

CUT COMM LINES (IN AND OUT)

A lecture given on 24 October 1956

[Start of Lecture]

Want to talk to you now, straightforwardly, on the actual application of the material I have been giving you here for two days and which you have been using, it is reported, with considerable profit in your auditing sessions. The actual use of this material is quite fascinating.

Now, trying to teach somebody a datum, a fact, is sometimes difficult if the person is alertly waiting for something else to happen. Supposing you're trying to get a fact through to somebody and he is sitting there, all the time waiting to be hit in the head with a .45-caliber bullet. Something is changing the circumstance of the auditing session over to another circumstance, and we have something called obsessive change; that's just obsessive change is going on. In other words, it is not ever now, it is then which is happening now, is what the bank is doing to the preclear. See? You got this? So you're trying to teach him that grass at certain seasons of the year has a tendency toward being green. And he sits there knowing full well that a saber, you see, is a thing which best bisects the medulla oblongata.

Now, what occurs? It's that something is going on -- something is going on in this fellow's make-up; his perceptions and so on -- which alters the present-time circumstance to another circumstance. And now you're trying to teach him something. Ah, but present-time circumstances of you an Instructor and himself a student, you see, is altered to some combative circumstance or some apathetic circumstance, some other circumstance. In other words, an obsessive alteration could be going on here. Do you see how this could work out?

Well, we won't plunge immediately into systems which work this out -- because systems can work this out -- but we get down to this basis that there is a change occurring. And that is one of the first things we must study. A change is occurring. You say, „Apples“ and it's received as „Bayonets.“ Now, that is almost too simple a statement of

the exact occurrence -- the exact occurrence I stated a moment ago. He is altering the situation of you sitting there telling him something, to another situation. Something is altering, something is doing some altering.

In what direction does this alteration occur? It occurs in the direction of less havingness (make nothing out of it), and it occurs in the direction of complication. I've already shown you this last week. You see? It occurs in the direction of complication.

You say, „*Grass at some season of the year can be expected to have a tendency toward the color green.*“ You have already complicated it a little bit, and you have a little more chance of being understood perhaps; but as you complicate things in your effort to transmit them you are actually in agreement with a mechanism of alter-ness, a mechanism of alteration. You're getting into agreement with a mechanism of alteration rather than a mechanism of the pre-clear. This is in the direction of error then, isn't it? -- as our Christian Science friends would say. It is in the direction of many things, but it's certainly not in the direction of getting very Clear.

Now, we know in older lectures about automaticity and randomness. Very complicated! But, unfortunately, they do (those two words) describe about all the complexity there is. Randomity: an individual has a consideration with regard to how much commotion or motion or activity he can tolerate, and he has some consideration that such and such is too much, and such and such is too little. Now, you call this his level of complexity and you've tied up Scientology for the last three years, see? Got that now?

Well, it happens that it states more easily today on a more casual basis than this word „*randomity*“ -- because that's a formidable word. „*It was too much for him,*“ the way the public would say. „*It was just too much for him.*“ Or „*She didn't have enough to occupy her mind.*“ That's minus randomity, you see? Everybody knows that this fellow had a nervous breakdown because it was „*too much for him.*“ It was a strain; there was too much to occupy his mind, and so he cracked up. That's simple; everybody understands that.

We look over the mechanism of it, though, and we find out that their vast understanding of it has never once handled it. The medico with his vast understanding of it is at a level no higher than that. „*She didn't have enough to do.*“ „*He had too much to do; he got into a state of overstrain. Overstrained himself, he did.*“ And that is a medical statement (circa 1956 and prior), and they just learned this in the last half-century. And they thought that was a big, beautiful lesson.

All right. If that's a big lesson for the entirety of the medical profession, what right have we to push it any further? We could make it lots more complicated: We could say „*randomity,*“ and give it a formula. But is it more complicated? No, not really, because it goes toward a closer understanding of the whole thing.

And we find out this strange thing about nervous breakdowns: If a fellow is working very hard, we can expect a letdown to occur of some kind or another, which may or may not take on the magnitude of a nervous breakdown. May or may not. But if a nervous breakdown occurs, we would be poor Scientologists today if we thought it was because he worked too hard. Oh, would we be poor Scientologists if we thought

that! It was probably that he stopped too quick. Got the idea? He just stopped too quick. You look at the stop; you don't look at the work.

