COORDINATION OF CLASSES OF PROCESSES

A lecture given on 1 November 1956

[Start of Lecture]

Thank you.

Want to talk to you now about the coordination of processes or classes of processes. There are several classes of processes which do not ordinarily cross very much. However, one is additive to the next, and you could put them in a sequential chain. They could be placed in a chain, a gradient scale, or any way you wanted to arrange them, but that would to some degree be false, because these classes of processes, each one, take up, really, another aspect of existence.

Now, I'm not going to give you a list of these classes; I'm going to talk to you about the most important ones. The first we know as mechanical, and the second we know as postulate processes. Those are two very broad classifications, and you mustn't get these two confused. They are two different classes of processes. We won't do an A=A=A on them and say postulates go into the mechanics and the mechanics go into the postulates because the mechanical processes that have to do with space, energy, masses, and so forth, are all dependent in the first place on postulates, so therefore they're the same processes. They are not. You got the idea?

Now, as I say, you can put one of these on a gradient scale to the other: You say mechanical processes are always junior, then, to postulate processes. But the funny part of it is that you have to process mechanical processes as mechanical processes, and you have to process postulate processes as postulate processes. You see this clearly?

The two broad classifications, then, stem immediately from the first few Axioms, and they break down into those two enormous classes.

Now, the moment that we take up these, we are taking up the actual anatomy of substance of the universe and life within it. The substance of the universe is just first and foremost idea and thing. There are ideas; there are things. See? Now, you call space a

thing. You might as well; it's a manufactured item. It's mechanical. It's a mechanic, you might say.

There's the whole category of particles which could be considered one different from the next, as on the periodic chart. But in view of the fact that the periodic chart doesn't even begin to cover the number of actual atoms, molecules, types of gas, invisible particles and so on, it just doesn't even begin to stretch. In the first place, it is only on this planet that it ends below a hundred. It's only on this planet. You realize there's a star, which is a companion star to Sirius, one teaspoonful of the substance of which would weigh one ton on Earth? Well, what element is that, if you please? You see, we're immediately outside the periodic chart.

Now, therefore, it is not true that we can carefully and neatly say, *„This is all the atoms there are. This is all the molecules there are,"* and just let it go at that. There is no sense in trying to completely classify particles. Why? Because each set of particles is simply another set of postulated particles, and there could be a complete infinity of these, don't you see?

So therefore, you take the particles where you find them and that's it. Don't ever be surprised to find a different kind of mass or a different kind of particle, because they are on a postulate basis -- originally. Look at our gradient scale here. They can be postulated but they are in existence. They are. They do exist.

You just might as well say, *„Well, all right. They all come from postulate, therefore it's very easy to handle them because they're just all idea";* and we're off onto a Mary Baker Eddy. You see? And she couldn't have done worse. I mean, as fine a woman as this was, she actually couldn't have done worse with her conclusion. Her conclusion was that if it's all so actual and painful, it better not exist -- so all is infinite mind, don't you see -- and never took that into category, so it never went south with anything.

Now, this is all very well. I'm not criticizing Mary Baker Eddy, because she was simply falling into a track which had, oddly enough, a tremendous amount of truth in it. You see, it's perfectly true: All is infinite mind. I mean, it's the truest thing you ever heard of. See? I mean, there's no falsehood there. But it unfortunately doesn't allow for the fact that infinite mind gives us at once infinite matter; and if you try to not-is everything, you've had it. In other words, you go through. You don't say, *„It ain't";* you say, *„It is."*

You have to admit the actuality in order to obtain a communication. We get to this as a very tremendously sweeping law in processing. The preclear has to admit an actuality in order to get into communication. And if he cannot admit it as an actuality, then he cannot get into communication with it, and so he will remain communication-shy of this particular item, and it will continue to communicate at him on a cause-distance-effect, don't you see?

So when we say *„All is infinite mind, you can just skip the rest of it,"* we are pulling a tremendous blunder in processing, because we are saying it is not then necessary to communicate with all these things which you put into existence to communicate with. And if you abandon this amount of communication the end product is insanity.

All right. We're not raising the devil with Mary Baker Eddy. She had a fine, hard time of it. She made a very gallant fight, and we are actually indebted to her for the tremendous push-back she gave the world of medicine. But we mustn't, in our gratitude, fall into the same snare.

It's very easy for somebody you're teaching to fall into that snare, and I tell you this as future Instructors. You're going to have people in your midst that are endowed with this philosophy that in view of the fact that it's all postulated, it isn't. Now look! If it's postulated, it is! Who are we invalidating? See? If it's postulated, it is.

