

# RUNDOWN ON SIX BASICS

A lecture given on  
8 December 1954

We are going right in here for blood on the subject of these basic six processes, give them a very, very fast spin. You have heard of them, you know something about them. We are going to give them a fast spin through just to make sure that you are cognizant of them.

You are going to be expected to train people. When you train people in Dianetics or Scientology today, that is, those – the branch of this science which is applied to man, you see – anyplace Dianetics or Scientology was to apply to man – boy, you've really got to know those six processes.

This is so much the case that you, in training somebody to a grade – because you'll undoubtedly be granted the right to train – in training somebody to the grade of HCA or HDA (they can have those degrees at their election), you will be expected to expect of them perfect performance on the basic six processes.

Now, that is so much the case that today, Bob was sitting down there, just taken over as Director of Processing, he has instructions and is carrying out these instructions that any preclear who walks in through the front door of the HDRF or HASI shall have run upon him the Six Basic Processes and nothing else.

And that is so rigorous that if an auditor brought in to audit an HASI preclear were to depart from these six processes, he would forfeit his fee. That is just bluntly that; I mean, he would just forfeit it, that's all. No argument concerning this.

Why is this? Because we have found that uniformly clear across the field from one end to the other, on – in various continents and so on, that where it comes to living, breathing man, these six processes regardless of any theory or rationale that you could apply to them, these six processes crack cases and exteriorize people.

Now, there are seventy-five processes, but all these seventy-five processes are variations on these six processes, one way or the other. Very fascinating here that we have six processes which in the hands of auditors working on miscellaneous preclears, odds and ends everywhere, produce results. Now, you take it this way: You take a poll of preclears, just take a big poll of preclears who have been run a long time in Dianetics and Scientology, see, we take this big poll, and maybe these people have had twenty-five, maybe have had fifty, maybe have had two hundred hours. Maybe they have had a lot of old-time auditing and you know, clear back to Book One.

And we would take a poll of these people and what do we discover? We discover that their case took a change on some odd process or another, they'll mark down some odd

process, their case took a change, you know, Black and White Processing; they got a marked change on this. And then they will mark down one of the basic six or all of them.

And you look at the next sheet, the next check sheet on a system like this, and you look at that, and you will find out that they got some kind of a random change when they were run on GITA, Expanded GITA, GITA applied specifically to money, they got quite a change on their case with this. They remember they did this. But the major change on the case occurred with one of the basic six processes.

As we go across the boards we discover that the common denominator of processes to preclears who had received change from auditing are the basic six; those are the common denominators; it's that level. Those processes are very important because they represent themselves a Tone Scale of processes, and they are very precisely placed on the Tone Scale and the various variations of these six processes make up all the auditing there is.

But these six processes done in a completely pure, unaltered state, have uniformly produced results on preclears. We can with great confidence, then, have a preclear walk in the front door at the HASI, assign him to an auditor, start supervising this auditor, make sure that this auditor goes through, make sure he picks up all the pieces and that he makes no boo-boos on the basic six processes. And we know at the end of a period of time – and remember that period of time can vary pre clear to preclear; it varies as the preclear goes further on down the Tone Scale, the time goes longer but – because you are working on basically time factors – we can be sure that at the end of the assigned period of time, whether that assigned period of time was 12 hours or 50 hours or 180 hours, that we will have a very markedly changed individual.

Not necessarily true that these processes used on students by students do a great deal for a case. This is not necessarily true. Students are able to enter in enough randomness, enough interesting curlicues, quirks, knocking over beds, falling outdoors, being bored with the situation, having just been audited themselves, they are in a chronic state of restimulation as they are trying to audit somebody. And their interest in the case is very poor. But that isn't the main thing that holds up student auditing. The main thing that holds it up is all the students know that all the students are students. And that is what holds it up.

We have this factor with us always in any class or any unit; any class. It should be present much less so in a unit like this where everyone is pretty well trained. There – they had a lot of auditing background. The point that we will find going astray in a unit like this is too much experience and too much conviction. And we will occasionally find somebody who, well, the auditor knows, and probably quite rightly, exactly what will crack the case in terms of 1952 processes. He knows he has cracked cases with this and he will run this process.

And you will find this student preclear, who is also a student, knows that is not what has been assigned. And of course will freeze up, say this auditor is incapable of following instructions and he will consider this a huge boo-boo and quit. And then everyone is very alive and very alert to the Auditor's Code and you would have to work like mad to break the Auditor's Code on the average preclear that you pull off the street. You would just have to work hard to break an Auditor's Code. You'd have to really be flagrant.

But I have seen Auditor Code breaks reported which consisted of “He sneezed.” It was a code break. He – oh, yes. “He really broke the code because he refused and wouldn't run the process that he should have been running that week,” regardless of what the auditor thought the preclear ought to have run on him. You see, this auditor was supposed to be auditing something or other and he didn't audit this on this preclear, and this preclear knew he should have been auditing this, so the preclear says “Ah-ha! An Auditor Code break, he's not running the right process.”

Everybody is training everybody all the time. Everybody has a big critical idea of everybody all the time. And so you get a very peculiar brand of auditing. You see auditing at its very worst in one of these units.

Anybody who joins a unit to get processing, if he isn't crazy to begin with, is liable to be at the end of the unit.

But the funny part of it is, the very, very funny part of it is, is there is no substitute for going through one of these units and watching all of the boo-boos and having them happen and unhappen and so forth. If an individual stays with it, he recognizes several things, and one of those things is that bad auditing doesn't necessarily butcher him. It takes the importance off of this.