Now, too many random factors came in which he was unwilling to do. He became unwilling to do these factors and so he stopped. Well, a fellow who stopped and also kept on working is, of course, an effect to such a remarkable degree that he'll crack up. Where did he stop? We have a young engineer, he's working like mad, he's building buildings and bridges, and he's doing this and that, and he's got his drawing board full of this or that, he's going at a hell of a rate and ra-ra-ra-ra! Medical doctor would tell you, „*That young man is working too hard and he will crack up someday.*“

We would ask another question: Is he happy about what he's doing? Oh, yes, he's very happy building his bridges and drawing designs and all -- his drawing board, and so forth. We say, „*He won't crack up; probably isn't working half hard enough.*“

Well, what would give him a nervous breakdown? It would be another determinism entering upon the scene. Somehow or another he would begin to feel burdened by certain things. Now, he was building a bridge and he was building a house and he was straightening out a bunch of plans, and somebody came along and insisted that he had to build a dogcart. And because he didn't consider this his business, the building of dogcarts, and yet he had to do it because it was from a client who was very rich and on whom he was very dependent, he built the dogcart. And the next thing you know he's not only building a dogcart but he designed a cupola for the wife, too. And this is all overstrain. And all this time he's got to be very, very nice about it. You see? No reality. The second you have to be nice about something you hate, there's no reality there at all.

Your reality fades with your preclear, by the way, the instant that you, tired and re-stimulated, half-asleep as the auditor, respond to him, „*No, no, I'm feeling fine. Go on, run it off again. Huh-huh.*“ You know, your reality of the session goes by the boards.

What you should tell him is, „*Yeah, I'm tired. I feel half- asleep. I'm badly restimulated. Run it again.*“ And it's a funny thing. This sounds like it'd be a formidable statement to make to somebody. You think he'd go right out of session. No, he doesn't; he goes right in.

He'll offer. He'll say, „*I'm now being a burden on you. I'm being a burden on you now. I don't want to continue the session any further because I'm... I'm ruining you.*“

You say, „*Yeah, you sure are. That's the way I feel. But I started in to audit you, and I'm going to finish, and I'm not going to take a lose here.*“ Or „*You're supposed to have this many more hours this afternoon; you're going to get 'em.*“ You would be amazed.

Somebody who is trying to stop the session on you, by the way, by pretending that you're tired is another breed of cat. Did you ever have anybody do that? „*I don't want to keep you any later.*“ You're feeling fine. Now, if you were to tell him a lie there and you were to say, „*Well, I am awfully tired and so forth, but we'll continue the session*“ -- you feel perfectly fresh and you're going along all right -- you've entered another unreality, and it'll go to flinders. What you want to tell him is, „*Come on. Try and... stop trying to slow me down; let's get the show on the road. Run it again,*“ whatever you're doing.

He'd say, „*Well, all right.*“ You've as-ised the situation, which was trying to be set up as another reality than the reality on which you're operating.

If you always operate on the reality on which you're operating, you're always okay. It's when you try to operate on another reality that you get into a nervous breakdown. This engineer is perfectly fine. He's working like mad. This is a nice, real situation. All of a sudden he does a whole lot of unrealities. And he keeps telling people that they're... oh, he's happy. You know, he's doing these things; he's happy. He'd just as soon design the dogcart and the wife's cupola and so forth. Yeah, he'd just as soon; he's fine. He's compromising his own reality. And the next thing you know he begins to consider things impositions. And the next thing you know he's liable to believe somebody that says, „*You're working too hard.*“ They never say, „*You're working too hard on the dogcart and the cupola end of your engineering business.*“ If they said that, he'd say, „*Hey, what do you know! I am! Well, the hell with that; I can get other contracts. Go back to doing what I'm supposed to be doing and I'm all right.*“

On an executive-administration line, an executive very often inherits hats to which he does not match terminals. He inherits a hat, he doesn't notice it, he puts no terminal there and then he considers the lines that come in against this thing since he has no terminal -- to be an imposition, because they're hitting him, a body. They're not hitting a terminal under a hat called Maintenance. He doesn't consider that he is supposed to do any maintenance in this place. He doesn't recognize the fact that he is actually part of the maintenance of a particular operation. So he has no terminal, Maintenance. He begins to resent and resist these lines, so lines start to hit him which he will not handle, and we get a break of ARC. In other words, he goes out of communication. So we have a person who is trying to break communication, break communication, break communication.

Now, this gets an awful lot simpler than you think right now. It gets awfully simple. If a fellow is running obsessively on break communication, he alters. All you've got to do to give somebody a nervous breakdown -- all you've got to do -- is make him want to break certain communication lines. That's the basic mechanism of it. You explain to him that certain communication lines are an imposition. Make him start chopping communication. And if you can make him chop, violently, enough communication, he'll wind up in a nervous breakdown.

Why? Because the only way he can handle the existing situation is with communication. So that if he goes out of communication with it, he does not handle it. And if he goes out of communication with it, not being able to handle it, he becomes the effect of it. Do you see this clearly?

