

## **SPECIAL EFFECT CASES, ANATOMY OF**

A lecture given on 23 July 1958

[Clearsound, checked against the old reels. Omissions marked „➤”.]

Thank you.

Well, I understand that you got it all fouled up again. I'm very unhappy about that because it makes me so right; I expected you would. You particularly.

Awfully dirty trick, you know, not look at anybody and...

Well, we have a lot of ground to cover here. The only difficulty with the ground we're covering is very simple; it's a very simple difficulty.

I should cover it all at once, because you need it all now! If I'd given it to you any earlier, however, it just would have been so much obfuscation.

This is the eighth lecture of the 20th ACC, July 23rd, 1958. In case you haven't come up to present time, you can do so. Anybody hearing this tape, of course, will go back to present time.

Today, unfortunately, we have to cover anatomy. This is not the basic HCA lecture on anatomy. I assume that you have some clue regarding anatomy, some faint clue. „*Anatomy*“ to you is a mass, and so anatomy is a mass.

But a thetan has the ability to have a thought anatomy as well as a mass anatomy.

That which you are handling when you go into the Rock is a very specific anatomy. We've had too many people in Dianetics and Scientology who, in teaching it, laid tremendous stress on thought.

I've already covered this yesterday - already covered it yesterday to a marked degree. People think they are thoughts. They get themselves interiorized into a bunch of data. You want to be careful you don't get it - yourself interiorized, however, into a bunch of truth, you'll blow free. But you get interiorized into a bunch of data, odds and ends;

how popguns go pop and how you mix up carbonated water with some indigestible syrup or other scientific technical goals and aims of this particular society. And they're a pack of lies.

And a fellow who gets interiorized into a bunch of data that's a pack of lies is just about a dead duck, short of Scientology. He gets very thoroughly trapped, because he says, „*This is true.*“

Well now, when somebody came along and looked at you and said, „*This is your name,*“ they told you a lie. In the first place that isn't your name, and the name you write so swiftly, easily on your examination papers as a handy identification tag reaches its furthest use in that function. It's of no use to you where Internal Revenue is concerned; only gets you in trouble. No use to you where the Federal Boys Institute is concerned; they will only tag you with the things you didn't do and avoid the things you did.

And you get this thing called identity and there is your first and most gross example of an individual becoming interiorized into data. Here is a name; it has nothing to do with the price of eggs or oranges, and you'll find people going around dramatizing this name. They are being their name; they're not being themselves at all.

Now, this is flagrant to this degree: we have to date had two people who were so thoroughly their names that nothing would happen to their cases until their names were handled. This was by old-time processing, but nevertheless quite true. Fascinating. I unfortunately can't give you the exact examples because the people are still alive and they're still Scientologists.

By the way, you can try to make too much out of your name too. That is the reverse reaction of this sort of thing.

You say, „*Well, my name is Jack. Therefore I should make lots of money.*“ Do you get the idea? Obvious, isn't it? And so forth. So people are not necessarily interiorized into their names; it just can happen.

Supposing we had somebody whose name was „*Neverrise*“ and you told him to „Come up to present time.“ Now, supposing this individual was being data, not just was being his name, but was being data; he was not himself ever, he was only data. The old Buddhist error that I have been mentioning to you: „*Man is knowledge. You are as much a thetan as you are a bunch of data.*“ Got the idea?

Well, this fellow, then, would have to have his name handled one way or the other. You always want to be alert to that factor. That is a fascinating thing because once every hundred cases you'll run into it head-on with a crash. The fellow's name is „*Neverrise*“ and you tell him to come up to present time.

Now, supposing we had somebody whose name was „*Nohelp.*“ See? „*Mr. Nohelp.*“ Well, if you don't think names can add up to such things, I invite you to inspect the phone book, look under „*surgeons*“ and find out what people have become surgeons and what their names are. It's the most fascinating thing you ever inspected! You must do this sometime. Look under „*undertakers*“ and find out what their names are.

Now, every once in a while the late Robert Ripley would put „*Bury and Grave, Undertakers, Sioux Falls, South Dakota*,“ you know, and he'd think this was very funny. Well, he'd put it in his cartoon, you know? And I don't know, it's so common that the commonness of it is funny. Not that „*Bury*“ and „*Graves*,“ two men, would team up and become undertakers. That's ordinary. And if you don't believe it's ordinary, go to the yellow pages of the phone book.