Instructional auditing doesn't necessarily kill him, and he finds out at once how bad auditing can be and what a thoroughly upsetting result you can sometimes get by auditing something incorrectly. He discovers that subjectively, which is a very interesting way to discover it, and practically the only way there is to discover it.

And the other, other thing that he learns, of course, is the reverse of that: That even though it is very bad, it still won't kill him. This is heartening.

Now, you take a unit such as this; there isn't a person present here who hasn't been pretty well trained one way or the other, who isn't pretty well conversant with the old-time methods and various things like that. And most everybody is fairly wise about these new processes that we have been using, and even some here have been very thoroughly trained in these six basic processes. So therefore our job is primarily to make good auditors. Do you get the idea? That's our job. Now, it wouldn't matter how good a fellow was, he could always be a better auditor. Now, I am always – when I'm ten feet back of my head auditing somebody, I am always aware of the fact that I could be doing a better job of auditing. I can pick up my own flaws and quirks and things I do wrong and correct them and carry them around.

I was doing a job of auditing just before I came to class here, for instance. And I was a little bit abstracted, because there were several very pressing items which were waiting just outside the door to drop in my lap and several other things were going on. And I suddenly recognized that I was not doing – and that I had been consistently doing one error in auditing.

If you want to do a perfect job of auditing or even close to perfect, there is several various little rules to follow, and one of them is “every moment is separate from every other moment.” If you want to define sanity, sanity is a state in which every moment is separate from every other moment. Insanity is a state where all moments are the same moment. Got that? That is a very handy definition. All right.

Now, when we say to a preclear “Let's look for some things.” the way we have to do, see, in Group Processing, “Let's look for some things which aren't going to eat you.” You know, just make him look at the walls or something. And he does silently, he checks over, you see that he is checking them over and then you say “Give me some more things.” and you do this in an individual session, you are wasting one of the primary, one of the primary things in individual auditing.

An individual auditing can monitor each and every individual preclear. And in monitoring each and every individual preclear we discover that each instant is going to be separate from every other instant.

(original recording stopped for a moment, because of the noise)

Each and every second, each and every instant is a separate instant. You see that stuff over there; that wall? Do you know that that thing actually and basically is there all the time because all instants are there? It's because all of its instants are the same instant. That wall is forever. That isn't a thin strata on the time track which is moving forward in time along with you. This is quite a basic and interesting discovery if you can grasp it.

It always has been there; it always will be there as far as the unit materials are concerned. It hasn't got any time! That's the trouble with it. And if you can tolerate something which is a total time, you can't get back of the time of that wall, you can't get forward of the time of that wall, you see? Because that wall is a forever. You see that?

Now, just reverse your ideas of time, thinking that that wall is giving you a time track by ticking off and moving. No, no, the only way you ever get any time at all is by making a consideration there is time. And you go on considering there is time – why you go on considering there is time. But this wall – I know those orbits travel around in very precise ways and all of that sort of thing, and it all seems to be perfectly timed. This is highly questionable. That is – that is terrifically theoretical.

Do you know that nobody has ever watched, ever watched the “L” orbit of anything. Nobody has ever seen this. They see the Earth go around the sun on a time basis, and they change every week – certainly oftener than a lot of these nuclear physicists change their underwear – they change their theory about the structure and formation and motion of the atom. It's a – it's curious. It's weird, because they have been going on the basis that time comes off of that wall.

That is why people are daffy. That is why people in the sciences, in biology, that is why they think man comes from mud and all the rest of it. They think time comes off of this matter, this space. They think it does the timing. Oh, no, it doesn't. Not even vaguely.

The only thing that does any timing is life. And if you can look at this and you understand it, you have got a reverse look really at what has been the popular scientific concept. We see the sun rising and setting; so therefore we know time has occurred. Well, it would be all right if we didn't have that word know in there. If we said “The sun is rising and setting and therefore time has occurred,” we are utterly incorrect. “The sun is rising and setting, and therefore we know time has occurred,” is correct. Know time has occurred. We have occurred; action is taking place.

Do you see this clearly? It's a little bit hard to grasp. You have to kind of get audited into it sometimes. But all of a sudden it becomes very clear. You say, "Holy Cats! Thme is a consideration." You look at this stuff around here, it is going glug, glunk.

Now, one of the things is time has assumed an automaticity as far as science is concerned. Science believes that time is this terrific automaticity, see. And if the sun is going around its axis and the Earth is going around the sun – and that this automaticity finally enforces time upon us.

And if you want to get ahold of an E-Meter or do some remembering, you will discover planet-builder incidents, system builders. It is quite curious; life has actually agglomerated the material which makes up the sun and the Earth. They have set these things into motion. They have been set into motion. They are energy which is being swung by life. And if life took no further interest in it at any – of any kind, it wouldn't go on swinging. Believe me.

Science has taken a backwards look at this. It is a little bit hard at first maybe to grasp the fact that time is a consideration. But let's look at it this way and you can see it immediately. An individual begins to depend more and more upon clocks, watches, the position of the sun, he begins to believe more and more that these things are giving him a timing – that they are delivering into his hands a timing – and he goes nuttier and nuttier. Let's watch that one. Why?

He'll get more and more jammed; he has less and less time. You can see that one take place. Just take somebody who has – who has been utterly dependent on clocks or even the sun, and we take a look at him and we find out that he is not the free spirit which he once was.

See, the more we depend upon the MEST universe to give us time, the nuttier we get, the less decision we have. Why? Because we have had – it has aggregated to itself a function which can be performed only by life, you see? Life keeps giving it this function and says "Look, this is time." Life gives it the function in order to have an agreement on time passage so that you and I both know what time you and I are in. It doesn't have anything to do with it.