This fellow, let us say, is an attorney. And all of the court cases he's getting are from bums on the wrong side of the track. And he has seen himself as a great divorce lawyer, but nobody ever comes to him for divorce. People keep wanting to sue the railroad and they haven't got any money and so on. He can still do this. There's no real strain here. He's still in the lawyer business. He kind of wants to do something else, but he can still handle this. One day somebody comes along and explains to him -- agreement -- that he is really fitted to be a great divorce lawyer, and that it's a terrible

imposition on him to have all these shoddy, ragged clients hanging around his office. It doesn't do his reputation a bit of good to have all these people in overalls sitting in the outer office. Maybe she's some pretty girl; they're always convincing. He begins to resent his clients.

Look, there is a reality. He is in a business which does handle a certain level of client. No matter what business he wants to be in, he is in a business. It does exist, and he was handling it. And then one fine day somebody got him to resent a communication line, and he didn't like his business anymore. Now, the modus operandi of not liking what he's doing is to chop the communication lines with regard to what he's doing. You got it? Got it? It's real simple.

All right. There's another way to go about this. You cut his outflowing lines, and this is even worse than cutting his inflowing lines. Every time he writes a letter you call to his attention the punctuation. That's all you have to do. You get the idea? You give him the idea that his public presence is being injured by the type of spelling which his secretary is using. I'm sure this has some influence. It's not that bad. What's worse is not communicating, not writing letters to his clients, not getting out the proper tort for court. See? That's worse! But they say, *„Oh, I don't know. Every time I see you spelling tort, t-o-r-t-i-l-l-a, I get upset. It tells me that you are not the level of attorney that should handle great divorce cases.“* This fellow after a while gets so he doesn't want to originate. You got it?

All right. Now, because living beings do -- that's a maxim, that's not a law; you go down here in the government, you'll find it violated -- because living beings do, when you stop their lines and doingness in one direction, they start in another. You got it? They don't just stop. There's hardly anybody that dies just because you say so. If, because their lawyering communication lines were chopped inflow: *„You know, you shouldn't have that kind of people sitting around in your waiting room; it doesn't do your reputation a bit of good.“* *„You know that every letter that you write here that goes out, you know, it's a...“* *„And like the other day, you were down in front of that judge. And you know what a stickler he is. You know he considers proper legal usage, you know, the actual test of the worth and repute of an attorney. And to stand up there in front of him at that time and mispronounce half of that old finding.. I don't know how you live.“*

If the fellow at that moment would simply die and get another body and go on with it, you see, he'd be sane. But he's stupid. He just lets all of his lines be cut income, and he lets all of his lines be cut outgo, and he cuts them all in-come, and he cuts them all outgo. But beings do. So he's going to do something else. And it might be nowhere near as good as what he was doing, or it might be better, it might be something, or it might be internal or it might be external to his business, but he's going to do something else. You got it? He's going to do something else.

Now, that is the clue of all auditing. On any activity in which he's been engaged in the past, you can count that the incoming lines have been chopped and the outgoing lines have been chopped. Right? Both of these lines have been chopped on any one activity.

Let us suppose that he was one of the better marksmen in Morgan's Rifle Corps at some time or another during the revolution. And one fine day you come along and

you want to train him to be a rifleman. That's one and three-quarter centuries ago. And he takes the gun, and he puts it up to his shoulder and he looks through it and so on, and blows your hat off.

And you say, „*No, no, no, you don't put your finger on the trigger.*“ And boy, would we find that rifling is complex! You say, „*Now, on the range we take the bolts and put them in the rifles. And when we come off the range, why, we open the bolts. And we don't close the bolts when we're off of the range, going to and from the range.*“

He wants a five-thousand-word description of what's a bolt! „*What do you mean the bolt? Oh, you mean this thing?*“ -- and he points to the swivel. „*You mean this nut up here that the strap goes on,*“ and so on. In other words, he just can't seem to assimilate the rifle.

Another fellow comes along, he's never had anything to do with riflemanship. Nothing. He throws the rifle up to his shoulder, he goes bang! and there's a bull's-eye. And you say, „*On the range we put the bolts in the rifle, but when we come off the range, why, we open them.*“ He does that, he walks down the road; it's perfectly all right.

What's the difference between these two men? One has had all of his riflemanship communication lines, incoming and outgoing, pretty badly chopped up. So he is doing something else. You got it? He's doing something else! He's not doing riflemanship because he has no comm lines on which he can rifleman! He's doing something else. Don't you see?

All right. Now, the best thing that he possibly could do at this stage of the game would be to simply face up to the bolts and face up to the swivels and face up to the target, but he won't do that. And eventually this fellow who was the crack shot in Morgan's Rifles is put over on a cooking detail and is never permitted near the armory. Never! They carefully never let him on the drill field either, because he keeps dropping the rifle. It gets between his legs, and he trips and falls into the next file, don't you see? They don't even let him put one underneath his bed because the last time they put a rifle underneath his bed, he managed to get it loaded. Just how that happened we don't know. He doesn't either.