Go look up all the advertisements and look right on down the line. Look under any particular profession and you will find many. They are not the total example, don't you see? But they're sufficient to make you believe that it must be 25 or 30 percent totally because of name that they became chiropodists or something. „*Mr. Toe*,“ he's the chiropodist, you know.

Now, here's the most flagrant example of somebody becoming data; they become data. And as they become data, they are incapable of being themselves.

Now, we're not too interested in this phenomenon; it's just something for you to keep your eye on, and as a professional auditor, doing any professional auditing at all, there are several things you have to keep your eye on - several things. That, however is one of them. These things are not necessarily totally covered in the standard operating procedure; this is a sort of thing you just get to know, you know?

The other thing is eye flutter, obsessive agreement means hypnotism. That's an hypnotized person and if you don't recognize an hypnotized person when you see one, you're also going to get sunk. See, you won't get along very well.

I'm going to cover hypnotism. I can tell you what the stable datum is of hypnotism and show you why you have to be alert to an hypnotic subject who is sitting in your preclear chair. It's because hypnotism is irresponsibility and you hypnotize a person by making him admit, agree to and realize that he has no responsibility for certain things in his environment - not by trying to get him to be more responsible; you try to get him to be less responsible. And as you demonstrate to him that he is less and less responsible, why, he becomes more and more hypnotic. Here is one of those five buttons I gave you the other day on total parade: hypnotism and what you can do with an hypnotic subject.

Give you an idea, you hypnotize some subject, you tell him that the ruler you hand him is a flaming torch and tell him to shove the end of the torch into his face and burn his face. He'll do it. He'll do it as long as that torch isn't burning. He'll take responsibility for thinking it's burning; he'll take responsibility for shoving it into his face.

Similarly, you tell him to go over to the window, which is just a mock-up window with one foot between it and the floor, tell him to jump out and fall 185 stories to the ground, and he'll jump out the window.

But the moment you burn a real torch and hand it to him and tell him to shove it into his face, he comes out of it. The moment you tell him to step out a real window and fall to the ground, he comes out of it. Why?

Because he has, after all, a residual responsibility for his own safety. And as long as you don't actually mess up his own responsibility, as long as you can keep him in a totally irresponsible area, he'll remain hypnotized.

That's actually all you need to know about hypnotism. You could work the whole subject out and know far more about it than the Indians, Mesmer, Charcot, or any of the rest of the boys, who were around „*Svengali-ing*“ the human race.

All right. Now, these are just isolated little manifestations of one kind or another which do clear up in auditing, but if you are smart you will see them, and you will see them clearly.

Fellow sits down. It's always a good thing to look at the name. You don't have to examine the preclear very thoroughly, just run kind of automatically and audit him for an hour. You don't have to really look at him. But it's a good thing to at least look at his name at the top of his APA and IQ and any other papers that you have on him and just see at least what his name is, that at least. Because if it's „*Mr. Nohelp*“ or it's „*Mr. Irresponsibility*“ or it's „*Mr. Sergeant Major*“ or something, you are liable to be running into an un-auditable situation by reason of name, or you're liable to run into a „*special effects*.“

We have special effects men out in Hollywood. Well, names can be special effect things too! „*Mr. Cry*“ will weep, and you, you poor fellow, you poor girl will sit there and say, „*We're really getting somewhere on this case because he is weeping and he's gotten rid of a lot of charge on the case.*“ Five, six months later it dawns on you the reason why the fellow never got well, never recovered at all, was because you were auditing „*Mr. Cry*.“ See, that's a special effects and because they are the datum, a name, they will turn on special effects. Do you see that?

All right. Now, the other thing, if a person is so irresponsible that he is hypnotic, of course, he can't take responsibility for any part of the session except maybe to agree with you. He could take responsibility for agreeing, and you could run Responsibility directly on agreeing and blow him out of an hypnotic trance the like of which nobody dreamed of being able to do a year or two ago. Fascinating, see?

But why can't you get anywhere with just routine techniques on a special effects case? Hypnotized, being data - why can't you?

Because here is an obvious button standing in your road as far as recovery of the case is concerned. Given the fact that you are a good auditor, given the fact that you are actually able to lay it right down the line on the subject of the TRs, you'd never have an ARC break with this fellow, you'd always address, find and handle his PT problem, given these things - let's just take these skills for granted.

