17 56 28B 57 5 Nov 53 Certainty

Transcript of lecture by L. Ron Hubbard AICL-56 renumbered 28B and again re-numbered 57 for the *"Exteriorization and the Phenomena of Space"* cassette series.

CERTAINTY

A lecture given on 5 November 1953

[Based on the clearsound version only.]

November the 5th, first morning lecture.

I want to show you here - somebody has left me a picture - somebody has left me a picture of an automatic machine. And this machine - this machine has as its primary function, doodling. And this gives a certain automaticity, as a person sits down, a pencil appears in his hand and he makes these motions. And the picture draws - the machine draws itself every time.

Now, the reason I know this is because the entire science - excuse me - it's early in the morning for me to tell lies - *"science"* of psychology is based upon this premise: that if you can only find the picture the machine draws, you will know that there is a picture. And they have worked this out. It has taken them a long time.

Did you ever see analysis of doodling? It's very interesting. Also, there's black spots. Now, black spots are very, very interesting, you'd be surprised.

Who's missing here?

Male voice: Harold. He's been in the sack trying to run out a headache.

He's what?

Male voice: Been in the sack trying to run out a headache.

He is trying to run out his own headache? Well, that is very interesting. That can't be done, I assure you. But with all these auditors present he is lying in a sack.

Well, somebody had better bail him out and audit out his headache. Call him up on the telephone and audit it out. Because I assure you that all he will do is just lie in the sack and audit out his headache for a long time, only there will be no out appear.

I've seen many people audit out somatics out of themselves and it can be done with great ease. But they've got to be in fairly good condition before they do it, otherwise they just audit themselves into headaches.

All right. This morning - November 5th lecture - this morning, we are going to take up the categories of certainty, and right off here and find out how many things a person can be certain of.

How many factors are there in Dianetics and Scientology? How many odds and ends of data are there? How many conditions are there in the MEST universe? Not conditions of what - just how many conditions are there in the MEST universe?

Well, there is a plus and a minus certainty, equally great (either one) on both and on all the conditions in the MEST universe and on all the factors we've covered so far in Dianetics and Scientology.

Now, if an auditor finds himself so mentally pauperized he can't think of something for the preclear to be certain of he ought to quit. Because everything about - you get this: *"Now are you certain - are you certain you have a facsimile? Are you certain you have any facsimiles?"*

"Have you any certainty that you have ever had a facsimile?"

"Have you ever seen some kind of a mental image of any kind?"

"Are you certain at this moment you don't have a mental image at which you're directly looking and which is not in full and brilliant color and three dimensions, in motion? Are you certain you don't have one at this moment?"

"All right, you're certain of something."

Now, let's look in particular at space, energy and matter for certainties. Now these, in Scientology, add up to be, do and have. And we get our primary certainties on this.

But a person who is not certain of beingness - that is, location in space - immediately (of course he should go up to that as soon as possible) can be reached on doingness and if he can't be reached easily on doingness, believe me he could be reached on havingness - positive and negative in each case.

And you have, therefore, a formula for Orienting Straightwire which is actually infallible as long as you can get any slightest communication with your preclear.

Now, the truth of the matter is, there are levels of certainty which can be reached without a communication system to which the preclear is immediately agreeing.

Let's take a bullet; now there's a great extremity. A preclear could be shot, no matter if he was psychotic (I'm not advising this as a technique because we're not in the field of psychiatry), but he could be shot and would be certain that he had been shot. See,

now that's an other certainty, that's other-determinism certainty. Every impact of every kind, or originating exterior to the preclear, is other certainty.

All impacts do is assure him that there is another beingness, there is other-determinism. Now, this is not necessarily bad because as people go down the line and get foggier and foggier, they're less and less sure that there are other beings.

So, we have these two categories: we have his own certainty and we have other people's certainties. And then we have the MEST universe certainty, within the MEST universe, observable. And so out of these certainties on spatial position (which is beingness), consecutive motions (which is doingness in consecutive spaces), and in consecutive motions, by the way, these things finally condensed until you get a havingness; and this havingness of course is, in itself actually time as far as experience is concerned.

So, if we have somebody who is terribly bad off on the subject of the past, the present and the future we'd go into havingness.

Does he have an elephant - a MEST universe elephant in this room at this time?

Now actually, you wouldn't realize to what degree this straightens out time unless you've really used this on somebody who is psycho. Somebody who is psycho will consider the matter and look around and feel around and finally look at you and say, *"What are you trying to do to me? There is no elephant in this room."* Now, that's an awfully low level of certainty but you have at least made him certain of something. All right?

Another way to do it is to give them impossibles. Now there is a certainty of an impossibility. And this one is a technique sitting over on the sidelines of Orienting Straightwire which is almost a technique by itself, the certainty of impossibilities.

We take the first things of which he can be certain and he isn't certain of any of them. Well, he can be certain of an impossibility. Is his body here at this moment and in the street, too?

