in the world you could do would be change this term „*auditor*.“ Would not be possible. Similarly, I don't think you could even vaguely change this term „*mock-up*.“ Guys go around, they speak of their bodies as „*my mock-up*“ and so forth. They really like this word. All right, it's a technical term.

Facsimile and mock-up: You got the difference between those two things?

All right, now let's take the next singular difference that we run into. Some of these incidents are sunk out of sight, and we call these moments of unconsciousness. They were a picture of a moment of unconsciousness, and they stay out of sight. They stay unknown even on the track. But they are there and everything is in them, and it's quite interesting to recover one of these moments. That is a moment of unconsciousness.

Now, there are other moments on the track which are moments of pain; these are mental image pictures of instants of pain, and they also contain the pain recording.

Now, the next significant instant is the emotional incident which we consider as a secondary -- technical term, secondary. And that is simply an engram of a secondary nature. It really depends on a moment of pain and unconsciousness, and it contains emotion, a grief charge. Also there are secondaries which contain laughter charges and all sorts of things.

It's quite interesting that any emotion could be seized up as a mental image picture on the track and if this is the case we then have what we call a secondary. Got it?

Now, the moment of pain and unconsciousness we call an engram. And the reason I didn't enumerate that at first is I wanted to show you that there were two different types of engrams: One is unconsciousness and the other is pain, and we got them both together, we've got a brute!

Now, there's another type of incident there and that we call a compulsive exteriorization. Fellow was blown out of his head. In other words, he lost all of his havingness all at once, one way or the other. And this moment of compulsive exteriorization is also on record on the track. And in Scientology this becomes a Scientology engram: pain, unconsciousness and compulsive exteriorization. All three together, we have a ring-tailed snorter.

Now, that ring-tailed snorter will act underneath one of these secondaries. You see the picture now. You could have a moment of pain and you could have a secondary. You could have a moment of unconsciousness, you could have a secondary too, you see? You could have a moment of compulsive exteriorization and have a secondary on that.

Many a time you've told somebody to get out of his head and he actually has picked up at that instant a secondary. Compulsive exteriorization was restimulated by his ex-



teriorization in session. He became very upset. He thought of dying and all sorts of things. Really you were laying in a secondary right there at that point. All right.

This word engram then is a loose word -- a loose word -- since it could contain only unconsciousness or contain only pain or contain compulsive exteriorization. But in Scientology we knitted all these three together and we say „*An engram is a moment of pain and unconsciousness and compulsive exteriorization,*“ and that is a Scientology engram because it's a wicked one.

Now, if he doesn't have an engram, he can't get a secondary. Do you see that? If he doesn't have an engram he can't get a secondary. Got that?

The old theory was all you had to do was yank the bottom out from under him by pulling the engram, and what do you know, that's true; still true today. You'll blow the secondaries loose.

Very often a person cannot cry. You remove a moment of pain and unconsciousness and all of a sudden he is able to cry, and you run out a secondary engram, the loss of his dog. Quite remarkable.

Now, you see these moments that we classify as an engram? What are they? They're moments of pain, moments of unconsciousness, moments of compulsive exteriorization.

Actually, very loosely, just any kind of an incident like that (mental image picture of) we could call an engram, but if we're very precise in Scientology we say it has to include pain, unconsciousness and compulsive exteriorization. Then we've got an engram because we know that's the biggest engram on the track. And if you can pull one of those and get one of those straightened out, you've really done something.

But do you know that until really recently we did not have the processing weapons to accomplish the erasure of a Scientology engram? All right.

Got an engram, got a secondary -- loss of mother, anything; see, it contains an emotional charge -- and then we have a key-in and then we have a lock. Our old terminology.

Key-in means, this engram -- nobody had thought about it for a long time and the external universe came along one day and thought about it and one got another incident which looked like the engram, and we call that incident a key-in.

Now, if we want to put the engram back in the file drawer, all we do is have to run out the key-in. There's a lot of trickery connected with this. We run out the key-in, the engram goes back into the file drawer. The guy lives for ten more years before he gets another incident that pulls that engram into being, then once more he has bursitis, or rheumitis, or Eisenhowerosis.

And anyhow, we get, then, a lock simply as being a moment of conscious memory. That is the total definition of a lock. That really is all a lock is, because you'll find out in handling preclears that any picture they've got is appended to some chain series of

one kind or another. We have this general word called facsimile which covers all these breeds of cat: covers engrams, covers secondaries, covers key-ins and covers locks.