Now, if it is true that you must get rid of all of it, whole- track-psychiatry style, then you better postulate all of it. The way you undo mass is to undo the postulate of mass. The way you undo a particle is to undo the postulate of the particle. The way you undo space is to undo the postulate of space. Do you see that? But this will be found, in essence, to be pretty doggoned stratospheric for most of your preclears.

So therefore, we have to have this class of processes which simply admit the existence of MEST and accustom them to its actuality. Do you see that? They can't see that they postulated it; they have to accept it just as it is. And you get them to accept it as it is -- that is a wall; that is a floor; that is a ceiling -- and we get quite a gain, quite a gain. It's quite interesting what 8-C will do for numerous cases -- what straight locational processing will do for numerous cases.

Now, these are processes which admit fully the mechanics of existence and so we must consider that as a full class of processes. It is a full class. You don't have to say anything to him at all about how he postulated the stuff and how he agreed with it and how he helped out with the whole thing. You don't have to say a thing. He'll find this out eventually as you process him.

Now, it is quite a strain on a case to run postulate processes. It is such a strain that running postulate processes -- Change the Idea, and so on -- on a lowscale case is routinely unsuccessful. It reduces the havingness.

What is this mechanism of reduction of havingness? It is the simple mechanism which I spoke to you about just a couple of minutes ago. You say it isn't when it is. In other words, you get a second-postulate situation in the thetan. He postulated it into existence, it is still in existence, he hasn't undone the postulate which put it into existence, and now he says it isn't in existence. And he's made a liar out of himself, meaning he has denied himself, which is the only thing he can do that is terribly aberrative. Do you see that? So that if we bypass all of these mechanical processes, sweepingly, we wind up with a reduction of havingness. It is, but it isn't.

Now, in the field of postulates this just makes a liar out of him, that's all. I mean, it's just as simple as that. It invalidates him.

Now, you will find preclears who just ache to be invalidated. They invalidate themselves all the time, and so on. They've got this obsessively. They said, *„There is a lighter. Now, I don't see any lighter.*“ They said, *„My postulates don't work,*“ didn't they? They said, *„There's a wall. I don't see a wall. There is no wall there at all.*“ This is the same statement as *„My postulates don't work. When I build a wall by postulate, I thereafter have no evidence that a*

wall has been built. So therefore, I cannot build a wall, and I am not capable of building walls, and there I am, weak." What made him weak? The fact that he said he was by the statement, „*There is a wall. Now, I see no wall.*" Do you see that?

Now, if he wanted to get rid of the wall, it would really be necessary for him to say, „*There is a wall.*" He could run out his having said „*There is a wall,*" and this, then, would make the wall disappear. And this would only tell him, then, „*I can put a wall there, and I can take a wall away.*" But the course that leads to complete disaster is this other course: He says, „*There is a wall. I don't see any wall.*"

Now, he has to be able to see a wall, and you've moved him up just that height. Reduction of havingness is this process: „*There's a wall. I don't see any wall,*" „*Here's an engram bank. I don't see any bank,*" and we get this odd manifestation of a jumbled-up havingness denied.

Now, the person feels that he should have and then he says, „*I don't have to have anything. I don't want it.*" You see, it's a clutter of postulates. But you start running nothing but ideas on somebody, you get in trouble. Nothing but ideas. No masses, no particles, no spaces. And the only reason for this is that he has put the masses, particles and spaces into existence as an actuality, and by your complete ignoring of them -- you ignore his ignoring of them -- you get a bunch of things which are there but aren't.

Now, I talked to you about the dwindling spiral of reality, where it went down from postulate to agreement to terminals to communication lines to no lines. Well, the funny part of it is as you start to run reality upstairs again, you have to exert an idea in the direction of, first, there are lines.

Well now, you'll also run into the phenomenon of his saying, „*There are no lines.*" What a clumsy tangle. Now, don't be amazed, as you start to process somebody, to have him totally packed in solid all of a sudden, because that's what he's been doing. Stuff has been appearing around him and he says, „*Oh, it doesn't exist.*" He postulated it into existence, then he says, „*It doesn't exist.*" See? „*I'll think about that tomorrow,*" you know, „*That's nothing. Doesn't exist.*" In other words, each one of these statements is „*I won't go into communication with it.*" See? It doesn't exist; I won't go into communication with it -- same thing. Well now, if he made it and now he's unwilling to go into communication with it, he's really in the soup.

