FLOWS

A lecture given on
1 February 1962

Thank you. And here we are at the what?

Audience: February 1st.

Oh, we've got the Feb. We finally moved into the Feb. The "Febs" are after us now. All right, 1 Feb. 62, Saint Hill Special Briefing Course.

And today – today we have a great deal to take up, but I forgot my notes. I wrote a bulletin in a rush today, and it's all in the bulletin, so the bulletin of 1 Feb. has something to do with what I'm going to talk to you about which is flows.

What is a withhold? A withhold is not a flow.

What's this?

A withhold is the unwillingness of the pc to talk to the auditor or tell him something, because a person can withhold about a flow.

So you actually have a withhold, which is what you're working on, as a "don't know." And you're working with the subject of knowingness when you are working of, "What have you done that the world does not know about, that you don't know about, that other people don't know about, and especially me, your auditor, what don't I know about?"

With withholds you're talking about knowingness. But this knowingness is tremendously influenced by the subject of flows. So when you say "withhold" in Scientologese, you actually mean something that the person does not wish the world, others, all dynamics and his auditor to *know* about. Or it has not occurred to him to tell the auditor or he is *incapable* or finds it *impossible* or is utterly *prohibited* from advising anybody else about it. Now, that is a withhold.

And oddly enough, a pc can withhold about flows. So get these two different things sort of disentangled, because all flows can be a withhold. And if you get flows gorgeously mixed up with withholds, you're sunk.

A withhold is knowingness. Now, I'm straining a point here. I'm straining a point to elicit your understanding of what you are doing as an auditor.

A person who is restraining something from being known is withholding, but basically it is knowledge that he is *withholding.* He's withholding knowledge, information and data. And you can put a withhold, as we're using it in Scientologese, under the heading, you see, of data and knowingness. That is a withhold. So restrained data and knowingness is a withhold, right?

Now, oddly enough, any one of the flows can assist, aid or abet a withhold because knowledge can be buried under the flow. You see what we're up against here? We've got a datum and let us say it is a white pebble. And we can cause various flows over the top of and away from and over and back to and so forth, this white pebble, to a point where it becomes totally obscured. See, we can just fix it up so that every time anybody starts to look at the white pebble, a flow starts. And then the individual has the sensation that he mustn't tell about it or something of the sort.

We therefore have a datum or knowingness which we call withholds and the next step and stage of this is the attitude toward flows. And then we have flows.

Now, all of this can be somewhat carelessly condensed under the heading and subject of flows. But I don't want you to remain totally in ignorance of the fact that the thing is compartmented.

We've got attitudes toward flows. Now, actually there are only two flows. Given any one point or any two points, that is, location and space, you only have two flows possible for any one of those points. And one is outflow and the other is inflow. Elementary, my dear Watson. That's all that's going to happen. You can only have outflows and inflows where flows are concerned.

Now, the thing that causes flows is the motionlessness or the fixedness of the point. So flows are regulated as flowing out and flowing into, from fixed points. Now, the point may or may not have a mass. All power, speaking now of electrical power, is derived from holding two positions in space. That is electrical power. It is the base of the motor. I call to mind 8-80. And it is the base of the motor. It isn't the armature nor the electrician nor his plans. Nor is it yet the diesel oil that is poured into the engine that does something or other. If you didn't have this first fundamental, you could have nothing else. And the first fundamental of power, electrical energy and power, is of course two fixed points in space. And whatever gives power has to have a base that keeps these two points separate. And to the degree that these two points can be kept separate, you can generate power, electrical power.

Now, if you had two little copper wires that were just stood up in space, one in one location and one in another location. And they're just stood up, you know. They're not braced at all. And they're stood up there with sticky plaster or something of the sort. And you took an armature and you developed a thousand horsepower of rotation between these two things, you

see, you wouldn't be able to do it. They simply – the two wires would simply collapse into the armature and that would be it. Does that follow? You see?

You turn an armature there and you'll get these two wires falling in on each other. No, it requires a couple of pretty doggone big poles between the thing that is cutting the space between them, you see. And they've got to be very strongly fixed and the strength with which they're fixed has everything to do with the amount of horsepower or electrical current or kilowatts or anything else that can be generated between these two points. Do you see that?

Now, this gives you an idea of how *fixed* some of the points must be in a pc's bank to actually generate flows between them.

Now, as a person gets (quote) weaker (unquote) he is no longer able to hold two points in space. And he gets masses. Masses are collapsed locations. Therefore, asking somebody to locate things in space will generate flows.

Now, if you run Havingness long enough on just this simple command, "Point out something," you're – you'll start running into flows.