You and I agree that there is time passage going on. We say, "Look at this motion which we have started here. All right, now, as this motion keeps taking place and so on, we will say – we will consider that a motion is taking place. You and I will both consider this motion is taking place and therefore at this uniform rate which we have both carefully concentrated on, and so forth, will be a rate of agreement on which you and I can talk, converse or shoot at each other."

You understand this, then, that at the mo... The less an individual is in control of, the less an individual depends upon some other exterior force to give him time, the more difficult this individual's case is.

You just look at your worse off preclears and you will find out that they're – it is impossible to get them there for appointments. They just don't – they just slop all around.

A psychotic one; he doesn't know whether it is midnight or Christmas. You told him to come in at 2:00; he wouldn't know anything about it.

Now, let's look at it the other way. If this is the case then is there a process by which we could simply tell a fellow "Postulate some time. Postulate some more time. Postulate some more time. Postulate some more time." Yes, there is such a postulate. There is such a process. It's one of the more rugged processes you would want to undertake. It is not one of the basic six processes. It's too rugged. You put this process around there; you put this process around some neurotic pc or something like that and you are going to have time on your hands because he hasn't got any on his.

It is just like – there's a very silly process, a very interesting process whereby you have a person who is having mechanical difficulties, you know, they go out and they start a motor and then it kills. And they start it again and it kills. And they start it again and it kills. And then they run down their battery and then it won't run at all and then they get their battery charged up again. And then they make sure that they don't get the oil changed or they make sure that the wrong oil goes in or something is going to happen so they start the motor and it kills. And they start it and it kills.

There are such people around. We have them in the organization occasionally, and the machinery doesn't operate in their vicinity. We had one recently; it's quite amusing. Machinery just didn't operate around this fellow and so he is not handling it anymore. Anyhow, we didn't bother to run this process on him; we should have.

The HASI to some slight degree is the case of the cobbler's children; they never have shoes.

So, here we have this process, we took it on a person who – whose case has always been a little bit boggy and we found out he had a little difficulty with this so we didn't care what we did to him because it was just investigation we were conducting. And we pegged his... Everybody becomes expendable in that particular field. So we took this process and handed the fellow an object and said "How many problems can this object be to you?" See, of course, this immediately ties in with the automobile that won't start and the machines that won't run and so forth.

He's – he hasn't got – he has a scarcity of problems as far as objects are concerned, see. So "How many problems can this object be to you?" Well, this fellow went on and on and he was audited several hours on this process and at the end of that time he opined like it could be an awful lot of problems to him. He finally came to that consideration. It could be – there could be quite a lot problems. He didn't think it could be an infinity of problems yet but it was the end of the auditing session and the auditor turned him loose and then didn't get around to him again for about two weeks.

And this fellow had nightmares. This fellow had the most difficult time you ever saw with his breathing, with his heart action. He just had – was having a ball with the thetan's own machinery, see. He – we at least brought him up to a point of where he didn't think he was going to have any – we had just brought him up to a point where we didn't think he could have any more problems, we weren't going to allow him to have any more problems evidently with material objects, so therefore he was going to take his own machinery and he was really going to fix it up.

Now, most thetans are in this state; they are gumming up their – at least their thetan machinery. Their machinery cannot be enough problems to them.

Well, we just went back with the old adage, you see, That the process that turns on a somatic will turn it off” And we went back, took exactly the same object in the same auditing room and continued the process for another fifteen hours: “How many problems can this object be to you?” Now, this individual was in foul condition, you see. We didn't have any business running such a process on him at all, but investigation, as I have said, you have to find out where processes won't work.

And what do you know, what do you know. We got away with it. We actually got away with it. It's very possible, from this and two other tests, that we could get away with this at every level that we applied it. But it certainly takes long enough and it produces some of the most fantastic comm lags on your lower-levels cases. So therefore, there are other things you can do. Even before you can run this process you have to get him into communication, of course. Now, the individual who is having his facsimiles go wild in front of his face is getting drifting fields, is doing all sorts of weirdities of this character. Let's just put him into the bracket of “How many problems can his machinery be to him.” And we could put him in that bracket and we find out that this is very much the case with this individual. He can't have any more problems. Nobody will let him have any more problems with material machinery. See, he isn't permitted to break any of that down or do anything wrong with it. He is supposed to make that run. And he falls back and gets covert, and he drops back and starts lousing up his own bank.

And every time you have a disobeying piece of machinery it's because the individual has – I mean, this is the reason why. I mean, we are not giving you one of; a lot of stuff; because this works it out, so it must be the reason why – he just hasn't enough problems on the subject of his bank and so he's making it do all sorts of problems to him now. A theoretical process which is offered there is a – well, it offers just tremendous variations. “How many problems could machinery be to you – your machinery be to you?” “How many problems could eyesight be to you?” “How many problems could hearing be to you?” “How many problems could this, could that,” – anything you could think of under the sun, moon and stars – we could run into this type of process.

Well, what kind of a process is it? Where does it belong in the scale of the Six Basic Processes? Well, oddly enough it belongs in the first data bank. We have taken some real rough cases, three to be exact. It is pretty hard to find real, honest-to-goodness rough cases that stay rough these days. They snap on up to “Just won't progress out of pure cussedness.”