Now, there are some other things that can get so thoroughly in your road, that you yourself will start to invalidate yourself and say, „*I am not getting any further along the line and I am just not making headway and I must be slipping somewhere.*“ Well, the only place you could be slipping is in the special effects department.

He's hypnotized: the only possible process that you could run on him would be Responsibility. It wouldn't matter whether you started the session or ended the session or anything else. As long as you got in there with some Responsibility.

And you might have to clear the word; the word might even be totally unreal to this person. It's very interesting to watch an hypnotic person wake up; been hypnotized for years and years and years and years and years and they start waking up on this one. They've been going around in a total trance.

You say, „*Invent a being. Tell me his ideas of responsibility.*“ If the person is hypnotized, every single one of those ideas will be quite bad, upsetting, so forth.

And they invent a being. „*What is his idea of responsibility?*“

„*Oh, well, he wants to get everybody under his thumb and crush everyone.*“ Now, that's almost too sensible for an answer.

„*What is his ideas of responsibility?*“

„*Well, bolts of cloth.*“ Buy it as an answer; that's as close as a person who is as bad off could get to a sensible answer on responsibility. It's just totally beyond them.

The gain of a case is a gradient scale of taking responsibility for themselves and existence. And unless that increases, nothing else is going to increase, so you have the special effects which knocks out the button.

Now, I've given you the name, and I've given you hypnotism for another reason than this. So could there be a suppressor on each one of the five buttons - each one of the five.

Now this special effects fellow is a zero-creation person. If you were over in Dublin, you would know what I was talking about. You have never seen anybody anywhere in America or England with the kind of ideas on the subject of creation that you find in Dublin.

You can get in darn near a fistfight with people sitting in a PE course, just by mentioning the word „*create.*“ I've seen somebody clearing definitions on people in a PE course in Dublin.

- One of the reasons the Dublin office was wheeling as long as it was is I found it terribly incomprehensible, rather amusing and a question of how far south could it get. Anything that worked in that office would work like a breeze anyplace else.

Now it's - I'm not being sarcastic about Dublin. This country was originally oppressed by continual piracy against its coasts. It's been all torn up one way or the other. One time it was probably a more fruitful, richer country than Scotland and England, but that certainly was an awfully long time ago. And the people who are there now are under tremendous economic duress and this all by itself is quite upsetting. Further, they're under a tremendous religious duress, and this itself is quite upsetting. So they've got two buttons gone, which then tend to make the rest of them disappear.

Religious duress, their ideas of creation - you can actually start a fistfight with trying to clear the definition with a group in Dublin on the subject of create - just trying to clear that definition of „*create*.“ They all sit back there and swear that you're being blasphemous. They have an immediate reaction against you because you mentioned the word.

And these people are all special effects cases - special effects. Lord, you have to wind your wandering way through the awfulest maze and morass and labyrinth of special effects when you're auditing somebody in that area who is of the lower case level bracket.

- Of course there are people in Dublin who are quite well cultured and educated and all the rest of that. I'm talking about the longshoreman and the rest of the people who just come into class and sit down, you know, wow.

When creation goes out the window, everything else tends to. It's the senior button of all of this; it is the senior button of the five. But when it starts out the window it shatters something or some part of one or more of the remaining four. And the buttons which we're discussing are, of course, Change, Problem, Help, Create, Responsibility, in that order.

The special effects case can't create, but that's true of every case: his creation is unlimited. But it is (capital T) true of the person who goes back against creation. You say „*create*“ to him and he goes... You can be sure he's being his name or he's being his job or he's being a datum. He certainly is not being alive.

So it is that as each one of these buttons is knocked out or suppressed, you get a specialized category with no adequate case gain as a result.

People who are shattered on the subject of Change are hard to audit. Maybe the rest of them are apparently all right, but Change is going to influence the other four. But Change is so pinned down that you could just sit there forever, practically, and go through motions and have nothing happen. And, of course, you can understand and you could possibly write an interesting essay on how Change influenced the other four buttons; you could figure it out one way or the other.

But the point is, we start right into a case on Change and if Change is held down - wow!

Now, I'll tell you how a person gets that way: He can be keyed in in this lifetime, versus all earlier bad situations on the subject of Change. He can be keyed in simply by being moved all over the place. That's one way and that would be a clue you would have on the subject; the fellow was going to be a rough Change case. See? He's been moved-moved-moved-moved-moved-moved-moved-moved. Never let - nobody ever let him stay still at any time; they changed his location, changed his location, changed his location. Never stop, never stop.