So communication undoes the whole level of postulate processes, but postulates do not necessarily do so. Do you follow this? You got communication here as the tool which works best on postulate processes. Nevertheless, I'm going to give you some of the beefiest postulate processes there are.

Project: to turn on somebody's mock-ups so clearly and so brilliantly that he won't possibly be able to even flinch. He himself will be flabbergasted. It's rather easy to do. The worst of the cases have to be given a Subjective Remedy of Havingness. You have to have him mock up black spaces and black masses or something and push them in. Remedy his havingness with these blacknesses in order to clear the field up a little bit. But maybe that isn't even necessary, because the process I am going to give

you is a quickie, it's impermanent, and he will be upset by it, but it's a process you have to know.

You have the preclear get the idea of putting up a mock-up or a facsimile the size of the wall before him, and then have him get the idea... This is just get the idea, you see; just postulates; nothing but. Now, you don't ask him to do it; he just gets the idea of doing it, see? And then he says, *„Well, tsk! that'd spoil the game,"* and not do it.

Have you got this sequence? Let's get this sequence well. You have him get the idea of putting up a mock-up the size of that wall, have him hurriedly get the idea that it would spoil the game, and have him quickly stop and not do it. It's devastating! Run on a case that is quite high it is a very powerful process. Run on a case that should have been run on mechanics, it still works but it's one of the most deadly things you can do to him. All of a sudden he has staring him in the face something he has so often postulated mustn't exist -- a facsimile, a picture, a mock-up -- that he is flabbergasted. And you are doing something which appears to him to be just witchcraft, that's all. Because the facsimile he will begin to put up there, the mock-up he will begin to put up there, whichever he does, will be so deep, so massive, so brilliant and so big, it'll be quite upsetting. You simply run the cycle of postulates which ran him into not putting up things. Got that? That's just the one-two-three. Got those now?

I don't tell you not to do this. Do it all you please. Isn't going to kill him any. It's certainly going to stun a few preclears, because even on a black case it has some chance of happening. But the kind thing to do to a black case is to give him a Subjective Remedy of Havingness first to get rid of the blackness and then do it.

It's just those three steps. I'll go over them again. You tell him this; this is just your palaver:

„All right now. I want you to get the idea of putting up a mock- up the size of that wall. Now get the idea that would spoil the game and not do it."

And that's all there is to it. Then you tell him again, *„Now get the idea of putting up a mock-up the size of the wall. Now get the idea that would spoil the game and don't do it."* One-two- three, one-two-three, one-two-three. Just like that. Over and over and over again.

Now, at the end of an hour or two, he will be getting these fantastically huge, overwhelming mock-ups. That's for sure. You never saw such brilliance and clarity in your life. If you, in Dianetics, wanted to turn on somebody's facsimiles so he could see them and run them, then this would have done it.

That's why I say these days I couldn't be interested less in research; can do things like this.

Now, this has a companion postulate process:

„Now get the idea of putting a mock-up in the center of the room that everybody could see. Now get the idea that would spoil the game and stop it." The one-two-three again.

„Get the idea of putting up a mock-up in the center of the room that everybody could see. Now get the idea that would spoil the game and stop it.“

Now, those are run, first one, then the other. In other words, you have to flatten the one where he puts up the facsimile or the mock-up the size of the wall before you enter in upon this other one. It has been found to be more successful if it is done in that sequence.

Now, I have never run a preclear to a point where the mock-up did appear with total solidity in the middle of the room -- on this same process. Never have. But I have run one to the point where a shimmer appeared, which some other people, coming into the room a short time afterwards and sitting down, noticed and wondered what it was. There was a shimmer in the middle of the room.

Now, we're straight on the highway of putting a universe together when we can do that with a postulate process. But don't think for a moment that it doesn't upset your preclear, because he becomes convinced that it'll spoil the game, and sure enough it would. Sure enough it would. That's absolute truth.

„All right. Let's get the idea of putting up a stack of a million dollars worth of one-dollar bills in the middle of the room. Now let's get the idea that would spoil the game and not do it.“ (*„Stop it“* or *„not do it“* interchangeable; *„stop“* sometimes upsets him.) And he'll pull out of that in a very short space of time with wild protests. *„What you're trying to do is just ruin the economics of the country,“* he's liable to tell you, because he shortly becomes aware of the fact that it is within his capability to put that stack of bills there that would be perfectly passable bills! He sees himself ruining the construction trade, ruining the whole of the contracts and business of the planet builders, completely wrecking the genetic line. What would be the use of having the genetic line if every time you wanted a body you simply mocked one up? And then everybody did this, and we would have a game without limitations which would not then, of course, be a game because there wouldn't be any barriers in it.