But the guy who is really worried, who is haunted, who goes in houses and glances behind doors, who is desperately afraid he is going to fall off the sidewalk, who is certain that the federal government has his brain wired by Western Union to get all of his secrets; these guys are scarce. They get around here, you start to get into communication with them. That is the basic processes which breaks up psychosis and that is the end of the psychotic. Now, we – if we get into communication with them, then get them into communication with walls, and psychosis is not longer a problem. It might take quite a while to do this, but actually nowhere near the estimate that you would have made in the yesterdays of Dianetics and Scientology.

For instance, a girl we are processing right now. We got an hour-long comm lag out of her – yesterday – it is a curious thing; do you know that this girl has never comm lagged before; not worth a nickel. The auditor was running this girl's machinery exclusively. See, the auditor sort of took over the body and the machinery was running it and this case is only about fifteen or twenty hours deep. And all of a sudden we run into this hour-long comm lag on 8-C, Opening Procedure. You see? The case just stand back and looks at this wall for one hour and finally goes over and touches the wall. The first time the person had touched the wall herself See, I mean we were getting a shift there, a very violent shift.

Well, we speak of this whole thing about problems; problems are so basic to human problems and so basic to answers and so basic to case solutions that we just throw this right in there with two-way communication. I told you yesterday that a two-way communication is very necessary; that communication which has not become a two-way communication but is still a one-way communication Will go on to the end of the universe, see. It Will go on forever. That is an engram bank and so forth. It should have been a two-way Communication; it is only a one-way Communication yet. And it is still a one-way communication until somebody audits it because there isn't anybody there to answer anymore.

And you – you shot – well, let's look at the overt act-motivator sequence. We are familiar with this old mechanism, you know, guys get guilty consciousnesses and all of this. They get guilt feelings and shame, blame, regret, all of this mechanism. We find out that an individual who is complaining about his father, his father, his father, his father, his father, his father, his father, his father, his father and his father did this and his father spanked him.

I even had a preclear get so desperate because he couldn't interest me in this subject of how bad his father was, tell me that his father had been – habitually practiced coitus with him from the ages of eight till twelve, and I thought this is really going a long way. So at that time I alerted enough realizing that this was really getting spinny – I alerted enough to at least straightwire out the overt acts against Papa. Of course, we immediately got a flip as far as the case was concerned; this fellow changed and he knew he had changed; he knew something had happened and so forth. We found out that about a year or so before he came to me for auditing, he had beaten his father to a bloody pulp. Father had come in, his father was drunk and he himself had had a few drinks, and the old man by this time was about 85 and he wailed into his father and he beat him up just for stumbling around the house. Sent him to the hospital with a broken jaw. This guy had been an awfully sick mental case ever since, see?

And his father was so bad and his father was so bad. What he was trying to do without doing it well or technically was wrack up enough over... – motivators, you see, to have justified this overt act, but they were on the wrong part of the time track.

Well, now what is this overt act-motivator sequence but a one-way communication. Do you see that? It's just a one-way communication.

Now, if his father, with a broken jaw, had suddenly gotten up off the floor, had picked up a club or knuckle-dusters or something of the sort and worked this guy over and broken his jaw, you would have had no aberrative factor in the incident at all. “Oh, so we broke each other's jaw today.” Two-way communication would have occurred.



Now, a soldier on the battlefield is very often in a happy carefree state. He's shooting enemy troops and he's shooting enemy troops and he's shooting enemy troops. Supposing he found out 24 hours after he had shot twelve enemy soldiers that the enemy had not shot anybody on his side for several days. There was an armistice or something in progress. Well, he might have shot two hundred before that time, but he would go on till his old age feeling like, well, he just shouldn't have shot those twelve soldiers, see. I have run into cases like this. One fellow, one fellow was on detached duty in World War I and had shot down a plane well after the armistice. A plane came over flying very pretty and the guy shot it down. No two-way communication was available there, see. The guy wasn't shooting back, wasn't in a warlike state of mind. Well, however many things he had done before that time, that one stuck. In other words, we didn't have a two-way communication so we had a hang-up.

You can almost say, then, that in the absence of a two-way communication you get a hang-up of some sort or another on the track, and there's always something waiting for that answer. The bank is waiting for the answer. The fellow wracks it up waiting for the answer. Two-way communication has not occurred.

So an individual on a two-way communication gets into a state where he does not expect any answer will ever occur from anybody and where he feels no answer of any kind is expected from himself. And this is worsened by the fact that within his own machinery and within his own body he begins to believe that no communication is ever to be expected from his bank and therefore any communication that comes from it is a – is a surprise or an upset.

Yet, if he, out of a scarcity of living beings to talk to, goes into communication with his bank, like a prospector starts talking to burros, you know, and if he doesn't have a... Prospectors who take burros along with them stay fairly sane; prospectors who take no burros around, everybody knows they're crazy; there's nobody to talk to and they go around talking to themselves.

I ran into a fellow in the middle of New York, not in the middle of the Southwest, who walked into the restaurant, sat down, got up, pulled out a chair, evidently sat in a – it was in the Horn and Hardarts there on Broadway, that's just above, I think it is just above 44th, the Horn and Hardarts on – this guy is – up in the upper second floor – and this guy sat this imaginary person down and started to argue and he got more and more violent and he got more and more angry and he would wait for replies and then he would beat the table and he would get more angry about this whole thing. And in the meanwhile, however, he pushed over a bowl of soup and a couple of other items in front of this imaginary person. And then finally he pulled them back and wouldn't let the other person – quote – unquote have the bowl of soup. And he got more and more violent and more and more violent and he finally picked up his own chair by the top and brought it down with a crash on the empty chair. Got his overcoat and flounced out. The most terrific conversation I ever saw in my life. It must have been a two-way communication of some kind or another.