This will tell you an awful lot of other things. It'll tell you that he has upsets about friends. Obviously, every time he'd leave a place he'd lose all of his friends and he'd have to make friends in some new place, and then he'd have to leave that place.

Navy brats and army brats are definitely suspect in this particular department; they've been moved all over. Diplomatic children, that sort of thing.

Somebody who was an itinerant worker - let's go down scale - and had kids and dragged them all over the country in a trailer and that sort of thing. As soon as you see a tremendous - lot of change in location in the present-life history of a case, then you can suspect the person is resisting change and will take a long time in auditing. Got that? Now that comes under this special effects department.

Your next: Problems - Problems. The fellow, let us say, is a mathematician. Well, if you know this preclear is a mathematician and you go on and run Problems of Comparable Magnitude or „*What part of that problem could you be responsible for?*“ you ought to be shot, because you're wrong!

This man has some specialized stupidity on the subject of problems. He tackles every problem on an innumerable series of vias. All problems are symbols. There's nothing real about a problem. What's a problem to him? Well, if he's a professional mathematician, it's very improbable that he would be clean as far as this definition of him I'm giving. I'm not condemning him as a professional mathematician; I'm just showing he's a special effects case.

He could sit down and get the square root of a third of an arc, he could trisect the hypotenuse with a few deft lines, but in most cases, for God's sakes, never ask him to go up and see Johnny's teacher because Johnny's having trouble. He usually could just walk right out of the house with the house on fire; that's quite characteristic of somebody whose profession is problems. Yeah. That wouldn't be a problem to him. The problem is how do you trisect an arc?

And you say, „*Do you have any problems?*“

And he says, „*No.*“ And the needle doesn't budge because he's being totally correct. He isn't working with mathematics at the time you're auditing him, so of course he doesn't have a problem. Do you see how this would be? He's a special effects, special category, special definition.

Now, if he's pretty sane as a mathematician, this doesn't much get in his road. But if he's totally plowed in and is being obsessively mathematical, man, brick walls are thin compared to the barriers this puts on a case. And every time you try to audit him he runs into one of these brick walls called „*solution*“ and he's liable to work it all out in terms of a symbol and come to some equated answer that doesn't have anything to do with the price of oysters in Chesapeake Bay. Nada - not the faintest. Problems are not real; they are a special thing. Got that?

All right, let's look at this next one: Help. And we have a special effects case, and this special effects case is simply this: a nurse. Oh, man, you're going to run Help on a nurse just like that without doing anything else? What are you, goofy or something!

You just proceeded along beautifully; you got through Change, you got through Problems, so you said, „*This person is auditing beautifully and therefore we don't have to take any more notice of the case, and we can just wheel on through to the end of the line and that's that.*“ And

they go thud on Help. Why? They're professional help. A Scientologist only has this single held-down button as a class of people. See, that is their class button: Help. And it's quite interesting. It's quite interesting. They're professionals and they have been for a very long time. It wasn't just this time that they got into Dianetics and Scientology, see? See, they dramatized the whole thing up the line, and some people who are having a hard time learning Dianetics and Scientology are simply swapping horses!

You see, the compulsive impulse to help people is simply a method by which they can continue to be an apothecary. After all, all of your pharmacist's certificates and everything else have been withdrawn from you. They might as well have been thrown in the coffin with the last body. So that road is blocked, but it is a good way to help people.

So, you get a Scientologist, now and then, who is on a substitution. Now, he wouldn't be in Scientology if he were totally on a substitution, got that? You have to give the guy a break to that degree, see? He wouldn't be there if he was totally on a substitution.

A psychologist in this lifetime has been found who was on a total substitution, and he wasn't learning anything because he was two substitutes removed from where he was trying to go.

The first substitute was psychology and then he was trying to understand psychology through Scientology. But what was he trying to understand through psychology? Well, he was no longer able to put his hands on mass, and so this lifetime he couldn't practice as a veterinarian. But he surreptitiously could put his hands on a brain as a psychologist, you see?

This guy was all wound up. His button oddly enough was „*animals*,“ „*an injured animal*.“ Well, I don't know what that's got to do with Scientology to amount to anything because we're not auditing any animals, so he was very, very unhappy about the whole deal. He had to have all of his goals reoriented.

Well, this is a professional, occupational button as far as a Scientologist is concerned, because even if he were new and fresh in this lifetime at helping people, as he went plowing down the track handling the dynamite that makes men die, he'd sooner or later get himself keyed in someplace or another on some other time he was trying to help people.