A person who's pretty goofed up will say, *"Well, I just don't know. I don't know, I don t think so."*

Well that isn't impossible enough. So, you can say, *"All right, is there anybody in this room who is certain you are here?"*

"You are!"

Now we move right into one of the primary buttons, by the way, when we do that I'll mention it again: reassurance. It's when we interplay these universes on certainties, we get this action known as reassurance and its a powerful button.

So, we say, *"All right now, when do you suppose this building was built ?"*

"Oh, I don't know probably in the last 100 years."

"Well, were you here in the year 1201?"

"No."

"How old is the building? Were you in this building in the year 1201? The building is 80 years old."

Now that is too wide a span of impossibility for you to brace, but what do you know, it's possibly not quite wide enough to bracket some cases. You say, *"All right, now, did you ever build a house? Or did you ever see a structure go together?"*

The fellow says, *"You mean - I remember somebody building an apartment house."*

"All right. Were you living in that apartment house two years before it was built?"

"No, of course not."

And you're getting exactly the same phenomenon of certainty. That's the certainty of impossibility. It's - rather than the certainty of nothingness and the certainty of some-thingness. You just - within his own limits of understanding you reach out to what he considers impossible. Because if you - you realize that if something is actual, if you're looking for a certainty of actuality, you'd better look for the opposite which is a certainty of impossibility.

Now, people go around reassuring each other. There's only one problem, one class of problem. That's a horrible thing to tell the preclear this before he himself has experienced this in processing. There's only one class of problem and that's other people's problems. There isn't a class of problems known as the thetan's problems. He doesn't have any. That is as deadly to him - the one thing he doesn't want to realize - as not having other people's problems; that could be a zero, too.

You know, if you want to get a wonderful response from anybody, I don't care if they are in the corn belt or Tahiti, you just say, *"You know, you look the kind of a person that people confide in, that people tell their troubles to."* Whoever you tell that to immediately goes - slurp-slurp. I don't care if he's a little urchin sitting on a curb with no clothes on, he realizes this is so. Because this is the only place he's ever going to get a problem. He can't have, for himself a problem and he himself is not in trouble.

When an auditor recognizes this, he recognizes that he's doing a double-stage on the preclear and all of a sudden realizes why, every once in a while, he's processing the preclear but the preclear is processing somebody else. He just has that spooky feeling, like he isn't really processing the preclear, he's processing the preclear who is relaying it somewhere else.

And a case that hangs fire is doing this uniformly. They're still trying to make Grandma sane. They're still trying to make the truck driver live although he has gone over the embankment and the truck is on fire. See? Other people's problems.

So, if you don't have a problem solver which underlies all other possible problems, you're not going to solve the preclear's problems. That's how far south you have to go. You have to go as far enough south to get problems which are in excess of any problem he is trying to solve for anybody. That is to say, they must have either a greater violence or a greater simplicity.

And you must go, certainly, and process in the strata which foreruns language. Otherwise, your language itself is all that gets processed. Processing language leads you into processing something else, which leads you into processing something else and you just keep moving back, back, back on this unless you're actually processing the exact elements with which he's concerned. And that's how far south you have to go.

What are the elements he is concerned with? They're concerned with space in this universe - and actually in his own universe - they're concerned with space, energy and matter - be, do and have. And those are the elements he's concerned with. And if you can separate beingness apart immediately in terms of spaces, wonderful.

Well, if you can't do that, then separate doingness. You've got an identification at the bottom of this, and it's just by putting things in different places that you get things unidentified. In other words, differentiation is what you've got to achieve with the preclear, so by putting him in different spaces, you've got them different. And as soon as you've got this, you've got his bank unsnarled, believe it or not.

Now, if you can't differentiate in terms of being in different spaces, you actually differentiate by being different people, being different objects and being different things.

If you look at this preclear and he's very, very upset about it, and you say, *"Well, let's see now, are you a man?"* (There'd be some doubt about that fellow who lived in Hollywood for years.) You say, *"Well, all right..."* Now, let's fall right on over into the category of impossibility.

"Well, are you a horse? Do other people think you're a horse?"

"I don't know."

"Well, do other people think you're the Empire State Building?"

"No, of course not! That's silly."

See, you just exceeded the limit of responsibility...

"Well, now do other people think that you're a cow?"

"No. But I knew somebody once that thought they were a cow."

"Well, do you think you're a cow? Do other people think you're a cow?"

"No. No."

"Do you think you're a horse?"

"No. I'm not a horse."

What have you done here? It's just you have gotten a wedge in there, see? And you're still in space really when you're in the terms of beingness. But we have immediately moved it into the category of objects - being objects. Being, primarily, is geographical location and it's actually a significance that brings about the object. So we can marry beingness, which is space, immediately to objects, and we have an Orienting Straight-wire process.

Now, you look at some preclear and you say, *"Now, what are you doing right now?"*

The fellow says, *"I um - I'm sitting here."* See. That's what he's doing.