Now, you didn't realize that when you are running a pc, you actually should probably have an electrician's or an electrical engineer's license. You probably didn't realize that. But we're going to require this from all medical doctors who wish to practice on the mind. They have to have an electrical engineer's license because they frankly are handling a power plant.

Now, when the pc was no longer able to keep Keokuk separate from Sioux Falls in his mind, he has an identification between Sioux Falls and Keokuk. All right. Now, we're talking totally about the mechanics of space, don't you see.

When he couldn't keep his mother away from his father, he got an identification between his mother and his father. Do you see this? So identification is actually identifications of location in space. Foremost, of course, way above all this level of mechanics, you have knowingness and postulates and all the rest of that, but I – we won't stress that point particularly. You recognize that a thetan's mechanics derive from his postulates. And even this universe and its space derive from his postulates and considerations. But we're not going to bother with that right now. We're talking about this electric eel that you're handling

And Keokuk and Sioux Falls are the same town. And then they become no town at all. They disappear as a location in space because he can do nothing to them or about them. His causation over Keokuk is zero. If he ever went inside the city limits of Keokuk, the police, he knows, would immediately scoop him up and throw him in the hoosegow and chew him up and hand him over probably to the hamburger mill to be fed to the wolves or something He's sure of this and he can't do anything He knows he cannot do anything to Sioux Falls. Sioux Falls can do all kinds of things to him, but he can't do anything to Sioux Falls, don't you see?

So he's total effect of Keokuk. He's total effect of Sioux Falls. He couldn't place anything in Keokuk and he can't place anything in Sioux Falls and you'll find these two towns are identified in him. And you say, "Where did you live early in your life?"

And he says, "Well," he said, "I've lived in um – uh – Keokuk – Sioux F – Sioux – uh – Keok – Keok – um – Sioux Keokuk. No, Sioux Falls. No, Keokuk, yeah. No, I was in Keokuk when I was eight or nine and then uh – I was in Sioux Falls when I was five or six. No, no, no, no. I was in Sioux Falls when I was eight or nine and in Keokuk. . . No, I was in Boston that whole time."

Have you ever watched a pc trying to place something Well, just exactly that. Consider it just exactly that. He's trying to place something on the time track. Well, he's also trying to place its location in space. And when he can't do this, he gets a confusion between the two and therefore you get this principle of identification. The basic principle of identification, that's what you're dealing with here.

You realize that all aberrations and identifications A=A=A=A. All right. Book One. You realize also that the pc's ability to differentiate amongst two objects regulates to a large degree his state of sanity. You realize also that when he can no longer differentiate, but tries to, he does it compulsively and you get a thing called disassociate. So that he can locate nothing, he simply disperses off of everything he tries to locate. See? So two things or three things or six million things all become one thing. And then they become one thing to such a degree that they cease to exist. In other words, he can't even spot the one thing and you have forgettingness or lack of memory. These are the mechanics of the memory.

All right. He said, "Well, I was in Keokuk between – I was five and six except at Sioux Falls uh – except that was eight or nine. No, that was another lifetime."

When you get this kind of thing going around and around, it sinks just one step lower. For lack of identification, he can't place it at all and you have – he can't identify. He can't even identify himself with Sioux Falls, Keokuk or the mass now that Sioux Falls and Keokuk have become in the bank. And that submerges out of view and you no longer have any ability of any kind to remember Sioux Falls, Keokuk or anything else. And that is the condition most past lives are in. The fellow has lost all of his power over that life and the cities and locations of that life and so he forgets that life. And that is all there is to it.

Now, of course, you understand that everything I'm telling you has nothing to do with postulates, considerations, attitudes. It's just simply the mechanics of how a thetan goes nuts. These are the – these are the electrical phenomena connected with going nuts.

Factually, you see, he forgets everything to get even. I don't know if you realize that. He ceases to be able to place things in order to make another effect. The fact of the matter is that a thetan never gets into a situation where he is not making an effect. He's always trying. Axiom 10 is always in with full throttle. You should know that about a thetan because it'll

save you a lot of worry from time to time. You just remember that remark. It's a more important remark than you believe – that a thetan *never* gives up, *never*.

Forgetting is just a way of getting even. That's all. If you don't believe that sometime, ask somebody, "Who would be influenced by your forgetting about . . . ?" whatever his chronic somatic is and you're liable to get an evaporation of the chronic somatic. You know, just trying to hold the idea of getting even by forgetting is liable to cause a vanishment of a chronic somatic or a change of his case.