- Now, Scientologists all wince from being a minister, so that is a safe one to ask the E-meter about. Alright. Once again we have special effects, right? Alright.

All right, let's go into this thing called Create, and here we get the master button. I'm very sorry that we don't have three, four hours of lecture here today because I - really, you ought to come right on up the line here on all of this dope that you are working with right this minute.

But here we go. This thing called Create is the senior button of all other buttons, so that anything creative can be suspect and this is really what you're going for when you're trying to find the Rock.



The whole Rock sequence hangs in under this button Create. And you might say that the Rock - as important as it is, and as it seems to pervade everything else you're doing - is subordinate merely to the Create button in this chain of five because it's obsessive and compulsive creation which is being inhibited.

All right. We'll go into some more of that in just a moment. Now, I can say here that you should be suspicious of, then, when you're looking for the Rock, above everything else, all creative professions, actions or objects. And you'll get faster going along asking about sculpture than you will asking about the time they were a streetcar conductor, you know.

All those buttons come under - each one has its own particular route, but the Rock is under this Create, and that's all it's under.

Now, this next thing is called Responsibility. If you want to be sure, always round off a process with Responsibility. If you want to be sure, test the sincerity of responsibility and definitions of, of a preclear.

After you've run Help - after you've run Help on a red ruby, if you want to be sure, don't buy Westinghouse, run Responsibility. „*What part of a red ruby could you be responsible for?*“ You just want to dust that thing off the rest of the way. Why?

Most auditing is looked upon by the preclear as a new system of blame. And it's not. And all a preclear is really doing when he racks around on the track is finding new things to blame. But in view of the fact that, particularly in his own mind, he created them, he's blaming his own creations, therefore he's denying himself thoroughly and he's the best person to invalidate self that you could ever find. You could never find anything more thorough in invalidation of self than the preclear himself.

So when he starts wracking around the track, he really is trying to find things to blame. „*Is this what caused my aberration?*“ is his primary question.

When you start looking for the Rock, you run into this one directly: „*Is this what caused it? Is that what caused it?*“ Caused it, be damned! You caused it! The only thing that's wrong with it is you don't know it. Cause has very little to do with it, but knowing about it certainly does.

As a matter of fact this is sufficient that you could say, really, if there was ever to be found a sixth button, it would be „*unknowingness*.“ But in view of the fact that Not-know processes don't at once lead to Clear, because the Not-know has a lower harmonic of the inhibitor, and every time you start auditing the inhibitor, you start uncovering creations that he's making obsessively and the creation gets brighter and they knock the preclear's silly head off. He's silly because he's mocking something up with a battle-axe in its hand, and as you uncover the inhibitor, you move the battle-axe figure a little bit on time, and just as surely as some of these automatons that strike gongs when it's 12 o'clock, the battle-axe will come right on through.

Don't expect, of course, that a preclear's head will be found in a very short time lying on the floor if the battle-ax passes through his neck, but also, don't be surprised if it does. If you find the pc's head on the floor because he cut his own head off with a

mocked-up battle-axe, don't be at all surprised. You'll have the satisfaction of knowing that he did it.

Now, to get back to Responsibility - get back to Responsibility - assignment of blame, or assignment of cause sometimes makes the preclar the effect and where the assignment of cause is creative cause, the preclar of course can become the effect of it one way or the other. The picture, however, is not as grim as you would suppose. But certainly Irresponsibility is a senior button to Knowingness and Not-knowingness, because you might say that Irresponsibility is only not-knowing about it. See, that's the primary irresponsibility.

How do you become irresponsible for something? Well, you just forget it. It's even a cliché in English. Guy has a flat tire, takes his best girl out, got a flat tire. Eh-eh. So he says, „*Forget it. We'll walk up the road and get something to eat at the diner and have a date anyway,*“ and just leaves the car sitting there. Get the idea of that? It's being irresponsible for the object during that period of time. See?

So you might say that not-knowingness is a method of irresponsibility. Irresponsibility is how people get into knowingness and not-knowingness. People don't get into irresponsibility because they knew and not-knew. Do you see this? Why?

Running Responsibility turns off and on the phenomena of know and not-know. Running Know and Not-know often doesn't influence the factor of responsibility at all. So which is the highest?