So what you mistake quite routinely for stupidity is an excess of randomness. Now, Scientologically, very precisely we say an excess of randomness -- plus randomness. Better communication, perhaps: complexity. You look at a too-complex complexity and you then say it's a stupidity. You say this person is unable; he cannot learn.

Any time you get a psychiatrist and you put him down on a basic course, you'll be sorry; you're training him over his head. If you were to train a psychiatrist along these lines -- take him down the corridor of his own spinbin and say, „*This is the corridor of the spinbin. This is where the patients are permitted to walk into and out of the spinbin. And this is the reception office for the spinbin. And this is a patient*“ -- you'd be training this boy way over his head. Really now, they are, in the field of the mind, untrainable because all their comm lines are cut on the subject. You just learn all the nomenclature of a brain and you cut your comm lines to ribbons! Instead of having some cellular masses to be in contact with inside your head, you have a bunch of symbols to be in contact with in-

side your head. You've gone down just that much. Get the idea? It's different. It's all different. It's altered. It's been changed. It's altered. Got the idea?

Now, what alters? What alters reality? Comm breaks incoming-comm breaks outgoing alters reality. Got that? It's one of these idiotically simple statements. It leads, however, to the entire panorama of a preclear's behavior. You sit down, you say, „*All right*,“ you say, „*now we're going to run a little process, and the process consists of you doubling up your fist and putting it on your right knee.*“ Well, it's not his fist; it actually becomes impossible to double it up because it has a somatic. His right knee is very hard for him to establish because he's in a mirror- image reversal. Oh, wow! Do you see what happens here? And so he alters the command -- not so he can do it, but because he alters the command. He does something else. Where you have a bunch of comm lines broken, incoming or outgoing, you can count on the fellow doing something else.

This is, then, the basic anatomy of alter-iness in terms of action. You as an auditor can overcome, then, this doing otherwise, this nonsimplicity, this nonaccomplishment and so forth, in repairing the chopped in and chopped out comm lines. See? Get the comm lines stretched again and he will stop doing something else.

But this has to be met with a certain level of complexity. Now I'm going to give you the actual use of this Reality Scale in communication. I'm going to give you the lowest rung. The preclear is sitting there; he isn't doing anything. He isn't doing anything; he's just sitting there. He is incapable of doing anything or responding. You could actually pick up his hand and drop it on his lap and pick up his hand and drop it on his lap. Now, if you merely tried to overcome this somewhat catatonic state in this preclear by picking up first his hand and dropping it in his lap, and then moving his leg, and then picking up his other hand and dropping it in his lap, and then moving his head into a different position, and so forth, I guarantee that he will go right on in such a state.

But supposing you were to pick up his hand and drop it in his lap, and pick up his hand and drop it in his lap, and pick up his hand and drop it in his lap, and pick up his hand and drop it in his lap. Sooner or later he is going to go into communication of one kind or another, because a duplicative function is a thetan function. You didn't alter it, you didn't change it, you just kept doing it; so he figures you're boss. You must be a thetan, he's not. You see that?

Now from your taking over control of it and his noticing it, you then prompt him up to a point of where he can take control of it. And you've got the entire cycle of auditing very simply stated. You take control of it and then he notices -- this is the lowest case that you could ever touch -- you take control of something and then he notices that you have control of something. And then you bring him up from there to his controlling something, and you've done it. You see? By your lifting and putting down a piece of paper, he would then understand that it was possible to lift and put down a piece of paper. You understand? And you could then lead him to lift and put down a piece of paper. You see? And eventually he, on his own decision, could lift and put down pieces of, paper. Now, that is a cycle of auditing. That's really all there is to it.

And the only thing which gets in its road is alter-ism. You pick up and put down the piece of paper, and he walks over here and turns around the newspaper clipping. Why does he do this? Why does he alter your simple action of picking up and putting down a piece of paper to this action over here of turning around a newspaper clipping? That's because his incoming and outgoing comm lines on the subject have been so thoroughly cut that he thinks of doing that and the bank makes him do that.

Now, your preclear seldom changes out in the open. He seldom changes out in the open. You tell him to do something and he apparently does something quite unreal to him, but himself does something else.

An old-time, engram-running preclear runs something else and tells the auditor -- perpetually they do this -- they run something else in some other fashion and tell the auditor they're doing what the auditor says. See that?