That's a rather fabulous pair of processes.

Now, you can figure-figure on these processes if you want to and undercut them in some fashion or another and do other things with them. Yes, they advance a case, but they don't put a person in a frame of mind where he can live in this universe. That is the singular limitation we are confronting. In fact, it puts him in quite a different frame of mind: that it's impossible to do so, particularly with a fellow on the loose like you, an auditor. Because sooner or later you're liable to start in on this and start mocking up Ford cars from one end of the street to the other, and that would ruin the economics of the automobile business and that would ruin this and that would wreck that, and he begins to find out he has a stake in this universe -- which is the important postulate recovery. Nothing else is important about the process, really, except that one. He does have a stake in this universe.

You never saw a man get down and scream until you've run this process for several hours on a preclear. It's just over his dead body!

„All right. I'll do it again.“

I've seen them sweat, so on. People who a few minutes before would have said, *„Well, now...“* Oh, I mean pardon me, a day or so before would have said easily, very easily, *„Oh, well. The destruction of this universe would be a very good thing. Very, very good thing. Yeah, nothing wrong with that because -- get it out of the road -- because it's the thing that's victimizing all of us.“*

And then you run him on this other process, and he finds out he doesn't want to get rid of it, and as a matter of fact is liable -- and not in all cases -- but is very liable to accuse you of being a destroyer par excellence.

Now, those are the two most powerful postulate processes of which I have any acquaintance, because they do not necessarily change a case but they certainly upset one!

Now, we've fooled around with this quite a bit. Years ago we had Concept Therapy. Somebody down in Texas (a traitor to the state by the way), turned this out just as Concept Therapy, and he's been fooling around with it ever since. And they've had their various vicissitudes. But Concept Therapy is one of the limited therapies. The only thing wrong with it is havingness; it throws havingness down. You directly make somebody change his mind. You run the positive and the negative in order to get out the maybes. A maybe is composed of the positive and the negative. We remember all this. This is years ago -- Scientology 8-80. It's true and there's nothing wrong with it except one thing: It doesn't work well on people who are still getting acquainted with the mechanics of existence. You get that? So it's one of these real high-toned processes. A fellow would have to have a Remedy of Havingness from A to Izzard. He'd just have to have a Remedy of Havingness the like of which you never heard of, on any subject under the moon, stars and sun. He'd have to be able to accept and reject anything and everything on the whole planet Earth and the surrounding galaxy, too. And then Concept Therapy would work without liability.

But why do we have a therapy, since a thetan can do this anyhow, and if you get him up to that state, he can always simply change his mind? Remember there are certain things he doesn't want to change his mind about, and the first two processes I gave you are those things. He doesn't want to actually get into a frame of mind whereby the whole universe is invalidated and he has no game left of any kind whatsoever.

Now, we could work this out in various ways so that it became more workable and we got around these odds and ends, but it's too high for the usual case that you run into. That case has to be run on mechanics.

So, the two major classes. You get somebody exteriorized in present time, he'll run on all the postulate processes you ever wanted to do. And you can do the first two on him with great success; he'd love them. But he'll tell you after a while, *„You know, you're trying to ruin the universe if we keep this up much longer!“* He gets quite convinced of that.

So mechanics do fit into the realm of existence. It is no good to be a physicist, and reject all masses.

Now, I want to call to your attention an omission in the first ten Axioms. There is an omission in those Axioms. One of those Axioms says that the particles, grouped, become masses. Do you know that? Well, masses also become masses simply by being

mocked up as masses. Got that? So there's a little added clause in that, and you'll see the proper correction on it one of these days. It's already been done.

Now, when we started to keep walls from going away, it became apparent at once that our people had been misguided by the field of physics; and the whole subject, in paying some attention to physics, had itself been misguided. So we just took physics out of Scientology. The one thing that seems to run out when you keep walls and masses from going away is simply this: molecules, atoms. They're a swindle. A wall is a wall! It's solid! How come it's solid? Well, because it was postulated as being solid. Ground is ground. Mass is mass. And in view of the fact that nobody has ever seen one of those molecules or atoms, it of course gets into the realm of invisible particles, which the physicist is terrified of.

You would never get into such terror in your life as you would get into running a physicist on making the air of the room solid without seeing that it had to become so. There's real terror on that for these boys. The invisible particle; they're haunted!