Now, back in Dianetic days we said a lock very definitely was something -- an incident which succeeded a key-in. Got it? So you had a whole chain of locks on top of that. Now, that was technically correct. However, in running this thing that erases a Scientology engram, we find the fellow doesn't recall anything else.

You actually have to give him an awful shove to get him off of locks into a very non-significant facsimile. If you want to be precise then these are the categories and these are the definitions.

Do you understand them?

Audience voices: Yeah. Mm-hm.

Some of you here have looked at these for a long time; you know more about them than I do. But these doggone things are the anatomy of the time track. Got it? Those are the anatomy of the time track.

Person is no longer building his own universe. He's taking pictures of this one. He stores them up in chronological order. They have time tabs and pictures of things. And every once in a while one of these pictures gets a supersignificance and these supersignificant pictures louse him up. And any psychosomatic illness is traceable to one of these supersignificant facsimiles.

In order to be supersignificant, the thing at least has to be a lock; it at least has to be that. Only there are some people that locks go into like engrams. I mean, you start to run them through a lock and you have four hours work on your hands; you're running a lock off.

Somebody mentioned his first wife's name or something like that and it takes you four hours to erase the party. Why is it so sticky?

The keynote of all that stickiness -- I tell you now, and this is new -- is havingness. If he considers things sticky his concept of what he can have is down. He's run the CDEI on the whole track. The whole track is considered by him to be terribly inhibited. Havingness in it is just gone. There just isn't any. See this? See how this could be? Well, he's sad about the whole thing. He can't have it, so he wants to throw it away. If you did give him some havingness he'd do something horrible with it, because he says, *„It's awful scarce stuff, and I can't have that, and I know it doesn't exist.“* He's on an inverted conviction.

Well, let us look this over. Havingness is the keynote, not memory! Well, there must be a terrific shift or change of havingness connected with an engram. Mmm. Well, you make something too painful for somebody and he can't have it, see? You've beefed it up above his level of tolerance and he can't have it. You make him unconscious and of course he has lost things, hasn't he?

And now, let's look a little bit further, and a compulsive exteriorization was the loss of the works, wasn't it? That was really the loss of the works. Even though he came back

into his head, he now knows that he could lose it all. Got that? The key- in was another threatened moment of loss of the same order as the engram. Somebody just walked in and says „*I think I'll knock you out.*“ Doesn't, you know? Just walks off then, but that's good enough to take a knockout engram and put it into restimulation. You see, it's a threatened moment of loss. Got it?

All right, we look up the line just a little bit further and we find out that a lock would be something just like he was sitting there thinking about maybe he'd lose it.

Loss. Loss. Get this now. Loss. Not loss of memory; that's not even vaguely important. Loss -- that is. Have -- lose.

Some people have come up with the computation that if you have anything you lose it. It's just enough to have something to lose it. You give them a Christmas present, they instantly get the sensation of having lost something. They are so certain that if they have something they'll lose it, that they don't acquire. And that is why they don't acquire, because they know they will lose it, and that will bring them pain, and that's that. See? It's just a twisted-up no-have.

Well, we for a long, long time knew about this thing called loss. We knew that loss was the common denominator, but loss of what? Loss of a thing, we thought. Oh no, it wasn't loss of a thing; it was loss of havingness.

Now, you can't lose something unless you've had it. That sounds awfully simple, but it's the anatomy of this whole works. You can't lose what you have not yet got. You can acquire that. But anything you have had is something that you lost. You see, you have had it and you no longer have it, therefore, you must have lost it in some fashion. And we find loss is the common denominator of those pictures in restimulation in the average case. It's very weird, but they're pictures of loss.

You have a preclear sitting there; he's looking at this picture. This picture is of a backyard. And every time you run him on Over and Under (which I'll talk about in a moment), every time you run him on this Over and Under, why, he lands --for a later view, you know, for „*later than,*“ „*an instant later than that,*“ „*a facsimile later than that,*“ he'd say, „*Ah, I got one.*“

You say, „*What is it?*“

And he says, „*It's the backyard.*“

Well, after you've run him earlier and then run him later again, he says („*Well, what have you got now?*“).