"Well, are you knitting?"

"No. I'm not knitting. Of course, I'm not knitting."

"Well, are you playing tennis?"

"Well, I might think occasionally about playing it."

"Well, are you playing tennis right now?"

"No."

"Are you playing tennis in the past?"

"No."

"Are you running around a tennis court over on the other side of town?"

"No."

"Well, is your body running around a tennis court on the other side of town?"

"No!"

"Well, where is your body?"

"It's sitting here."

In other words, you've got a differentiation of space by nailing an object which, of course, is directly processing an anchor point.

Well, there are a lot of choices. You name an impossibility. While he's sitting here, he can't be running around a tennis court. Now, we find out with such an excursion, if we've just run such a process, what do you know, this guy can't conceive of a doingness. That's very interesting, isn't it. He must be nailed on the subject of objects. His whole, almost entire level is objects which means, boy, he doesn't have any space like mad.

You just ask him this exercise. You say, *"You see that lamp? Now look at the space all around it."* And you'll find his attention going onto the lamp - bong! They - I don't think there is anybody in this class who'd realize to the degree that somebody's attention will bong onto a lamp. You will see this in processing people.

You say, *"Look at the space around the lamp. Look at the space around the house. All right, let's look at the space around the car."* And their attention will snap to the car, the second they try to look at the space, so fast that it will hurt their eyes or blow their face in or something of the sort - I mean, it'd blow a ridge. Never done it before. See, it doesn't produce that effect upon you simply because you're not that bad off.

But remember, you can go that far south where a guy cannot see the space around the lamp. And then you've got a psycho. He'll tell you that there is no space around the lamp and this he is certain of.

You know, it's sometimes a little bit difficult. You look through this psycho's eyes at what he's looking at and you simply see what he is looking at. You don't see any of the significance he attaches to looking at it. This is peculiar.

But if you want to know how people look and what things - how things look to them - if it's viewpoint plus the significance, why, you get a very funny picture. You ask this psycho a little bit further, *"Now put your attention on the space around the lamp,"* and so forth, and he tells you there's no space around the lamp; how's that - how must that room look to him? See? The room looks real, real peculiar. Yeah.

And you can, with various - various questions of this character, you can actually get what this person is. But what are you trying to do? You're just trying to get him distributed through space.

The most important thing about getting him distributed through space is get him to have an anchor point or two. He hasn't got the body as an anchor point, even though he's apparently fairly sure that the body is there, and so forth, he's still not, to much degree, accepting it as an anchor point.

The moment he tells you, *"Yes, I am in my body,"* he knows that now, that's the first time he's known that real good, he has an anchor point in the body. But until he says this, why, he doesn't have the body as an anchor point. Well, now, the body can get a lot better as an anchor point than just that. He can be outside of his body and have the body as a real anchor point. He doesn't have to be the anchor point.

The trouble with the thetan is that he has used the body as an anchor point. The body is mobile and he has then ceased to use the - here you get your communication particle theory, comes right in here - he has ceased to use bodies as anchor points and has begun to be anchor points, which means there must be a viewpoint someplace which starves him for attention, and also says he mustn't be source - and he isn't source - which also says he's a particle, which also says he can't arrive and he can't start and he isn't source, and so forth. He is in the body which is his primary anchor point. See? So he is an anchor point. Which means he must have a viewpoint which is a demand of attention.

People who are insecure have an enormous attention demand. They - it's just first.

Is it necessary for a person to have somebody else's attention? Well, look at this. It immediately says: If I have to have attention, it must be that I need help; therefore, I am not independent but I am dependent upon what is done for me. So, this is the entering wedge of attention. If you found the moment in the universe or the area in the universe where the man first needed help - where he first realized that he needed help - and bailed him out of that, you would have solved, to a large degree, his thirst for attention.

And because he has a thirst for attention, he makes himself into an anchor point instead of remaining a viewpoint of anchor points. So, as long as he has the computation that he must be an anchor point for somebody else, he will have a tendency to stick inside the body. See? It isn't that attention is so valuable, it's because he has to

have attention because if he's ignored something terrible will happen to him, and he has been taught this lesson in this universe, so he cannot be independent.

But he wasn't taught this lesson by his own experience. There were many times when he could have used help and it never occurred to him that there might be such a thing as help. See? This doesn't occur to him until he sees somebody else needing help, or he does something to somebody and then doesn't help them, and all of a sudden realizes he has a problem on his hands.

For instance, if you were to use your - a couple of beams or postulates or something of the sort to send a bus full of schoolchildren over a ramp and down into a deep ditch and half of them were dead and half of them were hurt, believe me, there'd be a lot of problems there. Immediately you'd have a lot of problems. Now, you could just deny any such problem, but a thetan isn't liable to do this because he can't have any problems himself unless he has interpersonal relationships entering into it. A thetan has to have an interpersonal relationship before he has a problem.