This is quite amazing for a fellow to realize, since we've been told and told and told all down through the years by every sect and religion and wise man, soothsayer - oh, for billions, trillions of years! I mean this thing has been in this universe: „*Knowingness is all.*“ See? Knowingness isn't all at all. It's Responsibility; Responsibility is above Knowingness and it is a button from which a preclar will flinch as though you have just presented him with a red-hot eye-puncher-outer. He'll really flinch from that one.

Anything which turns on and off something else could be said to be senior to it. The light switch is not necessarily more important than the light, but it certainly is the thing which monitors and controls the lights. That is not a good analogy because a light switch is not primary. It's of course, the electricity coming over the lines or is it the dynamo in the local light plant, or is it the coal, or is it the plants that decided to live in some long-forgotten past that made the coal? And we get into merely the total association which this universe presents you with at every hand.

Well, a case gets jammed up into this total association and he feels he can't be responsible for all of it. He sometimes makes an heroic effort and decides to be responsible for all of it because if he doesn't he'll have some vast consequence. That's also a cute one that you'll run into in auditing.

The fellow is saying, „*Well, I could be responsible for this. I'd better be!*“ he's really saying to himself. „*I'd certainly better be responsible for this and better be responsible for that because if I don't I'll get a psychosomatic illness and I won't be Clear.*“ You know, consequence-consequence-consequence. That's a low, enforced responsibility.

And nevertheless, as that light switch is senior to the lights in terms of causation, so is Responsibility senior to Knowingness and Not-knowingness, and this I say into the teeth of all of the soothsayers that ever soothed.

Yes, it releases if you know about it. Neh-heh! But how do you know about it? You be responsible for some part of it and it's liable to leap, full armed, into your teeth. And for a little while, you wish you damn well didn't know about it because it turns on a lot of somatics and it's a lot of grief and it's a lot of upset; and if you go over the hill and a little bit higher up the line on the thing, a little bit more responsibility turns on a little bit more knowingness.

Searching for data is not as reliable a method of obtaining facts as taking responsibility for the object you wish to know about. If you don't believe it, take a little kid sometime and show him a machine and if he can at all grasp this concept of responsibility, get him to take responsibility for various parts of the machine and then listen to him tell you what the machine is all about.

Now, education is that system of giving people data without making them responsible for any of it. And you get a data trap and we are right straight back to Change again, aren't we? We are right back to the beginning of the parade.

Now, an individual who will not take responsibility cannot change, and a person who cannot change cannot handle any problems, and a person who can't handle problems certainly can't help, and a person who can't help anything certainly won't create. And a person who can't or won't create is doing so because he can't or won't take responsibility for the actions and parades of his creations. So this little thing goes round and round and round in an endless cycle.

One button runs into the next button, runs into the next button, runs into the next button, runs into the next button.

And now we're going to get back to anatomy which was what I told you about. I've been talking to you about the thought anatomy of a case.

The anatomy of a thetan is: thought products. See? He is self-thought products. Got that?

His products can be additional thoughts. But when we say „*products*“ we mean in essence that which everybody else considers a „*product*“ which contains space, energy, mass and exists in time. And every product which you see anywhere was developed by a thetan.

Now, I have talked about a special effects case so that you would understand what you're up against when you try to disentangle a case and find yourself a special effects case as an auditor. You as the auditor are being a special effects case when you will not confront the mass, space, energy, time products of a thetan.

So that the more you get into the ideas, the more you get into the complexities of thought, the more sold you get on the idea that you can avoid matter, energy, space and time. And you start figure-figuring as a special effects character, you're using thinkingness when you ought to use a shovel! Because mass is not a product of

thought! Someday, somebody will hear that and boy, will he become a whiz-bang as an auditor!

People have believed on this track for Lord knows how long that, „*If you thought a thought you got a mass.*“ Now, I took this up yesterday. No! No! Think a mass! See? Think a mass, don't think a thought to think a mass!

„*Now, I am going to put up a wall. Now, wall, appear.*“ And it appears. And you say, „*See, it appeared because I put up a thought.*“ Damn, it didn't! You went through all this mumbo jumbo and then you thought a wall!

Christian Science tells you that there is no mass nowhere, noplac, nohow.

- And I say it ungrammatically to express my contempt. All is infinite mind and mind is thought, and if you think right thoughts, everything goes to hell. Now, I never really sneer at other people's beliefs, I only sneer at their facility to believe lies.