„*I got a picture of the backyard.*“

Well, that's very interesting and so on. You should by this time become very interested in what he is going to find out! He will eventually tell you, after he's returned to this backyard about ten times, some cases, „*Yeah, I know why I'm remembering this. This is where I lost my cat!*“ The fact that he lost the cat made him hold on to the backyard. He at least had that. Now, when they lose the cat so thoroughly that they can't hold on to anything, they get a black spot, or they get a blank, a total blank. You got it?

So the engrams have it that one loses. And sure enough, one does, and this lock in Over and Under is omnipresent. Locks. You're just always running locks. You never get off on to facsimiles until your case is practically Clear.

He's all -- you don't care. It's perfectly all right. There's nothing wrong with this that he just keeps running these locks, but he keeps finding out that he's got pictures in restimulation of all those times when he has lost something.

Well now, if your time track adds up finally to a totality of loss, it of course is lost. So time becomes looked upon as a mechanism which loses things for you.

You have there the mechanism of old age. You have the mechanism of body deterioration. You have all kinds of things there. I'm not asking you to add all these things up; you will in due time, and there's no reason I should burden you with them at this time, because it would just be burdening you, because it's a long, long list of significances.

But it's enough for me to tell you that they ordinarily get moments of loss, and in Over and Under they run practically nothing but locks. I made a technical error just a little earlier when I said the rest of them are called locks. That's because I'm puppy to the root here with Over and Under. The rest of them are called facsimiles. They're all facsimiles, but facsimiles of loss are locks. There are other pictures.

Now, this is what's amazing. This is actually amazing to some people that there are other pictures than moments of loss on the track. But anybody that's having any difficulty does nothing with them. He says „*You know, I have a picture here of a street. It's not a bad picture of a street; it's an interesting picture of a street. And I every now and then see this picture of a street.*“ You start to run him on Over and Under, the picture of the street will turn up eventually as the place where he lost his pocketbook when he was seven years old and couldn't go to the movies. See?

Now, the other significance about this track that is quite important and is the common denominator of it is the fact that the past track is a not-know and the future track is a not-know and the present track is a know. The width of that know, as I've said to you earlier, is very important. Is it five milliseconds wide? Is it five seconds wide? How wide is present time? It is as wide as he has not put not-know on automatic. As he puts not-know on automatic -- not-know the past and not-know the future -- as he puts it on automatic, the automaticity begins to swamp present time. And it moves in from the future, and it moves in from the past, and present time gets as narrow as a slice of baloney bought in a lesser delicatessen. It is a terribly thin slice.

Now, this is actual havingness. See, this is actual havingness, present-time havingness.

Increasing the width of that havingness is done by either simply a Remedy of Havingness or running not-knowingness processes objectively. In other words, we can take over the automaticity of the future and past.

Now, I'm going a little bit fast for you here, I think. But you realize that an individual does this to get rid of the past. He not-knows it; he forgets it; he puts it on the back-track. And he acquires the future by knowing the present and moving up into the fu-

ture, but he has to keep the whole future not-known. It doesn't even mean that he could know the future. He certainly can change the future. But the future is something which is not-known on purpose.

Now, it's quite amusing that if you have somebody run this process, that he begins to predict very accurately. You say, „*Tell me something in this room that's having an effect on something else.*“ You run this on him for a couple of hours and he'll start to predict. Why? Because predicting the future is becoming an effect in present time. One is never otherwise than cause really, but he can get into a prediction of the future which means „*I am here in present time and the future is going to have an effect upon me.*“ Therefore, his present time is an effect.

He does this by not-knowing a future which he has mocked up. Now, he has to have mocked it up and not-known it in order to have a future. But the common denominator on it is not-know. So you have not-know for the future, not-know for the past. And these not-knows encroach on present time until it gets as thin as a slice of baloney that you buy in a New York delicatessen. You see that?

To a preclear who has no perception at all, present time has become totally extinct. Do you see? The automatic machinery -- get this carefully -- the automatic machinery of the future and the past have not-known so automatically and so thoroughly that they've wiped out present time too. How do you turn it on again? How do you broaden present time? Now, that is the goal: broaden present time.

Now, how broad present time can become I do not know, but I think very possibly it could be broadened up to two or three years at a crack -- very possibly. And there is no total impossibility on broadening it up to a million years into the future and a million years into the past, and it'd all be present time. Present time would be two million years wide, don't you see? The person just wouldn't be not knowing it. My, that would be an awful lot of mass, wouldn't it.