As long as one is simply handling his own universe beautifully and smoothly and makes no other larger personality in his own universe, he gets along fine, he doesn't have a problem, does he? Because everything he does can be undone by a postulate.

He'll try and try and try to get himself into trouble, but he'd never get himself into trouble. Then all of a sudden he gets an interplay; he either makes another being or he meets another being, and in this interplay he gets problems which exceed his ability to solve.

So, the problems which worry him are other people's problems. Any problem which he makes up himself, doesn't care - no, I don't care how rainy the day is or how dull it is, or how much the stress would be, you still can't get a fellow to get very much out of playing chess with himself. He could make postulates, and figure and work, but he wouldn't work at it very long. So, he goes out actively seeking these problems.

The only thing that's worrying any preclear you have whether he agrees to it or whether you immediately realize this, is othcr people s problems. That's what he's - what he's got on his mind: other people's problems.

He was up there in space just as secure as you please and there was another guy there - speaking of space opera. This quite often is the basis on the track: space opera. Some other fellow there and the guy is sailing along and he's in a - in a space helmet and so forth, and he drills him. You see, there's no problem to our thetan-plus-body in space in a helmet and a suit being drilled. He's hit, see - pam! So he exteriorizes: so he gets himself another suit. I mean, it's just as simple as this. But because thetans are invisible on most of the track, the guy that he shoots is an actual being. and you're right into the middle of why other people's problems magnify.

You see, this other fellow obviously isn't solving his problem, and the biggest trick thetans pull on one another is, *"You see? Unsolvable problem."* Real silly, isn't it?

So he shoots somebody else and that other person is in trouble. But if he himself is shot, he's not in trouble. He can't be in trouble. All around him he sees people speak-

ing certainly, acting with positiveness, looking with certainty. After a while, *"Gee, they're people."* He's the only strange cat. They're people. So, if he shoots one of them, or he hits one of them, that person then is in trouble!

The young boy whose face he marred, something like that, that's horrible because all he - what he marred was a young boy. See, he just loses the viewpoint entirely, he just loses this, that he's working with a thetan-plus-body just like he is. So he feels bad.

He's a young boy, somebody mars his face, he doesn't feel bad, unless he's still trying to solve that other problem.

Now, how does he go about solving the other problem? And this is why people accuse each other all the time, very truthfully, of getting things - having things happen to themselves. They have things happen to themselves so they can solve them. For themselves? No, they're solving them for somebody else. It isn't altruism, it's the only way you get any randomity. We're right back onto randomity.

There is randomity: He has marred the face of a young boy and he knows it's a young boy; he doesn't ever think of it being a thetan-plus-young-boy and that in the final analysis the young boy - all he has to do is simply back out and leave the mock-up and the mock-up will go back to the worms and there are lots of young boys. This, you see, never occurs to him, because we've got to assign scarcity and value to this.

So, in his own behalf, he does what? He still tries to solve this other problem. This young boy whose face is marred is saying, *"The problem is unsolvable. There is no way to solve this, patch it up, repair it or do anything about it at all."* The thetan who did it denies it. He says, *"This is not possible. That's re-reparable. Anybody can patch up a mock-up. If I know anything,"* he says, *"a guy can patch up a mock-up."*

And this young boy says, *"No. You - it's - ,"* every action he's making says, *"Are you kidding? Nobody can patch up a mock-up, therefore you're guilty,"* and so forth.

Well, the fellow later on may have the body of a young boy and he decides to mar his face up, just to show them the problem is solvable, and that he can still go through life with that. See? So, he mocks himself up, which is to say, he gets his face marred.

And he goes on through life to some degree now marred up just to show people that it can be done. And then he finds out that a lot of things pay off in this. Now, he is playing this game in earnest. There's sympathy. There's - maybe if he had his face marred up horribly enough, simply by putting it into the face of some other young boy, the other young boy will run like hell! And that's one way to get out an anchor point. The computation of horror is just that. People look horrible, talk horrible have horrible news and so forth, that sort of thing, they're just trying to get out an anchor point.

So, here we have problem after problem stacking up stacking up, stacking up because of a misconception of what other people are. That's the ultimate certainty, is the certainty on the third universe.

That's funny, isn't it? It's not the certainty on your universe and yet every preclear you process will tell you uniformly that it's the certainty on his own universe is the only thing he's interested in.

He doesn't tell you, however, that what he considers his own universe is the mass of problems he's accumulated on the whole track, every one of which concerns another being than himself. The problems of others.

Do you know that that is the one dichotomy that you can't run on a bracket: other people's problems. It nulls in a very short time on oneself You can run it on all sides of the bracket except oneself. You run it a few times on that with a person who is pretty bad off and it'd just wear right on out. He'll recognize this fact.