Now, here we've got a good one - here we've got a good one. It says, „*Avoid all mass.*“ It said, „*The masses will all right themselves properly if we just think the right thoughts.*“ That's at least the impression people get out of it.

Now, please, as a Scientologist, don't follow that same route - please - because the route doesn't exist in Scientology. Read the Axioms. In Scientology, mass is; it is. It isn't whether it's real or not real or exists because of you or exists because you thought it up or any other nonsense; it simply is. And someday if you can just get this through somebody's skull - that it simply is. See? It isn't there because. Do you get the idea? It isn't there because you are hypnotized into believing that it is solid or...

Look at all these silly vias, see. There are just vias, vias, vias; they're going all over the place. You know? Anything to escape the idea of responsibility for being able to think mass! Do you recognize this as a primary irresponsibility?

You see? It is. That's all you'd have to say about it, you see? It's too horribly simple. It isn't a delusion, you see; it is itself. It isn't a belief you have; it is itself. It isn't even an agreement; it simply is. Now, if you can untangle this, never thereafter will mass on a case, particularly the Rock, confuse you. You'll never be confused about the Rock.

The Rock isn't a belief, see, or an agreement or anything else - it simply is! And it - isness creates resistance electronically which reads on a meter.

Now, you could take something and say, „*It is*“ and then come along and say „*Squash! It is not,*“ and have yourself the most beautiful hash you ever tried to get indigestion from.

People are coming along religiously and saying, „*Everything is simply a belief*“ or so on. Wow! Boy, did they take havingness away from anybody. I think that's one of the most expert games of can't-have I ever saw played.

Fellow comes down the street and he gathers a bunch of people together and „*You see all this stuff? Huh. It isn't.*“

And they say „No?“ And they say, „Well, we're willing to be irresponsible for the stuff.“ My, my, watch it fade out!

All you do is have to slap an inhibitor on it and it's there and it's suppressed from being there. We call this not-ness in the Axioms - makes you kind of - funny when you think about it.

Time isn't existing, either, by a mechanism. Time does not exist by a mechanism. Time just is. This stuff rolls along. To have time you have to be able to accept change. Well, that's fine, but time is. Do you get this trap? See? Time is.

Now, in order to accept what is, in other words, in order to not not-is it, you have to have a tolerance for it, and that's all you'll ever improve in as far as mass, energy, space and time is concerned. You improve his tolerance of it.

How do you improve his tolerance of it? You make him take responsibility for it. How do you do that? By demonstrating to him that it is within his creative range, that he can tolerate change and other special effects immediately surrounding this immediate fact of is.

Now all we've done is discover the ways he gets out of the idea of is. Those ways he gets out of admitting things are, are these five buttons. Do you get the idea? But one of them is a direct is. But he can get so confused and via'd by it, that it is a primary method of escape from responsibility.

He said, „God created it all and I had nothing to do with it whatsoever. God created all of it. I had nothing to do with it. Not even one tiny little atom of any part of this universe has anything to do with me. I'm author of none of it. Bury me deeply out over the green prairie.“

Do you conceive that a mental image picture is any part of a human body or can join itself in any way to a human body or modify it in any way, or add any mass to it in any way? Do you think this is possible?

Well, look - look, there is an isness, isn't it? And the body's in the universe, isn't it? Now, we don't even have to conceive the idea of it being buried and going away to „dust is to dust.“ See? It is in the universe right now; it doesn't join the universe by dying or any other cockeyed way. You see? It just is. Well, if it's having any mass added to it at all by the concepts of a thetan then he has added something to the creative fact of isness of the physical universe. Do you see that clearly?

So he isn't sitting over here all independent of it and some Throgmagog someplace or another... The earliest concepts of this are not Christian; they are not Indian either, but on earth here you'll find them in the earliest Vedic writings, the earliest written record of these things of which I know anything, that you can verify at the local library.

It didn't come from some exterior source totally. Now, nobody asked anybody to suddenly accept the idea that he himself personally is making the whole universe and is the only one doing it. That's a rather steep gradient scale. But one does look askance on the exact reverse of that: that he has nothing to do with creating any part of it.

And that is as extreme and as unworkable and as incorrect as saying that you personally are the only one who makes it all and you are making it all, right this minute and nobody else has anything to do with it. Now, you see that's kind of a nutty remark, isn't it? You don't even vaguely have any idea of what the Chinese have to be continued to be mocked up as lately. You see, you're falling short there just a little bit.