Now, how does a thetan get so he likes mass in the first place? Well, people keep shoving things at them until he accepts them -- CDEI. At the enforced level he begins to believe he has to have mass.

Now, let's look at this. The not-know then: you could just run not-knowingness processes and exercise and take over the automaticity of not-knowingness, you would broaden present time. You could simply remedy havingness and you would broaden present time. You see this? And then all you would really have to do as far as the ordinary preclear is concerned is simply cure him of having to have; not by taking everything away from him, but by showing him he could mock things up. That is the more esoteric remedy.

But you have three things then you can do about the width of present time -- three things at once. The processes you run on not-know are very simple. „*Look around and tell me something you wouldn't mind forgetting*“ is a wording that communicates to most preclears. Fabulous things happen. It's one of the most workable processes in Scientology. „*Look around and tell me something you wouldn't mind forgetting*“ Of course, „*forget we know*“ is the wrong postulate, but he interprets the other; he's going to run forget for

hours before he ever gets on to not-know, so you might as well start him out on it. Shift your gears later on when he tells you that he ought to. Now, you could do that, then. That wouldn't be too difficult then, would it? Hm?

All right, and let's take the next thing. Remedy of Havingness, that's fairly easy to do. You do that by gradient scales. Take any given substance or object or space, and you remedy his havingness with it in any given space. Now, you do it by gradients.

Now, remedying the havingness of space is quite interesting. That's done by mocking up and spotting more easily than otherwise. But it actually can be run as part of just straight Remedy of Havingness: „*Mock up a small piece of space and shove it in. Mock up a small piece of space and throw it away.*“ This has an efficacy.

Well, you could start somebody wasting this significant bit of havingness, and then you would have him mock it up one way or the other and push it in, and mock it up and throw it away. And you would have him mock it up on gradients, throw it away in gradients, give him enough of it right where he is sitting to where he is willing to throw one away.

It's quite interesting. An individual says, „*I cannot throw away a box of that.*“

You say, „*That's fine. Mock up another box, another box, another box,*“ and if you were looking in his head you would see the box he couldn't throw away is still stuck out there and every additional box that he mocks up of it, the box he was trying to throw away moves a little bit farther away. In other words, he's holding on to it quantitatively. If he has enough of it, why, he can throw it away. Now, that's a low-order postulate. Quantity doesn't enter into this at all, oddly enough. It is not a basic consideration. It's a very low-order, aberrated consideration -- quantity. But the thetan has got it. He's got this consideration that quantity is awfully important -- he thinks the most fabulously important thing he ever ran into.

All right, you got it that far?

Now, in view of the fact that he's obeying his track... Or you could simply have him mock something up; just him mock it up, and mock it up, and mock it up. This is the simplest of all remedies; not necessarily the most workable. On a lower-order case that can't create, he simply strips the bank of a stable datum and away we go -- confusion.

You say, „*What's the most stable datum that you ever had in your lifetime?*“

He says, „*Oh, I don't know. I guess my father.*“

You say, „*That's fine. Father, that's swell. Now, mock him up and mock him up and mock up your father, and mock up your father, and mock up your father, and mock up your father.*“

After a while he says, „*You know, I can't get any more mock-ups of father.*“ Watch that remark „*I can't get any more mock-ups of.*“ That means he wasn't mocking it up. He's using some kind of facsimile. And what did he do? He as-ised the totality of father, and he has no more stable datum in the bank, and all of his childhood illnesses and everything just go swamp! -- confusion. You've taken out the stable datum, you get the

confusion. You take out the confusion and you get the stable datum. See that? Substitutions?

But an individual who cannot create can't follow that process. But anybody can do this one -- anybody can do this one: You tackle the time track directly and run Over and Under Solids. How do you do that?

Let's say he had a horrible accident when he was fourteen. That's fine. He had a tonsillectomy. He had anything happen when he was fourteen. You say, „*All right..*“ You've isolated this now as the primary rest point of his case. Now, don't move him off that rest point! Got that now? You found out he's stuck there; well, don't move him! Got it? Don't move the injured.

You say, „*Oh, you had a terrible tonsillectomy.*“

„*Yes, as a matter of fact, got a picture of it.*“

„*Well, that's fine. You had a terrible tonsillectomy when you were fourteen. Well, think of that now. All right, now we'll call this the center incident, and we will say -- when we say fourteen, we mean that incident. All right.*“

And the fellow says, „*Oh, yeah, that's fine.*“

You say, „*Fourteen, that incident.*“

You know, you can use the file clerk to do this. You can look at somebody and say, „*When I snap my fingers an age will flash.*“ The age flashes. Use that as the age, you'll never be wrong. If you get a flash response and so forth, just use that as the center point in Over and Under and you've got it. Quickest way to establish it is that way, by the way. This requires an old Dianeticist. All right.