You could attribute this simply to this fact: Somewhere in that man's life there was a tremendous scarcity of communication.

Now, what happens when a person loses an ally? Let's take Book One. What happens when a person loses an ally, huh? There is no further communication with that ally, is there?

So this is real bad, isn't it? We get a stop of communication in this particular level; no more conversation with the departed ally. This would be perfectly all right if there were other terminals around to communicate with. But supposing one had only been in good two-way communication with this one ally, huh? And then there were no other people around there to talk with which made a great scarcity of communication. The individual will hang on this ally and later on, still lacking people to talk to, the individual will, very likely, conjure up the ally or a mythical person to stand in his vicinity to talk to. You will hear them later on having guardian angels and all kinds of mock-ups of this character.

Well, a thetan starts talking to his own machinery; a thetan starts talking to his own machinery, he is in bad shape because that machinery is never going to answer back anything more what he put into it.

Now, he could go right ahead and duplicate somebody. You know, he could make another being, no doubt, with full facilities and so forth, and have somebody to talk to, but he doesn't do this. He has lost the facility or he believes there's too much life on Earth or something of the sort; he will start talking to his machinery.

And you get a guy that is self-auditing; he is triggering some sort of a machine and then it triggers back at him and then he triggers at it and it triggers back at him. There is nothing happening there. I mean, it will just go on forever until eventually the machine breaks down or something occurs. Because it isn't a two-way communication; it's a one-way communication and he knows it as well as anybody else.

So the situation I said would go on forever. That is incorrect. The situation would break down somewhere. The machine would get bad off. The machine would break something, your boy would get occluded. Something is liable to occur here. Why? Because of a one-way communication.

Let's look at the condition – well, let's – let's look at something I'm very intimately acquainted with: data on the subject of the human mind. I was not even vaguely in any poor position on this subject in 1932, simply because I didn't know that the data was missing in the textbooks and library – to a very marked degree was missing. The case histories which had been accumulated, the data which had been amassed and so forth, had all been very, very carelessly done. This was a horrible botch job. But I didn't know it in 1932. I went on in a happy way that everybody was going to communicate with me on the subject if I communicated with them. And then I started talking to psychologists, one-way communication. That's a horrible state of affairs.

I know nothing drearier than trying to sell a psychologist on the idea that something can be done for the mind or to it. He is in the darnedest state of defeat you ever saw in your life. He will give you all sorts of arguments, authorities, castoffs of one kind or another but they all amount to the same thing; he, you know, he knows nobody is any good. He'll give you a bunch of sales talk, maybe, but he basically is talking from a defeated point of view. So you don't have a terminal if you, yourself, know you are just getting along famously on the subject and somebody else isn't. Well, a one-way communication is a liability as long as you do not know the rules and laws underlying one-way and two-way communication, then it ceases to be a liability.

I can go on. I had a student over in London, a long time ago, come up to me after a lecture and he says to me, “My God, Ron, how can you go on talking on this subject,” and so forth. “I suddenly realized that nobody ever talks to you from the same duplicated point.”

“Well,” I says, “but they do.”

“No. No. No. No. They don't.”

“Well, all right, what is the matter?”

“Well,” he says, “it makes...” He was talking about a one flow, one-way flow, and its difficulties and so forth, “and you are – you are an example of it, is that right?”

“Well, why aren't you an example of it?”

“Because I know what a one-way flow is, of course! How could I possibly be upset about it?”

And as a matter of fact, these days, here, of very recent times, auditors working in the field of the mind, working along this line, have gotten so darned smart that there isn't even a vaguely one-way communication going these days.

But knowing the mecharnsm takes the curse off of anything.

The only way the stage magician can interest or befog his audience, and so on, is by doing something quickly that is evidently against the agreement of the audience, do you see? And then the audience sits there and boggles and will worry about that trick. “How did he make those elephants disappear? Let's see how... so-so-so-so.

Probably, if it was really as spectacular as that – two elephants were standing out there in the middle of the stage and all of a sudden they weren't there – why you would have people going on talking about this and talking about this. They still talk about Houdini getting out of boxes underneath the water, and so forth. “How did he do these things?” And of course, Houdini wrote a book and, like Edgar Allen Poe, never told any of the secrets of his trade. The very silliest thing in the world is somebody like Edgar Allen Poe or Houdini actually sitting down to write a book on exactly how he does it.

People knowing that look at anybody in the field of development or research, and so on, and they get suspicious of them. And they say, “Well, now look, he couldn't write – really possibly be telling you what he is doing.”

But in view of the fact that the – the stage is not set here simply to produce phenomena, you see, and befog and bedazzle, we have a rather comfortable time of it. Nothing very horrible takes place. But it certainly could, you see, if there was this sleight of hand, behind-the-scenes kind of an activity going on.

Well, very often a student is so accustomed to somebody who does know something doing so much of this sleight of hand stuff, you know. “Now you see the jack of spades, you know, and there you see the king of hearts and, uh, and I have no cards. And you see, they are not up my sleeves.”

And he's used to being befogged like this, so he is always looking to be told something fantastic or fabulous, you see, that just breaks down everything else that's been said. So as a

matter of fact, then he begins to discount everything that's been taught on the subject, you see, and waits for a single trick, or something of the sort, that really was the trick. Well, he gets caught in this same mechanism of watching Houdini, you see, something of this sort. Houdini is there to befoggle them, to upset them, one way or another, and stick them on the track. Do you get that? Houdini is there to stick them on the track. Don't ever forget that when you examine the subject of interest. The fellow who is trying to be very, very interesting and who is himself being capable of being interested is only interested in sticking somebody; stopping them. It's a fascinating, fascinating thing.