This thing is susceptible to lots of proof. There are lots of demonstrations on this. But of course, we're talking now up in the zone and level of postulates, considerations, intentions and all that sort of thing and I'm lecturing to you on electrical phenomena. Don't lose sight of the other, but know that electrical phenomena can be treated as a separate field all by itself

And you can do rather marvelous things with just electrical phenomena. "Point out something" He locates the cupboard and the fireplace and the floor and the ceiling. *He is* locating them, see? The fact that he is locating them tends to generate power and all of sudden his bank sort of goes *whuzwhuz,* and he gets a funny feeling back of his eyes, and his chest sort of feels odd, and then he feels kind of tingly all over. And, you know, as he's running "Point out something" – if that's his Havingness Process and that thing is working – why, he'll get all these electrical phenomena and those are *flows.*

Now, at the border between *flows* and intention, we have intention about flows. Now, that sounds awfully *odd,* but intention about flows. You see, you really only have outflow and inflow until you mix it up with trying to do something with the flows.

Now, completely aside from the electrical phenomena and the blown fuses and so forth and the collapsed motor bases and so on in the pc's bank (completely aside from this) we move a little bit higher – you see, we only have outflow and inflow as possible flows – we have his attitude toward those flows. And it's right there at that very tiny little borderline that you can produce some interesting fireworks on a case, because you're at the band between electrical phenomena and knowingness. And that band is his attitude toward flows.

Of course, some people's attitude toward flows is there ain't any. We'll neglect that attitude at the moment. And we'll see here that there's only outflow and inflow and the speed of the flow and the magnitude of the flow. I mean, that's the only flow that a points could have. There aren't any other flows. But now, a thetan, he gets to thinking about it and he decides that he will *regulate* these flows and all these flows have regulations. So his knowing-ness is applied to the flow.

In other words, his intention is applied to the flows. And his intention about flows gives us at once, factually, several intentions of which only a few are important to us in solving cases. But the first band of intention about flows . . . Now, you see, we've got just the motor and the thingamabobs and the whatnots, but now we have a living being who has

intentions about these things. They outflow and they inflow. He's got intentions about them. All right. And we apply the CDEI Scale somewhat expanded and a little bit explained. Curiosity, Desire, Enforce, Inhibit – the old CDEI Scale moves in here.

Now, to get a thetan's intentions delineated with regard to outflow and inflow, we apply the lower version of the CDEI Scale. We don't say, "desire." We say, "permissible." Because that's an okay flow. A "so what" flow. That's an "all right" flow, you see. For lack of a better word, we'll call it "permissible." It also can be called "allowable." So that's the okay flow. And that's just at the lower edge of "desire," you see? That isn't really desired; it's really not desired. You say, "I'm hungry, so I will eat." You really don't want to eat, you really don't not want to eat, you see. You're just going to eat. In other words, that's an okay flow.

Well, that covers a wide band because it also covers a desirable flow and it also covers to some degree being curious about flows and that sort of thing, but it's an okay flow.

And just below this, we have enforced flows. And now we have two aspects of inhibit. We must point it out to the thetan that the flow can be prohibited and inhibited. From the point it is inhibited and from outside the point it is prohibited. You follow this? Outside this point it is inhibited, you see. You might say, "an other-determined inhibit," we will call that a "prohibit."

So we have these four things. We have "permissible," and we have "enforced," and we have "prohibited," and we have "inhibited." Now, oddly enough, these things harmonic, just to confuse you further. So we get permissible, enforced, inhibited, inhibited, enforced, permissible, as we go down scale. Now, it's quite important to know that there's an inversion there because as your pc runs it, this kind of phenomena takes place:

You say, "All right. Tell me a permissible flow."

And he says, "Eating."

That's interesting, isn't it? Eating has appeared there as an answer. Now, you've gone on asking for some more permissible flows, but after a while, you're asking him for enforced flows.

And he says, "Having to eat."

And then after a while, you're asking him for inhibited flows.

And he says, "Dieting."

See, he's got eating in here again. What's essentially happening His considerations of eating are moving up scale. And so they're appearing on these harmonics, you see. And then you say, "All right. Now, tell me an inhibited flow."

And he will say, "Eating Others won't let you eat," or something like this, you see? That's actually the lower one. Dieting is the other one.

And then he says – you're asking him later for an enforced flow and he says, "Eating" You ask him to clarify this. "Making them eat." See? "Making them eat. People have *got* to *eat.* It's good for you."

And then you ask him – you are asking him a little while further in a flow process and you ask him for a permissible flow again and he will say, "Eating."