But get the idea that you'd have to be responsible for not only the continuous actions of but the continuous mock-up of all of China, their customs, costumes and if you look at a Chinese street with 10,000 people on a short block, you get an idea of the number of bodies and the amount of confusion. And each one of these is individually being created by you simultaneously in all directions at the same instant. Don't you think it's kind of an extreme accusation to make? Huh?

Well, it's just as extreme to say there's a god someplace that does it all and you do none of it. See? They can be equally incorrect. I think the least God would do - to enlist your aid a little bit here and there.

Now, as we go along the lines, as we go along the lines here, we discover then that it's easy to get a case to concentrate on these five buttons in their state of vias and rather hard to get the case to concentrate on such things as the isness of. Pretty hard, but you can sneak up on it. You can swing in on it. You can bring him to a realization of it - by processing.

And the only thing you're trying to get him to realize: that he's creating something he doesn't even know he's creating, in his mind, called the Rock. And your goal is isness, not thinkingness.

Responsibility for the isness of the Rock: No Rock! See, bang! Bang! That's all the process there is. Reductio to zero. See, that's all the process there is.

Recognize the existence of the Rock, take responsibility for the existence of the Rock: No Rock - boom! Boom! Fast Clear; that'd be the end of that.

Now, it's how steep a gradient can you attempt per preclear that establishes the length of time in clearing. The goal is to recognize the isness of the Rock.

Now, the goal of OT is to recognize, accept and continue to create the eight dynamics, his share of. Ha-ha! That's a little bit different, isn't it? So an OT's goal also contains a recognition of the isness of.

And one might say that as you plow out the significance, you plow in the sanity. And as people are so reasonable, you find it almost impossible to knock on the door of some of their buttons; they are so reasonable that they could explain them all away with what gorgeousness.

The service fac is simply a method of explaining them all away and that's in plain sight. So the first thing you run into is the service fac.

And under that service fac, you have locks, locks. And locks are simply moments of restimulation of the basic engram of which the preclear is to some degree aware. They're light; they don't contain pain and unconsciousness, but they take, from the

basic engram on any chain, their force from the pain and unconsciousness in that basic chain. Got that? So, that's the next thing you run into, is lock.

And then you'll run into some secondaries. What's a „secondary“? A secondary is the emotional response derived from a mental image picture of a moment of pain and unconsciousness. That's a secondary. A secondary contains misemotion - grief, anger, extreme apathy, degradation, which is just an exaggerated apathy. It could also contain below apathy, and at the moment you look at the preclear and he's not crying if he has a secondary to the Rock which is tears, I can tell you very bluntly that he is below tears as he sits there in the chair in present time feeling all right.

Now, we're auditing so fast these days that we don't necessarily run through tears. The secondary is liable to blow without being dramatized. It also might get dramatized.

But below this secondary, this misemotional picture or series of pictures, you get physical experiences, mismanaged isnesses, which contain pain and unconsciousness which have huge irresponsibilities connected with them, and he doesn't even know about it at the time.

That's the anatomy of the Rock; and the engrams, the secondaries, the locks and the service fac contain personnel associated with the computation. Therefore you run into incidents - time, the isness of time. You run into energy, the disintegration of masses, at one time fairly perfect and shaped up. Also the inhibitors. In other words, you run into chaotic energy flows of one kind or another. Therefore you run into actual space; there is space trapped in this series of incidents, these actual things. There is space there.

There is also, of course, mass. And all of these things are present in this chain. And all the five buttons are to some degree functional on this chain.

And what you're looking for is a terminal, not an idea. What you're looking for is a mental image picture, not one created by a thought. You see, you're looking for it is. He may have a squash on it that says it is not. You start taking this squasher off of it and boy, is it!

You're looking for terminals; you're looking for actual existences. There is something there, it is!

And so don't you Q-and-A with your own bank and go on looking for thinkingnesses and data and the other things I've been talking about, because those are simply via approaches to the isness of what is.

Your pc wants the form he's got or something related to it, and the thing he is creating obsessively and doesn't know anything about is modifying the form he is creating and that includes the form of his own life and possessions.

And you have two isnesses in counterpoise which are totally in conflict and they won't agree. So noncomputational things come flying off the case; problems come off of the case like mad. All kinds of things come off of the case because you have two counterposed isnesses that never get along together.

So look for the isness and blow it out.

And in diagnosis, it's particularly true that you can't lose if you realize that what you're looking for exists.

Thank you.

[End of lecture.]