Well, let's get back to this one-way flow. Now, no one-way flow is possible here. In every unit that has gone through, I have learned thoroughly as much from the students as they have learned from me; this is a cinch. This is why we get modifications. Basic theory is not altered but application has – thoroughness of application. What can the student learn? All kinds of bric-a-brac, and so forth, has altered. You are getting the benefit right now of a great many clinical units in which this has been thoroughly hashed over. This isn't a one-way communication we are doing here, and don't think of it in that fashion.

But the thing that sticks this trick is the fact that it's a one-way communication. The second you know exactly how he made the two elephants disappear there is no longer any stuck, is there? So there's that mechanism senior to this mechanism of a stuck flow or a one-way communication, see?

If you understood the mechanisms attendant to a one-way communication and a two-way communication, if you understood these thoroughly, you would never stick on a one-way communication. Everything is basically consideration and these are the basic considerations which go to make up the track. There must be a two-way communication is one of them. We don't know why except it's – just is. Everybody has got that consideration, you see, “There should be a two-way communication.”

All right, so if they don't know the mechanisms of a communication, then they are subject to this one-way communication mechanism, so they have looked at MEST, looked at MEST...

Let me show you some examples of this. They have looked at MEST and looked at MEST and looked at MEST. Has it ever looked at them? Well, occasionally a mirror does. That's about all, that's about all. Once in a while a river does if it is very quiet; a lake. But has it really looked at them?

All right, you've given the body orders, you've given it orders, you've given it orders, you've given it orders, you've given it orders, you've given it orders. Is anything around a body who will give anything else any orders, really? Not unless we invent some; not unless we invent some. We can then say, “Look how this body is giving me orders. It is moving me around in time and place. It's doing all this sort of thing.” You know, no-responsibility, no-responsibility.

Just a-this is just subsequent to this stuck flow, one-way communication. See? We get a one-way communication, a one-way communication, a one-way communication. Eat, sleep, walk, make love, smile, dance, move, sit still, eat, sleep, dress, brush your teeth. Dah! Dah! Dah! See? Always just one-way. Does the body ever say, “Well, I don't know whether I will

brush my teeth or not.” Does it ever do that? No it doesn't. Has it ever said to you, “Thetan! Brush your teeth!” Not unless you said it first. Mirror trick, see, mirror trick.

Now, you actually could make the body talk back to you, apparently, by picking up an old-time facsimile of what you have said to the body or that somebody said to it. You can make a page talk to you similarly. Somebody said something to the page 50 now the page can say something to you but you know that isn't a communication, you see. It isn't a basic flow life to life unless you really realize that you are talking with Epicurus, or somebody, when he wrote on that page, you see. The – if you get into the silly notion that the page is talking to you, you'll get your nose stuck in a book, just literally, see.

The – the bibliophile, he collects books, he's collecting books, he's collecting books, he's collecting books. What do they say? He doesn't know.

I went into a movie star's home one time and this person had evidently been collecting books and collecting books and collecting books, and there was a library of considerable size, and boy did it have books in it, and so forth. And I thought, “Well, gee, that is just dandy I am going to have a good time over this weekend after all; and nice quiet places around here to read a book.” So I reached up, poor fool that I am, to pull one of these books off of the shelf – they were all dummies. But, they were just the backs, millions of backs the place had in it, evidently. Anyhow – just like the girl! So – nothing but back. I remember that star but I won't give her away.

The point here is that one-way communication will stick somebody. Now, this is a basic, cardinal rule. If you don't know all the mechanisms of communication, if you don't know what communication is all about, if you don't know what two-way communication is all about, if you don't realize a communication will hang up – the way people stick is determined by the one-way flow. This is the stuck mechanism. It is a one-way flow with no reply. And that is a stick. That's how a person gets into a body. That is how a person gets to be a denizen of Earth. That is how a person gets into this system or this galaxy or this universe. The one thing which this universe does not do is answer back. It makes you answer yourself back when you are talking to it. And an individual can make the mistake of talking to it, not through it.

Now, I can talk to you through the physical universe with perfect equanimity and with no slightest aberrative upset here, see. I am talking to you. You're alive; you're capable of self-determinism, even pan-determinism, of thought, of belief You could make postulates; you could make them stick. You can create machinery. You have all of these capabilities. Talking to you, sooner or later I will get a reply, see? Even if you just look at me I am getting a reply, see?

But talking to that stuff over there, see, that wall, that's a lot different, see. And if an individual is stupid enough to expect it to answer, if he ever makes this... It's actually just one little consideration on the track – it is just one particular type of consideration; it is the physical universe must answer back, or this rock has got to answer me back, see. He has just got to make that mistake and then keep on making it, and boy, does he get stuck, see? He'll stick right there – zoom! And that is the only way anybody ever gets stuck, except by the consideration that he is stuck.

Now, the consideration that he is stuck, of course, is the senior consideration. But the mechanics of getting stuck on which we have agreed – and they are only valid because we have agreed on them, we voted for them or something – is that a one-way communication will stick somebody. And that is why a person gets stuck in a body. That's why a person who is out of a body goes back into a body.

Let's say – here's a – here's a hypothetical, or maybe not so hypothetical, incident. This expedition is about to take off and invade this small moon which is passing around this planet. Okay. A thetan, who knows all about this expedition – who lives on that small moon and considers life very nice up there, and so on – objects to this expedition. So he goes down and he spots the expedition leader and he says, zap fashion, “What the hell do you mean coming and messing up this whole galaxy?” He bangs on into the head of the expedition leader and completes the expedition himself Why? Why did he do this?