Actually the whole field of disease depends on these invisible particles. Radiation for its reaction on the body depends upon its invisibility. Invisible, invisible, invisible, invisible.

Well, you see, it's closest cousin to being a thetan. It can produce an effect but it can't be seen. Well, that's disease germs and so on. Somebody invented a microscope and found out there were little wigglety-wiggles and animalcules and things like that and this convinced him. But he never asked this: Did they exist as live forms or did the body make them? That's a hell of a thing to throw at a... Do the diseases exist as a separate protoplasm line, chasing endlessly through time (the way they teach you in biology) or does one body scent the postulate from another body that it is making glumwums, and it starts making glumwums, too?

Now, the question is, is do glumwums make glumwums? This is an interesting question. I'm just asking it as a question. I'm not giving you any data here. I don't have any real evidence -- in spite of the fact that they say glumwums can be cultured, I don't have any real evidence that they're real glumwums. I think they're just glumwums that stimulate the body into making glumwums. I don't know that a body can be affected by some other body's glumwums beyond seeing the other body has glumwums and wanting to be duplicative and nice about it, of course, mocks up glumwums.

See, this whole subject is very interesting. In other words, is the entirety of disease autogenic by the disease or is it simply a generative function of the body, restimulated by the existence of such a pattern in another body? This is one of these fascinating questions. You could go round and round about it. But if you did go round and round about it, you might suddenly come up with the answer to disease!

You see, glumwums are supposed to be very, very chewish. They chew, you know, on everything, you know? They do! They just gnaw everything up and swallow it up and spit it out. But how come they don't chew up some bodies? Do they have some kind of a guild law -- hm? -- that bacteria must not eat bodies that have 862 more cells per cubic centimeter than other bodies? Or... It gets too complicated if you go that way.

So you find some bodies will always escape in an epidemic, and yet all of these bodies are made out of meat, and the most fastidious cuisinarian in the Solomon Isles would not be able to detect the difference of taste between one of these bodies and another, but one of these bodies is susceptible to glumwums and the other body isn't.

I don't care how new the disease is. It suddenly springs forth from the Middle East and chews up everybody in England -- the Plague! Well, how come everybody in England didn't die of the plague? Well, they should have! Or were there some bodies around that didn't think they ought to generate them?

It normally requires a fear of the illness before the bacteria will bite. Now, we know that in Dianetics and Scientology.

Um! So if somebody is very afraid, he is liable to be very agreeable. This is the principle that's used in international relations by France, England and other countries.

I wonder if this just isn't one of these things where some bodies make glumwums and some don't. You put some glumwums into body A and body A says, *„Ah! Eeek!“* and immediately makes some. You put some glumwums into body B and it says, *„Ho-hum,“* and doesn't bother to make any and therefore it gets a sign hung on it saying *„Immune.“*

You see, if you came way downscale about disease, you would consider at once that it was a thing, wouldn't you? It would become a thing.

Actually barbaric races always develop into a visible god any poorly understood phenomenon. They always give it a visibility. They build it a house and put it on a pedestal. They give it mass, in other words. If they don't understand something well, then they'll symbolize it in mass. Just like medicos and other barbaric peoples: They don't understand anything about the brain so they give it -- they give thought mass, and yet there is no evidence that any part of the brain performs any real function in the process of thought. There really is no evidence to this effect.

I know we've heard about people with bullets in their brains and they then couldn't perform certain functions. Well, we had one not too long ago in the HGC; and when we got through with him, in spite of the fact that he hadn't gotten any brain back, he'd gotten all the functions back, and they hadn't transferred over to something else, either.

So it doesn't look to me -- it doesn't look to me any more than somebody has manufactured a terminal to match up the postulate when the body starts making glumwums. Do you see that? And it fits in with more of our way of thinking, if we really conceive this, this way. It's by agreement. *„I get sick; you get sick. Okay? Fine.“* Tu-huh! And yet there is such an agreement.

Now, this goes down into a terminal and the terminal is a glumwum. This is an agreement gone solid. But what is an agreement? An agreement is a postulate gotten lonely.

Now when the glumwum disappears, we have the phenomenon of the solid communication line. In other words, the glumwum is a thing now, and so we say it's a solid

communication line of some sort or another, but the terminal is invisible. See that? An invisibility of terminal then occurs. You've got just the Reality Scale falling south here. And then pretty soon even the communication line disappears.