Well, you're actually not back where you started from. It is now, for the first time in his life, all right to eat. When you first asked him, it was down at the permissible, "Well, it's all right. Everybody does it. The poor little animals." You know, "The poor vegetables." And it moved, you see, from the lower scale permissible up through the – that is, the inverted permissible, to the inverted enforce, through the inverted inhibit – uh – prohibit, through the inverted inhibit, through the proper inhibit, through the prohibit, through the enforce, to the permissible. And therefore, the subject of eating, on the subject of flows, would graduate up all those bands and that's eight.

So there're actually eight attitudes toward flows, if you take the whole band – eight attitudes. And those, of course, I have just enumerated. Those are permissible, enforced, prohibited, inhibited, inhibited and prohibited, enforced and permissible. In other words, we take the thing turned over on one harmonic, in other words, and we've got eight attitudes.

But in auditing commands, you would only need four, you see, because it doesn't matter. The pc isn't interpreting whether you're asking him for the harmonic of it or the actual one, so you get away with four. So those four consist of permissible, enforced, prohibited, inhibited. And of course, they take care of both harmonics. Just don't lose sight of the fact that there's an inversion there, just because you're shorthanding it.

All right. Now, there's only two flows. There's outflow and there's inflow, until you add attitude to them.

All right. Now, we can discard the harmonic because it merely repeats itself. We have to know that it's there, but it merely repeats itself, so as far as fact in processing is concerned – the factual use, the reality of the use – you're simply using these words in connection with each flow. And you get permissible outflow, enforced outflow, prohibited outflow, inhibited outflow, see. And that's – you've got four of them there, which will cover all of eight of the inversion. And then you have, of course, permissible inflow, enforced inflow, prohibited inflow and inhibited inflow. And that gives you the eight basic flows for purposes of processing Understand that they are *sixteen.* There are actually sixteen flows there. But for purposes of assessment, Sec Checking, for purposes of keeping the rudiments in, for purposes of running a Flows Process, you only need eight because the harmonic is a duplicate of the two.

You see where this is landing now? Well, you've got eight things. You actually have four, phraseologically, attitudes toward an inflow and four attitudes toward an outflow, see?

Four attitudes toward an inflow, four attitudes toward an outflow and it gives you an eight command process if you're running a flows process with all necessary flows.

Now, this is sixteen, actually, you're running sixteen flows with eight commands. Recognize that. But if you were to put "others versus others," and not only the thetan here but the other point over there and then you were to put over an extensional point as in a bracket, for an "other to another," you of course have got the "another to the other," also. And you got sixteen more flows sitting out there, which we could express, however, in eight commands. Do you see that?

This gives us thirty-two. Now, we've got "another versus others," and "others versus another." We've now got sixty-four. We haven't got sixty-four, but we could add the other versus self, which makes a round of roodles on the thing and we would get up to the sixty-four.

All right. Let's take a look at this and recognize that we don't have to run it by brackets. Thank heavens. I'm clever enough to figure out a way where we didn't have to do this, because I can just see you now trying to keep in touch with sixty-four auditing commands. And we get sixty-four auditing commands merely by this tricky system of shorthanding, you see. So that we do not – if we do not specify "self" or "another," we can run all available flows with eight commands. Providing we do not specify self or others or which point we are talking about, the automaticities of the pc will shift over to that point or that dynamic or anything else that the flows apply to, you see. Just leave that on automatic and you only have eight commands for a flow process.

All right. Well, what would this flow process be? Well, I – it's almost gilding the lily here to describe what the flow process would be. And there's no real sense in giving you the *exact* flow process because you should be able to work it out from just that basis. And if you can't work out a flow process from your data, why, you're going to get yourself in a spot someday as an auditor that you're sitting there with your mouth open when you should be talking, because it is a little bit different all of a sudden. And you're not auditing from data, you're auditing from a ritual.

And I rather frown on auditing from a ritual without knowing why you have tied the cat to the bed, do you see? "We always, to start a session, tie the cat to the bed." I can see auditors two hundred years from now, you know, and they always audit the pc's chair for a half an hour before the pc is permitted to sit down in it.

And this all came from a developed fact. It is true that you should set up your E-Meter and adjust the pc's chair before starting a session. It's perfectly valid and you should do that because it places him in space and makes you cause over him.

But you could see that somebody on a ritualistic basis would figure this out that the pc's chair was pretty important in the session. Well, they wouldn't even be auditing the

reactive mind, don't you see? They could move all sorts of directions, you see, by just losing bits and pieces. So I'd like to see the theory stay in. I like to see an auditor audit from fundamentals rather than ritual.