Now, the auditor in this case should patch up his comm line in some fashion. Now, where's the entrance point? Well, let me give you a technique. This is a very, very good technique. This isn't an experimental technique; this is a very, very good technique which you very well could use. You tell the preclear, *„I want you to string if you can, a solid communication line by mock-up between you and that wall.“* Now, you understand, his first reality would be a solid line, even a very foggy solid line. See? Solidity not very good. That's his first reality. First reality is not a terminal. First reality is a solid line. We'll do this one by Creative Processing. *„Mock up a communication line between you and that wall.“* He does it and he does it and he does it and he does it. And he can't do it very well.

Now, you want to get a solid line there? You really want to get a solid line there? You want to get this preclear to get up to a point of where all of a sudden *„Well, what do you know!“* he's seeing some kind of a golden line between himself and the wall. First time he ever mocked up anything in his life; scared him half to death when he realizes it. Then he gets up and says, *„You know, I can do that. Yeah, that's not hard to do.“*

You see, the common denominator of all of his difficulties is broken comm lines on certain significances. And you've got to teach him that it's possible to string a comm line. You see that? You teach him by gradients that he can do so, but the gradients must include this factor of complexity.

Now, how do you really get him to string that comm line between himself and a wall? The command you gave him is too simple. That's what's wrong with it. *„Now, I'm going to ask you to string a comm line,“* you say, *„between yourself and that wall on as many vias as you find comfortable.“*

And he says, *„Via? What's a via?“*

And you say, *„Well, that goes someplace else first.“*

And he'll say, *„Oh. Goes someplace else first. Let's see, a comm line, and you want me to string it between here and the wall, and you want it to go someplace else. But the destination is the wall eventually.“*

You say, *„That's right. Eventually.“*

So he strings a comm line by mock-up, from here into the next room and upstairs and to Arcturus, three times around the sun, down here on the freeway, twice up and down the Potomac, transcontinental by cow path, and then gets it into the chimney and gets it to corkscrew down the chimney; and all of a sudden he has a line on that wall. And what do you know, some portion of the line he mocked up will be solid. Some portion of it'll be solid. Now there you have enough complexity. You got it?

It's always safe to be complicated. That's why a timid scientist is so complex. That's why a mathematician always can be counted upon as doing the thing by mathematics, when you did it in your head a half an hour ago. Complexity, additive complexity.

Now, if you just simply ask him to mock something up until he could mock it up, there's a possibility that you would bring him upscale -- possibility. But if you were to ask him, „*How complicatedly could you mock up Mother?*“ -- now, I don't know whether that auditing question would make any sense to you or not. But you would possibly, with that meaning (not with that wording) get success.

In mock-ups and the basic level of Creative Processing, you can actually ask somebody to mock up a satisfactory complication, or mock up a satisfactory complexity.

Similar to this, by the way, is mock up a satisfactory confusion. The way you do that, by the way -- you sneak up on him -- you say, „*Mock up a confusion. Good. Mock up another confusion. Good. Mock up another confusion. That's fine. Mock up another confusion. Fine. Now you got that pretty good, huh? All right, so you're getting there all right. It's kind of dim, but that's all right. That's fine. Now, why don't you mock up a satisfactory confusion?*“ Completely alters the auditing command because it alters the -- it's accusative, but a person will fall right in with it. Now, people on obsessive change get change so fast and hard that they get a total confusion. A complexity is no longer even a complexity of anything; it is simply a confusion.

Well, let's look it over. Where is the entrance point on a case? Well, the entrance point on a case, certainly, would be somewhere in the vicinity of a bundle of complicated comm lines. And that of course is a complexity of confusion to most people.

You say, „*Mock up a complexity*“ or „*Invent a complexity*.“

He tells you some wild complexity. He invents a new freeway which out-Los Angeles Los Angeles. You know? It's a freeway which has cloverleaves where you don't need them, has straight road where you have to have cloverleaves and actually is following a corkscrew pattern all the way, cars held to the road by centrifugal force as they go into town. „*That's very nice..*“ he says, „*That's pretty good. That's a good invention,*“ he says. „*That's a real good invention. You know, I...*“ And all of a sudden a lot of other things start to run off his case.

Now, there is a satisfactory confusion. But it's a confusion of what? It's a confusion of comm lines. He always gets a confusion of comm lines. This is what he does. When he starts to mock up a complexity, he will tell you they're comm lines. Now, you can ask him to mock up a comm line -- and this is the good technique: „*Invent a complexity*“ is a very, very good technique; there is nothing wrong with this at all as a technique. But one which is certainly an excellent process, right on a par with the

other one, is the same thing you've been doing with Mimicry Processing here in the last couple of days. All right, we invent a complexity or we mock up a communication line passing through a satisfactory number of vias. And we get him to trace the line -- mock-up, you know -- between himself and that wall, you see? And he finally connects with the wall. Some part of the line will be solid.