Now, let's look at that. Let's look at that, because this particular civilization has not yet attained that depth of depravity. The terminal is no longer visible. Just how you get glumwums is not clearly discerned because it's very hard to isolate all carriers. But they still isolate some carriers, don't they? They can still do that, in spite of the fact that the terminal is invisible. So we have come to a point of a substitute terminal. We call it a carrier or a host. In other words, we can find the host but we can't find the thing easily.

Now, the more electronic microscopes they invent, why, the greater difficulty they have trying to find glumwums. This is for sure.

I made one of these microscopes, by the way, in 1932, which was a very successful microscope. The first one used the principle of ultraviolet light, which I recognized was registerable on a sensitized plate -- photomicrography, in other words. And therefore, you could see smaller. We had already gotten to the microscope's limit on light, and you had to get a tinier wave of light in order to see smaller things, you see? So I went -- got smart here, one way or the other; got lazy or curious or something of the sort -- and went south into ultraviolet light against photographic plates. Very interesting. Interesting phenomena. Using a very, very, very fine-grain emulsion, and I couldn't see any difference myself. Although I'd gone south, it didn't seem that we had really wound up anywhere. I got some cultured slides -- some slides of various cultures of this and that and so on -- and looked at them. And they were definable; they were discernible and so on.

And the next year got even more curious, and we had something that would bombard a screen with very, very tiny particles that they have now assigned very interesting names to -- alpha, gamma, Eisenhower, all kinds of names to these menaces -- and anyhow, I found out the same thing that Yale spent, I think, two and a half million dollars finding out about eight or ten years later.

They've had these big electronic microscopes -- they fill a room! I don't know why they had to build them so they fill a room, because all they are, in essence, is some sort of a screen on which a particle, directed in straight line, will register. The particle, of course, sees something by detouring around it. So you just have magnetic plates that keep the particles going in straight lines, and where they encounter something, why, they leave a pattern on the screen. That's about the whole of it.

And two or three times they've had measles all beautifully categorized. They've had beautiful pictures of measles. Only they keep coming up with different pictures. And you can't take a slide and throw it into one of these machines and say, *„Ah! Measles.“* You say, *„Now we'll inject it into something and see if it gets measles, and that was measles, and we've collected another picture of measles.“* It's not a certainty.

It's like electrocardiographs. Have you ever seen one of these things? Well, somebody spends four or five years studying the patterns of these in order to detect whether or

not somebody has heart trouble. Look! Anytime you've got to spend three, four, five years studying a meter to find out how to read it, you'd better invent a new meter. Either that or the meter isn't registering anything.

It's like Rorschach. You spend four years to get so you can interpret a Rorschach. Well, any time anybody can take kid inkblots that were invented back about 1860 -- you drop a blot of ink on a piece of paper and then you smash another piece of paper down over the top of it. That's the first game. And you get an inkblot. And now the kiddies look at it and they say, „*What is it?*“ and they guess what it is; because it makes a strange pattern. Now you take a white card and you drop some ink, then, in the middle of this, and fold it good and tight. Squish, you know? And then you bring it out like that, and you look at the resulting pattern.

Now, that is a Rorschach inkblot! Was originally a child's game, and still is! Somebody goes to the university or some other pathological area and he studies for four years to learn how to interpret these things. And if anybody, however, has ever gotten a hold of the textbook, he can interpret in any way, shape or form that he cares to. And that's what makes it such a handy test, is it doesn't depend in the least upon the person being tested.

You always want several tests like this around. They lend to the authoritative atmosphere, you see? Requires super experts in that case.

Actually, the responses on Rorschach are supposed to be very standard from one type of insanity to another type, or one insane person to the next, or something like this and so on. Actually, there's the wildest response you ever heard of. And it doesn't coordinate against other types of tests, which makes it, of course, at once suspect. You take all the people in several insane asylums and you give them the test, and you take several people in a university and you give them the test, and you get what the difference is. And if the difference is undetectable you give it to several people out in the public and see if there's any difference again. Empirical findings.

All these tests do from our standpoint, by the way, is measure change.

That's a little bit off the subject. The subject is that we simply are dealing with the field of detection. Now, what is this detection? What are we detecting? We are detecting a terminal which has become invisible.

Now, if you'll notice, people wear glasses when they can no longer see small objects. Then they'll wear glasses to see the small object. Don't you see? Well, there is nothing wrong with wearing glasses. You're just boosting up the sight ratio. After a while people wear microscopes. Got the idea?