But he can run like mad this one concept: *"Other people's problems."* And it'll run and run and run and run and run and run and then he - get somebody else running *"Other people's problems"* at him. Oh, and that'll run and run and run and run and run. Now, *"Own problems,"* his own problems. People who are real bad off they'll run and run and all of a sudden that isn't running. And you say: *"Other people's problems"* - run and run and run and run and run.

Now, you get what the preclear is up to: He's processing other people's problems. Anything he is processing is.

So, as long as we validate - and this is why these subjective techniques which involve themselves with concepts don't go anyplace; it's because we've been - they go some-where, believe me, they'll solve it up to a certain line - but until we've differentiated objects, given him enough differentiation in space so that he can have motion, and gotten clean differentiation between the past and present space available, and all kinds of anchor points, this fellow isn't straightened out. So we are doing a process, in Ori-enting Straightwire, which is back of problems. You see, this is a real slippy one. You take the basic condition and you work with the basic condition; you don't work with a problem.

Now, I can't lay that down to you too strongly! A circuit is a problem. You know what a circuit case is. Well, a circuit case is running somebody else's problem, and he's auditing - he's auditing Daniel Boone who has been dead this long while, and that he insulted once. Or he's doing something else. He's not straightening out himself.

Now, your - our boy this morning that's over there auditing out a headache, let's just take him for an example. Is he auditing out his own headache? No! In the first place, let's take - it's a body's headache that he must be auditing out, you see. Well, that is perfectly all right. As a thetan, however, what is he doing being in a body auditing its headache and considering it his own headache? Well, there's his first misconception - is a misconception of space. He's saying, *"The only space I can really occupy is this body and it has a headache; so therefore, I'd better clean up the headache so that I can occupy this space."* Pure idiocy.

Pure idiocy to do this. For a thetan to run concepts to get rid of headaches is some-thing that just bails him in deeper and deeper and deeper because we're right back on other people's problems.

Now, let's get back to other people's certainties. There is hardly a preclear you'll tackle who doesn't have somebody present - and we put it in terms of bodies.

Now, you say, *"Is your mother's body here?"*

"No. No."

"Well, come on. Look around. Is your mother's physical body here?"

"I don't think so."

You could get it on an elephant, but if you just suddenly close with Mama's body, you're going to stump most of your preclears. That's how much Mama has pervaded the scenery and Papa, too.

So, let's say, *"Is the grocery boy here?"* And they'll say, *"No. The grocery boy isn't here."*

And you say, *"Well, is there a police officer in the room?"*

If this case is a heavily occluded case, he will say, *"Are you one?"* He's not sure of that one.

So we say, *"Well, is there a circus clown in the room?"*

"Well, if you had a TV set maybe this might be, but no, I don't think one is. No. Are you one?" That's what it'll keep coming back to.

He's no - he has no certainty on bodies being in the room except your body.

And you say, *"Well now, how many bodies are in the room?"*

And he'll say, *"One. Two. Well, you're talking about actual physical bodies, aren't you?"*

"That's right."

"Well, then, there's one and two."

He's not sure. See where we enter this certainty? We'll say, *"All right. Now, did you ever know somebody who was lost without a trace in history? Who was really lost? Well, all right. Did you ever hear of a goddess who didn't have a real physical body?"*

"Oh, yeah. None of the goddesses had real physical bodies. That was a lot of bunk," or - you're liable to get an answer of that character.

And you say, *"Well, all right, Athena. Now, is Athena's physical body in the room?"*

"Well, she didn't have one."

"Well, is her body in the room?"

"Well, no, of course not!" There's one body you don't have in the room.

Now, we'll say any type of impossibilities - impossibilities.

"Is your body in a temple in Greece?"

"I don't know."

See? The guy thinks, well, maybe he might have been part of the crew up on Olympus or something of the sort and one of his old statues might still be kicking around someplace. In other words, this terrific significance and rationalization, and so forth.

So, we see how many places we can enter this. But let's have havingness. All right.

"Do you have, at this moment, a million-dollar bill on the desk?"

"No. Oh, that's silly, there isn't any million - maybe there was a mi- . Was there ever a million-dollar bill printed? Oh, uh - was - was there ever? No, a million-dollar bill. No, I guess not. There wouldn't be a million-dollar bill, would there? Well, I don't know. I wouldn't have a million dollars anyway, would I?"

This is just level of fog, see? Now, there you're too far on an impossibility. See how far you could go on an impossibility, because that is itself unreal. See, it's so impossible for him to have a million dollars that it would be so unreal if you suddenly said he had a million dollars that anytime he got any sum of money, including his paycheck in the past, it all seemed unreal to him. And you're right back into an uncertainty.

You're talking about the most uncertain subject under the sun: money. Why is it uncertain? Just because - it's valuable merely because you can send it away. It's an anchor point which will leave you. You want to know why people waste money? You could make a big, good bunch of money and it will leave, and that gives them space; spending gives space, if you want to understand some people's idea of spending.