Of course, you – nobody really had to tell you to adjust the pc's chair. If you knew your fundamentals about flows and positions in space, you know darned well if your auditing commands are going to stick with the pc, you would adjust his chair. Pc shifts his chair over two feet or something like that at the beginning of session and you leave it there. Oh, *ha-ha-ha-ha-haha.* Whose flows are going to dominate this session? The pc placed himself in the session, didn't he?

Well, that's the same as asking the pc to say . . . All right, you say to the pc, "All right now say, 'Start of session,' so that you get the session started for yourself."

A session has a lot to do with flows and has a lot to do with knowledge, so you should know about your eight flows – four to inflow and four to outflow – and it's simply the simple formula. It is nothing but permissible, enforce, prohibit and inhibit.

Now, so that you get to know these things very well, I'm going to ask you sometime after the lecture to draw these flows. Take one point and draw all eight flows from that one point, so that you really got this in your mind's eye so that you just aren't understanding some kind of a ritual, so that you know what's going on here.

Will you do that?

Audience: Yes.

All right. Now, what's the use of all this? Why did it become necessary that all of a sudden after *all* these years I all of a sudden start researching the pc as an electric motor? Why? Because you're having a hell of a time keeping rudiments in during listing and differentiation and assessment.

Rudiments go out. Well, why do they go out? Well, rudiments get kicked out by triggering automaticities of flows. And that's how rudiments go in and out. The pc is so much the subject or the effect of electrical energy and bank that he feels the flow and obeys it. In other words, boy, is he inverted, see? He feels the flow and he minds it. "Oh, oh, that's – I shouldn't do that," you see? But of course, underneath this flow is a consideration about this sort of thing And that consideration is resident in the 'ead of – visible or not visible – some identity in the bank that will be someday discovered by 3D Criss Cross.

All considerations about flows that are present at Class II auditing are, in effect, the considerations of identities which are contained in the bank and noplace else. Recognize please, in Class II that you can do wonderful things with a case. You can get the case started. You can get the case bouncing along. Everything is fine. You can accomplish considerable gains. But recognize at the same time that you are processing the considerations of

beingnesses, which are whole beingnesses resident in the bank or in the pc's 'ead. Have you recognized that about Class II?

It's very hard to shift, by the way, the considerations of a beingness. Very, very difficult. But if you can produce results with Class II auditing, you can be trusted with Class III. That's for sure. And furthermore, pcs wandering in from here or there who are all of a sudden confronted with having to dabble with their mind – which they have not been in very good communication with for the last few trillennia, you know – being asked to communicate it, will find that they are far easier to communicate it probably along the lines of Class II, like a Problems Intensive. Just a standard Problems Intensive or something like this – they'd think that was very nice. And they'd get some gains out of it.

But recognize what you're processing You're actually not processing the pc. You're processing a package of beingnesses which have long since overwhumped the pc and you're changing the considerations of these beingnesses, which is difficult. That's what Class II auditing does. I'd be dishonest if I didn't explain to you exactly where Class II auditing begins and ends.

Now, these beingnesses which are resident in the bank have considerations with regard to flows. And when flows flow, the beingnesses in the bank all of a sudden get ideas because they become activated electronically. So a little trickle of electrical energy goes *whiz-biz,* and the pc says, *"Oooooooooh.* Now I'm supposed to inhibit outflow," and sits there in a comm lag, which is what a comm lag is.

And something else goes trigger-whiz-click in some other department as you're processing him and he says, *"Ooooooooo.* Now I know what I'm supposed to do. Now I know what I am supposed to do. I'm supposed to keep the auditor from talking to me. In other words, I'm supposed to inhibit inflow."

Now, he could prohibit inflow by talking back at the auditor or inhibit inflow by getting the auditor to not talk. And it'll be one or the other of these and he's liable to resort to this type of trickery of some kind or another. In other words, the now-I'm-supposed-to occurs because of the running of the flow. And these beingnesses which are packed into the bank one way or the other activate and obey these flow patterns. Quite interesting. Very interesting piece of electrical buffoonery. Very intricate.

It's all done on flows. So you can sit there under Class II and deal with pure knowingness which is pulling withholds. You're getting withholds into view, withholds into view. And of course, as you do this, you are running hard aground every now and then on a flow and the flow tells him to withhold. Oh, he's busy withholding He's got a flow. It's going this way, see. Now, he knows what to do. He actually doesn't have a withhold at all, see? You see them in session?

Audience: Mm-hm. Yes.