What is a pair of glasses? You notice eyes are supposed to deteriorate; the glasses have to be thicker and thicker and more and more powerful in order to see these objects more clearly, you see? Well, this is just the symptom of something going out of terminal. It's going out of the class of terminal into the class of visible comm line. You take anybody with glasses and have him mock up beams to the object, and he'll find out he can do that. If his glasses fit him at all he can always get beams between himself and objects rather easily, of course, given a clear field. You want to worry for him a little

bit if he has to do it forty or fifty times before he gets a beam, because he's running upscale from no beam. Got the idea?

All right. Now, the invisible terminal is a vast study and an important one, because it is the lowest rung of the field of mechanics. And we apparently have come back to postulates, only we haven't.

I want to call your attention to this rather strongly. We apparently have come back to postulates because we can't see it. It does exist but we cannot perceive it, therefore it's invisible. It can render an effect upon us, that is obvious, and yet we cannot perceive it beyond its effect. We can still perceive the effect area but not the cause area at all. Terminal gone.

Now, doesn't that look like a postulate? It certainly does. It certainly looks like a postulate; and you will find more people, then, classifying postulates in that band rather than in their proper band.

„Thetans are fearsome things. They fly around in the air and throw postulates at you.“ See? *„Anytime we get sick it's because of the ghosts and devils.“* See? Actually, it's just an invisible terminal that was set up there God knows when. Just held in place endlessly.

How many of these things are there? Duhhh! How many terminals have become invisible, per any given preclear? A few.

Well, let me tell you something very interesting: A thetan originally didn't think it was a good house unless all the light in it came out of the objects. We're using an entirely different system here. The light shines on the wall and then shines back. The wall reflects, or reflexes, you see? Well, this is different than the object emanating, and once upon a time a nice object was one which emanated. But how does an object emanate? Well, it has to glow, of course, and we get the whole phenomena of gamma and so on.

Well, now. These terminals have disappeared. One doesn't see these around very often, but one knew they were around and one knew they were scarce and one knew therefore that they were dangerous, and so one reacts to gamma.

Now, we can explain this very easily. It's a matter of lost terminal, invisible influence, hidden influence -- anything you want to call it there; hidden influence is what we normally call it in Scientology -- but it simply means the terminal is invisible.

Now, you run a fellow upscale and he will find more terminals than he thought were there, and several of these will be radiative terminals, radioactive terminals. We process mechanics on somebody who is sure it is all postulates and we're never wrong. Got that? We're sure. This person is absolutely certain, you get it, that it's... We've seen a lot of those cases.

I begin to suspect my own sanity every once in a while. I got a fairly wide comm line going on Earth here. And you guys got some comm lines going, and we put out some ideas, see? And these ideas wind up places. You know, all of a sudden they wind up in someplace, and somebody is glibly coming on the air and giving forth one of our

ideas. Now, our comm lines are better than you think. They're much better than you think.

Well, I forget this every once in a while -- I forget how good these are -- and I get a shock like I got in Great Britain one time. And I really tried to follow this comm line back, and had a hard time following it back. And it wasn't for about two or three weeks after my first effort to track the comm line that I found the actual communication channel; and the actual communication channel existed. Put out an idea out of the PABs about educating peoples before we armed them. I mean, just as simple as this. The Labour Party grabbed this whole-hog (of England), and came out with a policy which is now their policy with regard to other countries than England proper. It's very fascinating. And I thought, at first, you know, I says, *„Well, what do you know! You shoot an arrow into the air and it falls to earth you know not where.“*

One night the TV was turned on (British TV) and here were a couple of chaps, a Labourite and a Socialite or -- Conservative and a Labourite, that was what it is -- and they were discussing this idea. You educate them, and you make sure that you have democratic principles beaten into their skulls before you start shoving freedom and machine guns in their paws. You know, that was all the idea there was, and they were discussing this, and I said, *„The -- the -- the -- the -- the... What the hell here? The -- just a minute. Am I skidding? Maybe I shoot an arrow into the air...“* I said, you know?

Well actually, people in insane asylums are sure they do this all the time. That's the thing they're sure of. See?

So I said I'd better go over and take my Rorschach or my Wassermann, or whatever you take, and make sure I'm still moting on all eight cylinders -- well, at least one or two of them. And it had me in a bit -- a bit confused there. So I tried to run it down along one channel, and I wrote one auditor who had such connections and I said, *„Hey! Did you put this through there?“* and he wrote back after some time and he said no.