Later on he will think of it as one of his better accomplishments. What happened to the expedition leader? He probably banged on out the other side, but he certainly never got into contact with the expedition leader, he was only in contact with that body, and that body and anything else around that body as far as he could tell did not answer back. And he expected an answer back of the exact violence of the answer addressed. And the answer addressed was a violent statement, and there was no reply and so one-way communication had occurred; a one-way communication so thorough that he'd interiorized. So, therefore, time and again on the time track you'd put a beam or made a statement to a body and then gone on inside of it.

Now, you will notice this. You see, that comes basically out of this basic error that MEST can answer you and that bodies are alive. They are as alive as they are run. But they are a machine built by thetans for the operation of thetans; by the thetans for the people of the bodies. Now, there is the – there is the mechanism of sudden interiorization; there is the mechanism of entrapment. Of course, the basic mechanism that frees all entrapments is understanding. I was going into that yesterday.

If you understand something it certainly can't trap you. Well, one-way communication can't trap you either if you understand it; if you know what it is.

You say, “Look-a-here, now, this is a basic agreement that I have made, and that if I communicate one way and I don't get an answer then I have to close terminals with something and do the answering myself.” Have you got that? That is the basic agreement.

So a guy gets married or buried or something and lives unhappily for years with this character. And he'll come in here, you – this fellow comes in and he is all cheerful, you know, and he says, “I just bought a new hat. How does this look? Dear, I just bought a new hat, how does it look!!”

“Close the door, Henry.”

After a while you will see this fellow with some feminine gestures. How does this come about?

Well, he has to go over there and answer himself! All right, he loses this wife by smallpox or divorce or something and years later you are processing him as a preclear. And

you say to him – you say to him, 'All right, now let's get something you wouldn't mind remembering.'

“Dah – nothing.”

He's answering. The situation has gotten complex to this degree: How do you answer if you are the wife? By being silent, of course. Isn't this goofy? That's how you answer, by being silent.

It's this business, this business all over again: it's safe to do whatever your parents did. This is trial, error, natural selection, evolution, everything; it's one of the things that life does along the track – it's safe to do what your parents did.

And by the way you get a child to dramatize this, and if their – unless their parents have been terribly neglectful, just abysmally neglectful, why, they will get into this fascinating state. They – they won't really – they will momentarily and cursorily imitate a maid or a governess or something, just momentarily, nothing. It's not safe. They'll go right on imitating their parents. And it is quite a curious thing; they will imitate their parents.

It's safe to do what your parents did. You see that?

Now, I have smoked this out. It is a very interesting little discovery. I actually conducted a few little tests on this and did a lot of talking around and asking of questions. A curious thing – a baby will eat off of his mother's plate almost anything.

One of the more fiendish tests that I conducted on this was on my own kid, I wouldn't have done it to somebody else's kid. I pretended to scatter an enormous amount of pepper into the palm of my hand and then pretended to eat it with some relish. I didn't scatter any pepper at all on my hand. Hand it to my little girl, she promptly threw some pepper into the palm of her hand and ate it with considerable relish. And for some days was busy enjoying pepper in great quantity.

I got her maid, the maid, to put some pepper in her hand and eat it, and neither accelerated nor decelerated the child's. Now, she had been eating with the maid most of the time.

All right, went a little bit further than that. I got the maid to take some cabbage, cut it, eat it, and then – cut it, eat it, give it – she couldn't care anything about that cabbage. Nothing. I took some cabbage and ate it, and bang! the cabbage was fine. So I tracked up on this further and found out why the children made such a clamor at the table.

Most parents would love to find this out: Why are children so clamorous around a table? Well, it is because actually, that's the thing that is safe to eat, you see? They want to be in there with their parents during mealtime. It's safe to eat what your parents eat.

Well, the only thing I am making a point of this is, is just to give you another silly example of the rationale of life. If the parents die, it is then safe to die. Let's follow this. It is safe to do what your parents do is the basic postulate. So what happens to some kid whose parents are dead? He's dead! And there is another one of your key preclears whose case is hanging up all over the place. He is doing what is safe, he is doing the secure thing, the safe thing. This is one of the seventy-five processes, by the way. All right.

Let's look over this and discover this: that if you actually knew the mechanisms behind one-way and two-way communication, that they wouldn't bother you, not even vaguely. You wouldn't stick just because somebody didn't answer you. You wouldn't switch valence just because somebody didn't answer you. You would know that people were switching valence, though, because they weren't being answered. And you would know that many people were sticking on the subject of MEST because they expected walls and things to answer them; completely irrational, one of their own postulates, some game they played some time or another. They get out of their body and they stick to the wall. They put a beam on the wall and they can't get the wall – the beam off. Well, that's because they expect the wall to put a beam back at them if they put a beam on the wall. You get the idea? Nothing sillier than this.

Now, there is a little neurotic boy, who comes to mind, who used to beat his wagon and kick rocks. And a lot of children will do this. They will walk up to a rock, the rock will stub them or something, you know, and they'll kick the rock, and they will have an awful argument with that rock, see, a big argument with the rock. Actually, they get stuck to the rock. Only we know how they get stuck to the rock; they carry a somatic of the kick. That is getting stuck to the rock. Now do you understand? And that is a facsimile. A person would not have any facsimiles if he never expected this stuff to answer! He makes it answer him by making a picture and then looking at the picture, and then saying it is that picture.

Well, now, this is facsimiles, this is the stuck phrase, this is the stuck change valence, this is the rest of this, see, all around the clock here. This is the mechanism we have been playing with with Book One. It's the stuck communication.