Then you plug and plug. You say, "We know this guy's withholding something," and it turns out to be the fact that he twisted a cat's tail sometime or other. He actually has to dig one up to account for the fact that he's withholding. He's doing a flow withhold as different from a data withhold. But you can straighten this out by pulling a withhold. There's always a bit of a withhold kicking around someplace to ease this thing up.

But differentiate between these two actions: the datum which is wrapped up in the reactive bank, one little tiny tag of which may or may not be known to the pc and which you're trying to get at as a withhold. That when released, releases knowledge into view and makes the pc freer. And that is pinned down by flows. You're looking for the white pebble and you're getting all this, that and the other thing.

Now, actually, a datum can substitute for a thetan. It's done all the time. They do it *all through* modern education. The system is called the old-schooltie system. A datum is being substituted for a thetan.

I'll bet you the number of chaps – now I may malign them – that are hang ing around Cape Canaveral with the proper old school tie, that are actually contributing to the space program at the present time, can be counted upon the fingers of no hands. The only birds I ever ran into that were doing anything in that field very progressively had old school ties, but they didn't fit the job they were doing. They were professors with – of English and other things.

In fact, some of the more modern electronic machinery has been designed by professors of literature and so forth. And the boys with the old school tie – you see, if they're a perfect datum, not a thetan but a perfect datum, see; see, they're a Doctor of Mud or something – then they don't have to know anything, do they? Because this thing, this datum knows everything and then there doesn't have to be any thetan there.

And one of the most serious mistakes that a society can make is confusing ability with a datum because you can't confuse a thetan, you see, with a datum. A thetan is alive and a datum isn't.

Now, if you look along the lines of the datum, you'll find out that the thetan in his bank has parked data which has become *zzzzzz* fixed, rooted, *nrrrrrr*. These are the now-I'm-supposed-to's, you see.

Now, the most basic datum that he can park, oddly enough and what he was withholding the hardest and which forms most of the flows on the case – the bulk of the flows on the case are wrapped up and are released by 3D Criss Cross, because the data is John Jones. There's John Jones. He's John Jones and he knows where John Jones is. John Jones was buried in a graveyard someplace and now he's forgotten. And he's now forgotten John Jones. But John Jones was a datum and John Jones was what was holding locations in space, see? No thetan, him, was holding this location in space, but a thetan which was a datum. We had a

datum called John Jones. That's his identity and it held a position in space, he thinks. I mean, people get horrified at me because I actually have been known to almost forget my own name, because I couldn't care less about this particular phenomenon.

You possibly heard a lecture or two by me in which I have not approved of the old-school-tie system, to say it very mildly. And that's because I don't believe that you are you because your name is Pete. You see, I don't believe that. Nobody could convince me of that at all. I believe you are you because you're you, see. And I think you've been you for a *long* time and you're going to be you for a lot longer. And you're sure going to be you for a lot longer and have been you a lot longer than you have been Pete.

So, you see, I find it better communication to talk with you as you than you as Pete. Of course, my own identity's lines are fouled up by habit pattern, undoubtedly, as a writer. And most writers are trying to make a name famous or something like that and I didn't ever care what name I ever wrote under. It just didn't matter beans to me. As a matter of fact this has lost practically everything I've ever written. There are very few things extant, because I even forget what names they're written under.

But there are certain satisfactions in this. I wrote one of the stories in the *Arabian Nights,* for instance, many thousands of years ago and it's still in the collection very nice. It's the story of a lost prince. It's definitely me. It isn't by Achmed Mud or something. It's – I writ it.

But you know, Bob saying last night, he says, "Well, in – now, in space opera, that's good, see. Because you – of course, all doll bodies are all alike, but you know the guy. You know the guy, you see?" And that's true. See, they know him. And there's a lot of argument about whether or not this can or cannot be done. And it's not real to people in some ways, but truthfully speaking, you get spoiled here on this planet because they build all the bodies differently and you get dependency on appearance. And you don't have to know the thetan. All you have to do, you see, is know the appearance of somebody and you get spoiled that way and you can get hooked on this way.

Now, it is true, I'm sure, that thetans on the track had made mistakes about the identity of people. I know people have walked up to me occasionally in various climes, spaces and planets and have accused me of being somebody else, but never to the degree that they have here on Earth. Yeah, it's marvelous.

Anyway, you, a thetan, you see, are still carrying on very nicely and you are not a datum. You are a living thing and you are a creator and – of life and a being which is alive. And when you were John Jones, John Jones was a datum, you see. And there's that datum and it stays as a park place in the bank. And it forms the terminal from which the flow can charge and discharge, you see.