Well, all right, let's - we get into an unreality, however, on the subject of possession because nobody would ever give up a dollar. So, if you ask the fellow who you just asked that question to and drew a blank, *"Do you have a dime laying on the desk?"* And he'd look and he would say, *"No. No, I don't have a dime on the desk."* He'd know that. Why? He can have a dime. So, we don't get an unattainable object which itself is all mocked up with unreality to have the boy be certain of.

Now, there isn't any rule in particular that goes along with that that you have to keep in mind. But just remember that some of the reactions you get which seem perfectly idiotic to you, are based on - there's perfectly, perfectly good order.

Now, you say, you ask the fellow in terms of action:

"Are you turning handsprings at this moment?"

"I don't know. Well, I don't know. I'm not turning handsprings, not here anyway."

You see, why is doingness - why is doingness rough? Because it's being in consecutive spaces. And when a person cannot locate himself in any space then he can't be in consecutive spaces. So you take him, associate him as an object and then you put the object in spaces until he can put it into consecutive spaces and you have him back in motion.

Get the formula for how you get him into motion. You can't get him in spaces, but you can get him identified with an object and then you can get the object in various spaces, by getting it not in various spaces until you can get it into a space, and then

you get it into consecutive spaces, and you have reestablished doingness. That's what you're trying to do with this preclear.

He can't operate. See he doesn't do being a preclear well. You tell him to be five feet in back of your head; he says, *"What head?"* Well it tells you that something is wrong, immediately, not with his beingness so much as you're looking at it, but his doingness.

You're asking him to do things that have to do with space. And so, if he doesn't have a certainty on consecutive spaces his general doingness is very poor and certainly that operation is horrible. See?

"Be five feet back of your head."

If he does - if he does say, *"Yes, well I'm all right, I'm five feet back of my head"* and this person adds up to be not very active, doesn't walk very fast, doesn't talk very fast, you know that he can't handle consecutive spaces. If he can t handle consecutive spaces, the reality of his being behind his head is subzero. He's merely being agreeable.

Many a preclear will tell the auditor, yes, he's five feet back of the head and then come around and tell another auditor a half an hour later that he really wasn't. Two things have happened: One, it became unreal to him the moment he got back in this unreal object called a body, so he's forgotten how clear it was to him at the moment, to some degree; and the other one is, is he was merely trying to be obliging and now, by telling the other auditor something like this, he's being covertly hostile. See?

Now, the inability to use force is the inability to he in consecutive spaces. Now, the in - the unwillingness to hit somebody with a big solid fist is an unwillingness first to have a fist in somebody else's jaw, in somebody else's broken jaw, then to have a fist just before somebody else's jaw about to be broken, then a fist halfway to somebody's face, and then a fist back here, and then unwillingness to have a fist, and that's the final analysis of the thing. He doesn't even have a fist, much less have a fist in consecutive spaces.

In essence, force and violence have become differentiated as, pardon me, the same thing, and therefore all motion will or may add up to violence. So, if you use the word force, to an awful lot of people it's quite surprising because the language is extremely pauperized in words about this, and you say, *"Well, the force vectors of the situation..."* You see a little wince and you say, *"What is wrong with force?"*

"Oh, force is real bad."

"What do you mean it's real bad?"

"Well, it's just terrible; people walking all over people and ..."

You say, how the hell did he get there? The fellow's -the fellow's sitting there smoking a cigarette and if it weren't for force that cigarette would never have gotten made, believe me. He's there utilizing force, he's there as a complete parasite on all the forces of the universe and trying to tell you force is bad. This is real silly.

But if you want to rehabilitate doingness, if you want to rehabilitate force, if you want to rehabilitate the ability to move, motion, and so forth, you just go in it like this: You

get him identified with an object and then you get objects in various spaces, or you get him unidentified with an object as the upper level and then you get the object not in various spaces.

Now, I could give you a process which you'd never fail at, just bluntly never fail at, as long as you could get a preclear to talk. Fortunately, we are below the level of talking, so this one doesn't - doesn't ruin itself as a process. If you wear out the English on *"Where are you?"* or something like that, and it finally runs out and he says this is all meaningless to him, and all that sort of thing, all he has done is blow up his language machine. Well give him another one, process him in *"Scandahoovian"* or something. Process him by signs. The process doesn't wear out for that reason because he's involved in furthering this as the most intimate process he's furthering: not being in consecutive spaces.

The game he's being right now, he's just trying not to be in consecutive space. The fellow who says, *"Well, I'd like to retire,"* is trying not to be in success- consecutive spaces, so his doingness is all off. To get him up Tone Scale - he's in a level, he's bogged down in time which means he's bogged down into identification with objects and he's got objects all identified with objects and there isn't any space, and it's certainly the object - pardon me, the objects certainly aren't in motion, and higher on the scale, there certainly isn't any space. Now, we just have to take this apart; we just have to take the objects apart. I don't care how you take them apart.

You say, *"All right, take this piece of paper out of the microphone."*

"This piece of paper is not in the microphone!"