And just about the time he wrote back and said no, I got a long letter asking me for more material, from a person who had simply sort of hung around on the outskirts of the London organization but who is intimately connected with the government. And this person was writing me to get more data on the same plan. So it wasn't an invisible communication. You get the idea? But for a while there I had my doubts! What's going on here? What have I got here, an invisible communication line? From no terminals? Worried me.

But downscale they don't worry about it when they see something like this. They just *„know“* that is the thing. They just *„know“* that is the thing.

Now, you add it up to the fact that the person can't work, can't spit, can't think and can't run on any process that you run him on, and yet they're absolutely sure that all they've got to do is just accidentally think a thought that somebody is going to run into a lamppost, and somebody will run into a lamppost. Got it? They get sold on this invisible terminal, invisible comm line, way down south -- way down south below nowhere. Now, a thetan way up top can do these things. And they sort of remember this capability. Now, these people at the same time tell you that there is no such thing

as a mechanic. They tell you there are no walls; they can take care of that sort of thing, you know, and they tell you that's easy to handle. Their emotional tone is quite often beautiful serenity.

Now, this is interesting. This person not-ises mass and puts himself into some kind of an ecstatic state. He's got the whole universe on the back of his neck. He daren't look or the whole thing will fall in on him, don't you see? He has this all suppressed with such pressure that it is fabulous. He has the universe itself completely suppressed. Do you see that? All right. We see this commonly amongst holy men in India, Tibet, so on. They're quite good, many of them, and many of them are quite nuts.

There's a nice piece of differentiation here. You have to differentiate between the person who can do it and the person who says he is doing it. See, there's a difference. And that difference is the acceptance of the mechanical universe. The fellow who can do it can also accept or build or construct or reject the whole cockeyed universe -- the whole thing! -- and the other fellow daren't accept any part of it.

So don't fall into an error here in processing. The fellow who does it all by telepathic thought and has Western Union wiring up his brain so the government can read his mind, or something of the sort... It doesn't even have to be that crude. He tells you that he doesn't have to be processed on any of these things like walls or things like that; he's rather insulted about the whole thing. He's much better than that. This is your boy. You run him on mechanics. You just run him on mechanics.

Now, we don't care what processes you use. You certainly, however, use walls. You use walls and spaces and floors. You can put ideas into them, you can do anything with them you want to do with them. You make invisible particles solid if you want to. You do anything you want to. We don't care what you do as long as it is a mechanical process. The process must then process the mechanics of existence, with very good procedure, with tremendous stress on the communication formula. The funny part of it is, you'll have a hard time.

The other boy who can really do it is quite interesting in that he can be processed perfectly and easily on mechanics. He's just as willing to be processed on mechanics as he is on eating soup. Doesn't matter to him. He can stay in good communication with you or not. He might change his mind and not be in communication with you, too, you know.

Furthermore, the game (and here's the other one) does not have to be complicated for the fellow who can make the postulates stick at a distance. The game can be so simple it's idiotic. It can be awfully simple, and he can still enjoy it as a game. And brother, the other fellow has to have nothing short of Brahms. See? It's got to be nice. And, of course, if he's really interested, it'd be Prokofiev. That's life. That'd be really interesting!

That's fascinating to see there that we have newly inherited a brand-new method of detecting differences of tone, and that is complexity: What is interesting?

This, by the way, gives you the whole substance of interest. It tells you that interest has to be enforced by complexity as you go downscale, whereas interest and disinterest upscale is by postulate.

Now, you see those first two sweeping classes of processes? You have to call them classes because when somebody gets out of mechanics, he can handle mechanics, he can mock them up, he can do things with energy and spaces and masses, motion and no- motion, and so on, he can do things with all these things; he then has only one class of processes on which he can run with benefit and that consists of postulate processes. But we didn't understand it three years ago that these were as widely separated as they are. They're plenty widely separated. And so we have to treat them as two entirely different classes.

Now, these two occasionally coincide so that you can do both at the same time, and where you have that you have an optimum process because it processes both. But just because you're processing both, for heaven sakes don't think you're processing one thing, because you're not.

Some cases react very, very well to mechanics alone and some cases react to ideas and mechanics at the same time. But you're doing two things at once; remember that you're doing two things at once. Substitution and Confronting as processes are doing both postulate and mechanics at the same time, and there you have the coincidence of the two fields. But they are two fields, and if you get somebody who cannot even vaguely embrace both of them at the same time, you have then to run on him mechanical things, mechanics. Get him to feel walls, put walls there. Do anything you want to do but run him only on mechanics without straining the brain. Got it?

Okay. Thank you.

[End of Lecture]