Now, as he does this more and more and more and more and more, he all of a sudden informs you that he can do one rather easily. It's simply a wide curve between himself and the wall. He just mocks up a line, a wide curve, beautiful golden line; nothing wrong with it at all. And the next thing you know he can mock up a straight line between himself and that wall. Now, of course, that may or may not be a significant object, but you get into very many more objects and you will certainly tap with this person a significant object. You'll find out that he's had horrible accidents with light switches, that chandeliers customarily fall on his head, that floors have been known to open up and yawn hungrily beneath him and so on. But you don't care anything about this, you just have him mock up a communication line between himself and the floor through enough vias. He'll do it. And his mock-ups come up.

Now, something that's quite interesting is he will have to be able to mock up comm lines, evidently. Evidently he has to be able to mock up comm lines before he can start to mock up terminals that are really good and that are not just repeated facsimiles out of the bank. So, if you're bringing a person up all the way on the subject of mock-ups, you have to start in with these lines before you get to terminals. Now, you will find him fresh out of space and fresh out of everything else.

I asked a fellow one time for enough comm lines to something, and he just gave me solid space. That gave you an infinity of comm lines, he quietly informed me. And that was about the best thing there was.

I said, „*That's the best thing there was?*“

„*Yes, yes.*“

„*You mean all space, then, between you and an object with which you're communicating should be solid?*“

He said, „*That's right. Always is.*“ he says.

And so I said, „*Well, that's fine. Now, I want you to get up from where you are and walk over to the wall, and then turn around and come back and sit down where you are.*“ (I was going to trap him, see? Real smart, real smart!) And he did. And I said, „*Now, how do you account,*“ I said, „*for being able to walk through all that solid?*“

„*Oh!*“ he says, „*How do I account for it?*“ He says, „*There's nothing easier.*“ He says, „*I'm not.*“

All right. When we have, then, ways and means of patching up cut comm lines, we have a regaining of ability; we have a regaining of reality with an attendant affinity. That's all there is to it, really.

A chap on the British Pentathlon Olympic Team -- for which the association in Great Britain is the coach (official coach) -- did something really fabulous. Chap's name was Hudson. And he was being taught to shoot. And he'd been taught to shoot, but he had, of course, never been taught to shoot with a gun. That was a small thing left out of it. And he didn't have any gun in his hand when he was shooting -- which was quite remarkable -- yet, he was a championship shot.

Another one of these chaps, by the way, who was a championship shot was really so poor, as far as his own capability of shooting was concerned, that his score went from, you might say, sort of average contest score -- you know, average champion contest score -- up to worlds championship: A difference between 120 and 190. That's quite remarkable. You see, it's quite a remarkable jump. Well, the only thing he found out, by the way, was that he had a gun in his hand and he could keep it from going away. That was the only thing he discovered. That was what did that.

Well, this chap Hudson (according to a report I got this morning), this chap Hudson, he was having a little difficulty with shooting. All of a sudden, why, he got a rather hard-boiled look in the face and he stuck the pistol back in its holster, dropped his hands rather limply to his sides, and all of a sudden looked at the target, drew and fired six shots through the bull's-eye. See? Straight out of Dodge City. I don't know what... Completely unorthodox stance, firing and so forth. He had been a championship shot, what was wrong with his being a championship shot again. Got that? We actually had to run out, you see, the broken pattern of comm lines -- he no longer had that body and so forth. Just by, of course, keeping a gun from going away it ran it out. It was a senior process to time. Quite amusing.

So a person inherits a skill from his past, it's already full of broken comm lines. So he starts to use it out of his past. In order to use it successfully, he would have to have the comm lines repaired in some fashion, either by successes in this life (against Lord-knows-what duress that he would go through in order to do this), finally to teach himself again that he could communicate with a piano and that a piano did communicate with an audience. See? And that audiences did communicate with pianos, not necessarily with clubs. He'd have to get this out. And somehow or other he could smoke through and overcome this.

I'm afraid this is what nearly all of us have done. Let's take walking. Do you know that children are requiring longer and longer to walk? And the number of cripples per capita in the society is growing. Ability to walk. Ability to walk. It's not much of an ability, is it? Rather simple; everybody knows how to walk. And yet every time that he stumbled into a log that stopped him, his ability to walk was being criticized. And the communication line he had with his legs was being interrupted.

Now, he can break off and go on a whole new cycle and have nothing to do with any of that and never get it into restimulation again and he'll be all right. One day somebody comes along to him and says something that tends to shatter his comm lines on some subject, like „*How do you act?*“ The person is doing a good job of acting. He's doing all right. Nothing wrong with his acting. He's doing a nice job, getting in there

in front of the TV cameras, and he's walking up and down the stage; he's doing all right. And somebody asks him one day, „*How do you act?*“

„*Oh, how do I act? Uh...*“ Well, apparently, all that's happening is somebody has asked him to describe an action which should be unthought, you know, and automatic, and brings into view the modus operandi of his acting. And this is very upsetting to him -- very, very upsetting to him.