So if you don't understand anything else, for God sakes, understand a two-way communication, exactly how it works and exactly how it sticks.

And look very, very – look very closely at the world around you here, the next few days. Pick yourself up some independently discovered examples of people doing a one-way communication and getting stuck by it. You'll see it. It happens all the time. It happens all the time.

You understand this thoroughly, it's merely because they expect an answer back. But, who is it that is expecting the answer back? Huh? It's the person himself, isn't it?

Do you know that if you never expected an answer back from something, it's not aberrative. This isn't a mechanism that sneaks up on you. I mean, it's one of those horribly... It's like a corpse lying in the center of the – the – of the town, busiest street. It's right there in sight.

“I don't know why Aunt Hattie has not answered my letter. I wrote her last Tuesday, she hasn't answered, she hasn't answered. I want to know – I want to know if she is coming here or if she isn't. What do you suppose has gotten into her?”

What's the next action? To close the terminals. With a what? With a telephone at least.

All right, now, we have two offices, somebody sends me a despatch – this is easy to do these days because I am doing practically nothing but trying to get rid of this book and try not to take care of too many administrative details – and somebody sends me a despatch – no answer. You look at it. It's not an important despatch. It's not going to gum any wheels, I



might have seen it, might not have, see. But it's stuck, anyhow. Their next action is to come to 806, see – close the terminal, you see that? If you don't get an answer you have to come there and the next action after that – this one you would really consider nutty – would be for the person to write his own answer on his own despatch and then go back to 616 to wait for the despatch to be returned to him so he would know what I had said. See, that would be the next answer. That would be real nutty, wouldn't it?

Well, how about the fellow coming up from 616 writing the answer on the despatch and thereafter being me? And sending this despatch back to himself who is no longer there at 616? You are looking at psychosis when you look at that. That is psychosis. That's exactly what the psychotic is doing.

So the answer to this is obviously communication and it is actually – with the factors of affinity, the factors of agreement and reality thrown in, good old ARC, better understood – that is exactly what is going on with your preclear. And the remedy for it is to remedy his scarcity of communication, to get him into communication, to let him discover that there is another terminal around someplace, and that he himself is talking to the MEST and he is expecting the answer back from it; he is getting his answer back from it. Opening Procedure 8-C, you just make him go, you know, “Touch that \_\_\_\_\_.” He'll run out the postulate after a while that he is expecting this stuff to answer and it doesn't answer. Isn't this silly?

These guys that have these big massive ridges, that have lots of facsimiles, what are they doing? They just run a stuck flow, that's all, at energy masses, and so forth. Now, they are being the energy mass; it never answered back.

How about the fellow who is occluded? We would say offhand that he must have talked to some black energy masses at some time or another, and had done a lot of talking to the night with no answer back. Remember the song “Chloe?” All right.

So the first and foremost thing that we have here on our agenda is a good solid grasp of this two-way communication – the mechanism of getting stuck and how it results in facsimiles, shifted valences, being in bodies, getting stuck to walls and so forth.

There's lots and lots of processes that could be run on this subject – “Give me something you don't expect any answer from.” “Give me something you expect answers from.” – I mean any kind of a process you could rig up. A curious thing, in present time or otherwise, liable to do almost anything to the preclear. It will make him worse, make him better, do something or other. If he ran any of these long enough, however, it would always make him better.

All right. And it's the only way you could make a preclear worse with a process is to stop running it; that's a horrible fact.

Now, the basic modus operandi of existence, and so forth, the thetan stops duplicating himself, stops putting up sentient, thinking, self-determined beings just like himself, just by postulate – starts making machinery, starts expecting it to answer, gets stuck with his own machinery bank, starts expecting people around him to answer, starts expecting bodies to give him answers. You can run into most anybody in the street, they would swear that the person that's going to answer them is the body standing in front of them. And that is not the person

that is answering. And a thetan is there answering – no matter how bogged down he is, this is still what is happening, and so we get a two-way communication as the resolution of this.

So therefore, all processes, no matter how involved or how simple they might be, are dependent upon the first process used which is on the lowest part of the Tone Scale, on up. It goes from the lowest level we can reach on up. It's two-way communication. That's the first process we have got to study, look at and so forth.

A good way to go about it is to do some Straightwire. That is another process, you see, but you still get in conversation on the subject. You still have the fellow having his bank answering him and so forth. All right.

The main thing we are interested in is an utter, complete and devastatingly clear concept of exactly how two-way communication results in stucks – pardon me, it results – a one-way communication results in stucks and how two-way communication can resolve this.

If you see this clearly, why, there isn't any problem in theory or anything else that can ever baffle you. Nothing could baffle you in a preclear's case. He is, of course, being incomprehensible because any terminal that doesn't answer is then incomprehensible and all sorts of things.

It's the preclear himself who expects the answer. It is the expectancy of the answer which makes the aberration take place. You, as an auditor, could only be restimulated if you kept expecting the answer from the preclear, expecting the answer from the preclear, without understanding the mechanism back of answers.

Many a person is going around looking for the answer to existence when he only wanted his mother to say “Hello.” That was the basic line, you see. He wants the answer to his mother and then his mother gets out into everything else and you have association, associative logic, you have got reasoning and you find you get him expecting a – you find – you find him at Cornell studying mathematics or something in order to get the answer! You get the idea? Okay, so that is our most basic chore right now; is in auditing and in the environment around and about. Let's look over this very carefully and see if we can see some examples of people trying to remedy one-way communication by answering themselves, by any other mechanism we can notice in the field of communication.

Okay?

(End of lecture)