You made him spot it in space. You made him recognize there's space between.

There's another method of doing this which is the first pickup on the line that you can do is: Get the space between two objects. Get the space between two objects or the difference between two spaces. Take the two corners of the desk - let's get the difference between the two corners of the desk. Now, that's even more covert, that's really covert. You want him to look at the space between the two; but he - don't yet tell him to look at any spaces.

"All right," you say, *"get the space between these two corners of the desk, and the space between the other two corners of the desk. And get the difference between those two spaces."*

He'll tell you immediately there's no difference between spaces.

"They're in different spaces, aren't they?"

"Yes."

"Well, is there any difference between them?"

"Only that they're in different spaces, but actually there's no difference between the two spaces."

You can get involved in the most heroic arguments on this. Any argument about space is going to wind somebody up practically in spinbinitis, because two spaces can be coincidental if a thetan says they are. That's all it is.

Now, saying that two can't be is denying the thetan the right to do this. So this fellow is still insisting on his own rights. In other words - now, he'll get reassurance. In other words, he's working on other people's problems still, because other people can't differentiate amongst spaces; this has been obvious to him. His mother, his sister, his schoolteachers, they didn't know where anything was, everything was lost: What traffic light? What car? What dollar bill? This was his entire environment, so he's bogged down in the problems of no position. So, he tries to counteract this by achieving a good position in life. Maybe somebody is trying to do that, nobody laughed.

The fellow who is - who is position-hungry or grade-hungry or promotion-hungry or something of that sort, he ordinarily is worried about this, because everybody in his childhood was lost.

Now, you solve this not by running out what people wanted him to do for himself, you just solve it by differentiating space. That's all. It's the most elementary technique in the world.

Now, you want to know - this process will go a certain distance and then your preclear will exteriorize. And you get him exteriorized, what process do you run on him immediately exteriorized?

Well, there's a lot of processes you could run if he's well up on the scale. You can make him make - take over both sides of randomity and you - automaticity. You could run all the remaining steps (and should) of just SOP 8. There's a lot of things you can do with him just on and on and on, lots of things. Lots of explosions and all that sort of thing.

But the funny part of it is, is he isn't well enough differentiated yet when he's merely sailing around the universe to actually have enough confidence to see anything is there, because he knows he can't hold two objects apart, and he still feels this so he's going to get pictures of objects rather than the objects themselves. And he's going to get upset about this and he's going to upset his vision and invalidate himself. So he needs a greater security of anchor points. A greater security of anchor points is simply a greater security on space, and you'd simply deliver it to him more or less in this fashion.

You get that list of where all of the stuff on the track - with Change of Space Processing. Well, just straight Change of Space Processing will do things with this; this is obvious. But you find he doesn't have much reality on this one way or the other.

Just take some of his recent, this - present life accidents, operations and his birth, and move his attention on impossibilities.

"Now, while you were being born in the hospital room, were you in the waiting room being born?"

"No, I wasn't in the waiting room being born,"

"Are you sure of that?"

"Of course, I'm sure of that."

"Were you in the next block being born?"

"I am sure of that, too."

"Are you sure that three people with big claws aren't in this room torturing you at this moment?"

"Yes, I'm sure of that. Ha! Yeah, I'm sure of that."

"Okay. Now, were you in the next block - were you in the next block while you were in your house being born?"

"Well, all right, were you in the next building to the dentist's office when you were having your teeth filled last time?"

"No."

You're making him look aside from these things, and if you keep this process up - it's not a long process - he'll start to get engrams blowing up. They will blow up whether he wants them to or not, even though nothing has ever blown up for this preclear before. You take the dangerous spots of impact - the law behind it is - take the dangerous spots of impact for this universe in this lifetime and strip them clean and after you've gone for a certain distance on it, you'll find out he's getting better and better and better and better and better and better, and you will all of a sudden find him straightwiring back to the damnedest things.

And what will you find him wiring back to particularly? Now, let's go back to 8-80 and add to all this, this factor known as consideration or aesthetics. It would strike you as rather weird that somebody who obviously had no great pretensions to beauty would be starved for beauty. And you get beauty by locating ugliness. If you want to really blow some grief charges on preclears, see, you just start treating beauty.

"All right, let's get a place - let's get an object which you thought was beautiful."

"Yeah."

"All right, let's get a place where there were no beautiful objects."

And he'll start to come into the fact that he was so starved for beautiful objects that, you know, he kind of considers everything in the MEST universe beautiful, anything that's an object is beautiful. As you come up the line on this process, he gets into that frame of mind. They're really scarce; it's real nice.

So, you find a time when he didn't have a pretty face.

"Oh, gee, this whole lifetime," he'll say. *"Ohhh!"*

You're going to really start blowing stuff around on this case.

"All right, let's locate some pretty faces. Now, let's locate some places where pretty faces aren't, halfway between here and the moon. Are there pretty faces halfway between here and the moon?"