Of course, we all know this. Well, the mere fact that everybody knows this should damn it completely. Truth of the matter is, is that although he is acting now and he's doing all right, he has never really thought too much about acting; he's just gone on and acted. In other words, he always had the reality of his body, the reality of scenery, the reality of audiences, cameras, rehearsals, you see? He was just going through it. And one day somebody asks him to think about it, and the moment he starts thinking about it and telling him how he acts, he pulls in a complete bank on the ability to act. He has either been taught to act and failed; he's been taught to act and succeeded too well; he has taught people to act -- oh, I don't know where. Maybe he was part of the Dublin Theater of 1720. See? Nobody knows why or what or how or where. We have no idea.

The Dublin Theater of 1720, by the way, was running around in a breechclout, screaming.

Ceremonials, anything like that might have kicked in. A lot of overt acts -- motivators. Well, what's an overt act-motivator but reasons why comm lines should remain cut? That's all that is. It just explains why the comm line should remain cut, the overt act-motivator sequence. You can have a person sit and invent overt acts and motivators, and get him a lot further along with auditing than having him run out any. He'll have more reasons why his comm lines should be cut and he may let go of some.

You realize that lines are seldom explained as to their cutting. I don't imagine in your last death anybody came along and told you why you died. And you may have known about it, but in some death back down the track, you didn't know a thing about it. All of a sudden you were dead. You say, „*Who did that?*“

Now, somebody audits you on reasons why you should be dead and this incident blows to view. And if they're stupid enough to let the bank change the process and they don't run the process flat - - all of a sudden the fellow comes up and says, „*Here's this engram. So we now run the engram.*“ That's the bank changing the process. See? We go on running the other process -- „*Invent reasons why you're dead*“ or some such things -- why, we find out that there were 562 engrams sitting there in that one stack. We're adding purpose to the game is all we're doing, auditing in a games-condition direction: reasons why, purposes.

All right. Rather than wander along on this any further, I'll just tell you abruptly and bluntly that the patching of communication lines which have been broken is what the auditor does. If he does that he of course gets R. And if he has the Reality Scale, which tells you that R begins with nothing standing in no space and moves up to the ghost of a solid line, but no terminals, why, you've got it made.

Now look, it's very, very interesting that the ghost of a solid line begins with a complex mass of tangled comm lines. We've described this over the last four or five years. I don't know, it's like a ball of yarn wound up with -- well, it's a huge ball of yarn that contains, in the aggregate, five thousand yards of yarn, but there is no piece of yarn in the ball longer than five inches. Now, that looks like a comm line to him.

Now, that sort of thing will show up before he gets a solid line. And it shows up on a, satisfactory complexity, or it shows up on stringing a comm line by enough vias. These things show up. But that isn't what you're asking him to mock up.

Maybe you'll get a case someday that you'll have to ask him to mock up some kind of a bundle of comm lines like this, for them to go nowhere and stop anyplace and so on. Maybe so. But I kind of doubt it, because I've seen this other technique express itself too workably.

Now, the painter who is no longer able to paint can be asked to mock up a communication line between his face and an easel. Of course, he gets the terrific motion of his hands while he's doing this. But if you ask him to mock it up on enough vias, you'll find him going all over the place and running vias through the things that he *„tried to remember how they looked“* so he could paint them, and all sorts of other lines. And then you run vias between the painter and his public. You see? You have him mock up communication lines by vias between himself and public, and he finds out that goes through connoisseurs, critics, and finally he does spot the fellow who always gyms him -- fellow who gives him five dollars apiece for his watercolors and sells them for a thousand -- the agent and so forth. These vias. But he gets them as lines, he doesn't get them as terminals. And he tells you ghostily about these terminals. After a while he'll also be able to mock them up as terminals.

In other words, you improve his ability to mock up lines, communication lines, by vias. Then lines straight. Then, finally, lines which have some ghosty terminals. And then, finally, ghosty terminals and lines, and then just terminals. Got the idea?

Now, there's other tricks you will find that you have to employ, such as the positions of the terminals. Two terminals standing in the same place, of course, are much better. Two terminals in the same place, you see, are really two terminals. But two terminals three feet apart are really two disrelated things; they have no connection with each other. I mean, somebody will explain this to you. *„Well, all right, mock up your family.“* So he mocks up a kind of a heterogeneous one person; looks like homogenized milk. They all stand in the same place, see?

He'll find other things, but you know what this particular advancing, rising scale of reality is going to do. First you're going to have some kind of a cockeyed, creeping-all-over-the-universe-and-finally-it-winds-up-there sort of a comm line -- which is first visible as just a bundle of stuff -- and then you're going on up the line, and this comm line is going to get straighter, and then some terminals are going to appear at either end of it, and then eventually, why, he can get terminals and be satisfied that a comm line can exist between them and so on.