Well now, as John Jones, a datum, we also had enemies. Bill Smith, you see. And John Jones had the enemy, Bill Smith and Bill Smith, of course, has been approximated in the bank someplace by John Jones as an earlier time, you see. And now Bill Smith becomes a lock on the earlier identification John Jones has made with an identity and you get an electrical discharge between Bill Smith and John Jones because they're holding positions in space in the bank.

So you ask a pc, "What do you think of cake?" And all of a sudden he goes zzzzzzzz. "What was that? What was the matter?" you could ask with pretended innocence.

And he'd say, "Well, I felt dizzy," or "There was a little whir feeling in my head," or "I had a somatic in my back," or lots of other things. But it's the interaction of flows between these past *beingnesses.* And that is what causes all this nonsense and bric-a-brac that-goes on in the mind.

Now, if you get – a past beingness – it itself is a mass because it has blocked flows so often. It has gained mass and its mass is dependent upon its different positions in space as it is moved around and the number of positions it has held in space. And it generates mass. So you actually run into one of these things and they look like a – oh, I don't know – a Guy Fawkes dummy or something of the sort, done totally in black or a pyramid or something like that. And you run into these beingnesses and you say, "What's this?" you see? It looks like a burned-out tar barrel that's painted black. But it sometimes has a shape. Sometimes it has a head and shoulders and feet. Sometimes has only feet and a head. It can startle lots of pcs because there it is and it doesn't have anything in it.

He tries to find something in one of these things, you see and of course there's nothing in it. He was in it. He's gone now. And its circuits and connections, however, are still susceptible to flows, so its thinkingness can still go forward. And it can still think and it can disintegrate and it can – has a time track. When one or two of them started to come apart here rather remarkably and it's very startling because it looks like you've got a machine going off which is making pictures or you've got a machine going off which is doing something. And that isn't all. Well, you're just looking at the disintegration of one of these old beingnesses that's suddenly no longer so fixed.

Well, that's why your pc thinks he's on Arcturus when he's here on Earth; that's why your school child is out of present time, and so on, are all contained in these various things. And all the handles of these are, of course, proceeding from points in space.

But I'll let you in on something about points in space: You can't process them. You can spot them and so forth. But they are stills. We had to make up our minds about this a few months ago – if we were ever going to process stills. And I've never seen anything but catastrophe attend the processing of stills as long as you didn't discharge them.

Now, you see, a body – processing the identity of a body is not really processing a still. This person was after all moving all over the place. But if you were to process dead bodies only, you see, you would find the pc after a while going *zzzz-whizzz-zoooo.*

Now, you could process living beingnesses very easily because, of course, they do have motion. They're-only occasionally stopped. You can process those. But to process stills – "Look around here and find something that is motionless. Thank you. Now make it more motionless. Thank you. Now be as still as it is. Thank you."

I think if you ran that for an hour or two or four or five sessions . . . I don't think the pc would be there four or five sessions to run it on. But anyhow, if you tried to run it for a while, you would produce, at first, an interesting gain for the pc and then the gain would all of a sudden deteriorate and go, see? It is – the person, at first would say – you know, you'd restimulate being powerful or something of the sort; holding a position in space, something like this, you see, by saying "stills."

Now, keeping something from going away is not quite holding something still. It is not quite the same thing. That actually brings about the generation of power and it'll discharge quite a number of flows.

But, in general, you want to avoid inerts in the bank and process actions. That's in general, in generalized processes. That does not apply to winnowing out beingnesses and that sort of thing, because they're not proper stills. They're fake livingnesses. They're data.

Now, having a datum there in the bank – a withhold – which is fixed in place. . . Perfectly all right to process it, you see, because it's just a datum. It tends to act as a pole on a motor. A very false one, but it tends to act that way.

So this individual has a withhold – been to prison; has never told anybody. This ceases to become just knowingness, withheld knowingness and eventually will take up a flow action. And having been to prison caused him to feel sort of fixed and will cause an interesting lot of electrical play around in his body somewhere, like his stomach or his throat or his head or something like that. He'll be trying to do something about this.

Now, he isn't going to give up this datum. So that anything you do to him has still not gotten rid of the pole of the motor which has got him messed up. See, he's not made this datum general, it's not been released, he is holding a piece of knowledge here which he must not tell anybody. And because he must not tell it – anybody, it of course becomes a duplicated pole for the anybody he mustn't tell.

You see, there you are, the auditor and you didn't know that in his bank he's got "having been to prison," mocked up exactly like you. Because he's withholding it from you, it duplicates you. So to some degree, we get this odd phenomena of a discharge going.