Now, we have this series of commands which immediately result from this. You say, „*Fourteen, all right, a tonsillectomy, that's that. Fourteen. Whenever I say 'fourteen' then we mean that point. That's fine. Now, can you get a facsimile*“ -- see, this is a very factual sort of thing -- „*can you get a facsimile of a moment later than that?*“

He says, „*What's a facsimile?*“

You say, „*Mental image pictures, of course, you nut. No wonder I'm processing you. Don't even know things like that.*“ Whatever chitter-chat you enter in upon, it's a „*facsimile*“ Use that word because the word „*facsimile*“ is seldom found in engrams. Got it?

„*Can you get a facsimile later than that?*“

And he says, „*Oh, yes. Yes, yes, yes, I've got -- I have this facsimile of my college!*“

You say, „*That's fine. That's fine. Make it more solid.*“ He struggles; does so. „*All right,*“ you say „*that's fine. Now can you get a facsimile of a moment earlier than fourteen?*“ *Get the difference: You don't say „earlier than that tonsillectomy.*“ Don't go as-ising that rest point or your boy will be in confusion. Just say „*fourteen,*“ you know? „*Earlier than fourteen?*“

And he says „*Oh yes! I've got one here of me running into a tree with my bicycle.*“

You say „*Can you get another one?*“ Why do you say „*Can you get another one?*“ You walked right straight into an engram there, didn't you? Well, don't ever, if you can help it -- if you can help it -- you will, and don't worry about it. Don't sit up all night and sweat because you did this. But try to avoid picking up other facsimiles and making them solid, because the moment you make them solid you stick him in them. He can look at them without sticking.

So he says, „*A bicycle running into a tree.*“

And you say, „*That's fine. Can you get another one earlier than fourteen? Can you get another facsimile earlier than fourteen?*“

He says, „*Oh...*“ and disgruntled because that was an awful nice wreck. „*Uuuuh,*“ he says, „*Uh... uhh... I don't know, here's my mother standing alongside of my crib.*“

You say, „*Well, that is fine.*“

Now, you pays your money, you gives your command and you takes your chance, see? Very well may be that he has whooping cough and all sorts of things as he's lying there in the crib with his mother alongside of it, but it doesn't appear to be. Now, the truth of the matter is you can't get into too much trouble. We're trying to avoid the majority of engrams and secondaries. And if we hit a few, all right. But let's not do what the preclear will half the time want us to do, which is take only engrams and secondaries as the earlier and later incident, because you'd have him in more spots of track than you could easily count. Got that now?

All right, he gives -- you say, „*All right. Make it more solid.*“ Not make her more solid! Got it? Make it. Because you asked for a facsimile; you make the whole picture more solid. How did he do it? We don't care. It become more solid? That is the answer. „*It did? All right, now can you get a facsimile of something later than fourteen?*“

And he finally finds being bawled out by a professor. You consider this isn't very engramic so you, „*Can you make it more solid? Not the professor; can you make the facsimile, see, more solid?*“ Early and late, early and late, early and late, early and late. And never fourteen!

All of a sudden he'll start getting stuck in fourteen. And you say „*Ah-eh-eh-eh-eh!*“

„*Can I make it more solid?*“

„*No, nope. Nope. We want this processing to last longer than that. Something else, something else, something else.*“

Now, what happens is you build up his time track on both sides of this maximal loss point and thus fill in that maximal loss point very neatly. Do you follow me there? Hm?

The other thing is never under any circumstances change that fourteen-year-old rest point! Got it? Never change that; never go to some other rest point.

Now, that's Over and Under, and all the phenomena of the track will appear as you do this, and even on a black case you can run it. So he says, „*I see some blackness.*“



*„All right,“ you say „Make it more solid. Earlier than that blackness. All right, make it more solid.“ You can do extremes on this, and it works on any low level of case and it remedies the time track and brings a preclear out in the clear.*

We have never had this particular process fail, and it is a very, very good process indeed. It straightens out the time track and it does make a Clear.

Thank you.

Thank you.

[End of Lecture]