There's another technique which turns on these comm lines, quite interestingly, is „*Look around and find something here which has no effect on that table*.“ Eventually, people will start to see lines going through the air. In other words, it's a very good technique.

The Axiom 10 techniques are tremendously powerful. They have great power.

Now, just as we find a datum which explains a whole body of data, so does a process run out a whole body of processes. Just as a datum can be the most important datum in any body of data, and so resolve a body of data and bring alignment to it, so can a process run out all other processes.

Now, in essence, that's what I have been looking for and working with, are processes which ran out all other processes. And when you have something that does that, of course, you immediately have a process which will certainly run out life, because lots of other processes run out life too. Well, there's actually a number of these now that run out all other processes except themselves. It's quite interesting. There's a number of them; there's about five. That's quite a lot.

So we do have processes that run out all other processes. But before you start processing anybody, you have to address the central pinpoint of a case. And that central, hidden datum is: their difficulty is alteration. Now, you say, „*That's very easy. Just mock up yourself doing nothing and you'll have it*.“ Well, as long as you mocked up yourself doing nothing and you were the one who was making yourself do nothing, you might have some success with the technique. But when it goes off onto a yogi-type process -- sit still and meditate (in other words, do nothing) why, it gets very haywire because it's a no-game condition.

You have to say, „*You do it*.“ That always makes a game condition, by the way: You do so and so. You act to _____. You treat so _____. You produce an effect on _____. You got the idea? Those are game conditions. That's what you audit.

All right. If we have this, if we have a body of processes and one process in that body runs it out, runs out all these other processes -- that is to say, they run all the other phenomena out -- why, we would really have something that would be quite workable.

Well, unfortunately, there is no process which totally runs out all of life. There is no process which runs out all processes then -- no one process. But there are about five classes of processes, each one of which contains some processes which run out every part of that class. And these five classes in the aggregate do composite life.

We weren't then really looking for a single button. We were looking for several. But all of these things have a dependency on communication. In the absence of communication they don't work. If you just used communication and nothing else you'd find that you were placing a limitation. And you're placing one because it's an insufficiency of complexity. It then doesn't address all parts of life. You have to get more significant and more specific in order to have something work.

Let's take this as a practical example. We get as a communication patch-up, Problems of Comparable Magnitude. „*Give me a problem of comparable magnitude to the divorce which is taking place today*.“ See? Present time problem: the fellow is having a rough time; father

and mother are being divorced -- something like this. All right. „Give me a problem of comparable magnitude to that.“ What are you doing? You're merely asking him for a via complexity which will permit him to circuitously, eventually face the problem which he is confronting. Do you see that?

And we get down to, as the British say, the gen. (Gen, that's a very commonly used word these days. It's become more and more common. Must have been an American word, one time or another.) Anyway, the gen on communication is this: *“Communication in its entirety, as an entirety, fully done, nullifies anything it confronts”*. So that if anything is affecting a preclear (now get this datum -- get this datum thoroughly, will you please? This is a real thorough datum), if anything is upsetting the preclear or if he's unable to handle something and he's in a no-game condition because of something, something wrong with him, it's because his communication with it has a reservation. It is not a full communication with it. Do you get the idea? If it's troubling him, he is not fully communicating with it.

Now, if I were to ask you on a quiz for the thing which makes a problem or the condition which makes a problem, that's the right answer. You get a problem or a bad circumstance or an alteration (which I started speaking to you about), you get an alteration -- obsessive change -- because there is a reservation in communication with it. Anything with which you can fully communicate cannot trouble you.

Now, of course, I'm not going to tell you that as a blunt datum. It happens to be true, it is a fact, so forth; but I will say this instead -- I will put this to you directly, each one of you individually: If you could fully communicate with anything, would it trouble you?

Audience: No.

Male voice: It wouldn't be a game either.

That's correct. So the contest of life is: The control and regulation of things you're not in full communication with, and to stay out of communication with things enough so you can have them, and to stay in communication with them enough so that you can use them. You got the idea?

So the process of living this game called life is the process of quasi-communication. And when a person is incapable of playing this game called life to the limit that he should be able to, we discover that he has altered this in some fashion. He is in full communication with the things that he ought to be in partial communication with (he hasn't got them then; they're gone), he's in partial communication with all the things he ought to be long since in full communication with, so they're troubling him and he can't act. So there's an alteration of straight communication, undesirable, in the game called life. And that is what is wrong with a case. And that is all that is wrong with a case.

And to solve it you have to get him to achieve a satisfactory complexity of communication.

Thank you. [End of Lecture]