"No."

"Well, all right. Are there any - any pretty faces - tell me are there any pretty faces in a Bessemer blast furnace?"

"Nope."

"In Mount Kilauea?"

"Nope. I don't know though; that lava - gee, that's real pretty at night."

See, starts turning on the guy's aesthetics. You start asking him for ugliness and he'll find out that every time he's really seen any ugliness, he kind of thought it was romantic, too.

So find places where he wasn't beautiful and just find them ad infiniturn, and your track starts to blow to bits. You change his entire, entire attitude toward life. You get other people being certain of this and that. Now, let me show you a way - I mean on his beauty, other people being certain he wasn't beautiful, too. Of course, he can't ever be too sure about this, but he will at least be able to position them in space when they were doubtful about it.

Now, we've got this one. This is a method of running a chronic somatic by this same type of process. Let me caution you now - here, now and forever - about running effort on preclears who are below II - below Step II.

I can tell you that a great deal of experimentation and certainly your own experience so far here, should demonstrate to you that it doesn't get a preclear up scale, and I don't care how many thousands of hours you would run it on a preclear, it didn't do him any good. Remember that - below Step II. You can relieve a chronic somatic with it, but the uttermost limit that you ought to go is the effort to reach and the effort to withdraw toward a chronic somatic which is so wound up so much that it's in pain, and if you can get that and the effort to reach and withdraw from present time; see, these are very allowable techniques.

When I say *"the effort"* - just to go on for hours and run some kind of effort or some other kind of effort, and so forth, that's no good. It just doesn't get anyplace. You can run the effort within the effort within the effort within the effort with some stuff; you're stripping the whole track to pieces when you're doing that, but in the final analysis it will not have improved his tone. This is a great deal of experience that this is being taken from.

It should; it's pretty hard for a Step I to realize how running effort wouldn't do somebody some good, but a great deal of experience on it shows that the Step levels below II are too uncertain of the effort.

But you can run a chronic somatic with Certainty Processing in this fashion. Now, get you being certain it's there. Let's say the fellow has a sore eye. You say, *"All right, let's get you being certain the pain is there."*

"Yeah," he'll say. *"Yeah."*

"All right. Now..."

"No," he'll say, *"I'm not so certain it's right there."*

What's he doing? He's running the something/nothing on it.

"All right," you say, *"All right, get somebody else out there in front certain the pain is there."*

"Well, I can get somebody knowing I'm here."

"Well can you get somebody knowing that the pain is there?"

"No."

"Can you get somebody not knowing the pain is there?"

"Oh, yeah. Yeah. No, I don't know, I can get somebody knowing the pain is there."

You get what's happening? What you're doing is taking some kind of a ridge or some kind of a vacuum in the body, and you can shake it up by getting it viewed in various ways until it shatters. It's very easy to do.

Now, other people are more certain he is there than he is certain he is there and the only problems he's interested in are other people's problems. This sounds paradoxical, but other people aren't here, he can't see them. His main trouble is in - just in look-ingness.

Now, how do you get him to get a certainty of look?

Well, the way to get a certainty of look is to get a certainty of position, which is a place to look from and something to look at, or a position to look at. And the only thing that ever invited him to look was beauty, or repelled him from looking: ugliness. So you're into the first echelon of why he started looking and you're just cutting the first primary principles out of the case when you're hitting space, havingness, and beauty.

Now, it requires a little bit of an imagination on the part of an auditor to handle beauty and it certainly requires an enormous amount of tact, and if you find yourself flubbing the dub with a preclear on the subject of beauty, skip it. The other one will dig him out; it just takes longer.

You can spot the people - you can spot the people who have bad spatial positioning in this life - go up and down the street. It's whether or not they think they are pretty or they think they're graceful, forceful, beautiful or worth looking at. You can spot them.

You just say to this person, all right, now let's see this person - why, let's take this fellow, he was probably when he was young - probably was an Adonis, probably *"the dames was crazy about him,"* gee, and they're not anymore. You can blow grief out of this guy.

"Now where was there a place where you were good looking?"

Do you know that this technique is powerful enough that you needn't be surprised if he suddenly turns up not just with the Crusades, but when he was on a planet 200,000 years ago. I mean it'll blow straight through on something like that and he's liable to blow a grief charge on the loss of that mock-up. He's been so in apathy about good-looking mock-ups since, that he just kind of automatically makes them look bad. See?

He doesn't dare go for broke on the subject of a beautiful mock-up, because *"Bad things happen to them"* he says, and lots of other things. Every time he puts up anything beautiful it'll get spoiled. That's really apathy.

And that's really this society in operation; all it can put up is an automobile that's really beautiful. And it can put up an automobile because an automobile is so senior to them that they never put it up, it puts them up; so they can stand the idea of the beautiful automobile putting them up.

You see how you run these processes? I want you to get some experience on them today.

[End of lecture.]