Guy has got a withhold. He cannot talk to you. Well, he doesn't dare talk to you. But, of course, while he isn't talking to you, he's producing flow phenomena all over the place. You release this withhold . . . You are not processing a still because it's a datum and a datum is never a location in space, but a thetan believes it can be, you see. It goes out and he's got some kind of a circuit disappears at the same time, you see. It's gone. He feels good. It's quite mysterious to him. What happened?

Well, actually, what happened is, is he had this datum – which frankly didn't have a sixteenth of a grasshopper power in itself – restrained from all sorts of people and being restrained from all sorts of people, then, of course, must have been of as great a magnitude as the people it was being restrained from. You understand that?

So he sets up a motor. Just as nice as you please, he sets himself up a very interesting motor. And he's at the receiving end of it. So he's got all kinds of games going with everybody who doesn't know this. See?

In other words, it's the withheld datum which then operates as a pole which then generates an electrical flow which will then make a ridge and do all kinds of other things, you see? And you've got the mechanism there more or less – you've got the mechanism by which his valences have become solid in the bank. And when you recover these valences, they're all ridged and everything else. Of course, they've got withholds like crazy. Every time the thing had a withhold, of course, it had something then mocked up as big as it had a withhold from. And you've got motors set up. And when you start getting into the bank in general, wow, you know, you can really set up some currents and torrents as you already know.

3D Criss Cross makes going over Niagara Falls in a barrel, you see, look like a canoe ride of a Sunday afternoon on a placid lake. You really set up some currents. Well, recognize what the currents are being set up from. They're set up by old withholds and old intentions which are acting as false poles amongst themselves and against themselves.

Now, you see what a problem is, basically, electronically. I'm not really giving you anything that cancels anything I've said about problems. This is just the electronic look at a problem. Why do people fight when they have a disagreement? Well, they have intentions to fight and all that. We neglect that. Let's get in – for the moment. We'll get into the electronic or electrical phenomena. Don't call it electronic. Call it electrical because it's practically the same juice that goes through that light up there. Electronics – that's mostly how you get transistors to capacitate without rectifying them on the infiltrusions. And that's pretty hard to understand and – but if you stick your finger in a light socket, that's not hard to understand at all. You ever stuck your finger in a light socket?

Audience: Yes.

Have you understood that? Well, that's all you have to know to understand Scientology electric – electricities.

Now, here we have John and Mary. And John says that we're going to have fish for supper and Mary says we are not going to have fish for supper. Well, you'd think ordinarily in any universe that a person could have the intention not to have fish for supper and another person could have the intention to have fish for supper totally independent of any kind of an upset. I know you could have an idea that you were going to have fish for supper and I was going to have an idea I'd be damned if anybody is going to serve me fish for supper, without us getting into a fight. But if we've got withholds from each other madly, it only takes this new little datum of fish for supper and no fish for supper to set up two opposite poles, which then discharge on the old withholds. See, they actually – that's why the prior confusion holds the problem, don't you see?

And then all you've got to have is some prior withholds and you get this little tiny thing – one is going to have fish for supper and the other doesn't want fish for supper and so forth – and the next thing you know, man, you look over the police records. How did the argument start? There lies – there lies this fellow stone dead. Well, how did the argument start? And it'll start in some stupid way like that. Be all there is to it.

And, well, how does it discharge against each other? Why did they fight for three days and then she sued him for divorce? How come? Well, it took these other hidden poles. And the fight is actually, simply, the electrical sparks flying off of these two hidden poles – speaking electrically.

So he's got a bunch of hidden withholds, which is knowingnesses and she's got a bunch of hidden knowingnesses and these are hidden from one another. So they're already pulled back from one another. So they're all set up, you see, to be fixed positions in space. And then we get this one visible datum, this little tiny visible datum which doesn't amount to anything about have fish for supper or not have fish for supper. "Well, all men are alike. My father was just like that." I mean, we can get all sorts of irrelevant statements being made on the subjects, you see? "You men think you are the lords of creation." "Housewives never do anything" You know, I mean, you can go on and on this way. The power – the electrical discharge and the power and the violence on the whole thing, however, is based on former withholds.

So if you want to solve a problem between John and Mary, you find out what the problem is and it's "He likes fish and I don't like fish." Only the problem by this time won't have been anything that mild. It'll have blown up to something that they have justified having a fight about. In other words, they dream up eventually something that's big enough to have a fight about. And this action's tracked back and you look for the prior confusion and of course you find little cotton-picking withhold here and one there and it all just blows out and they – there's no problem.

You could do it to both of them and they wouldn't have any problems with each other, and they – because the problem, of course, was never a problem in the first place. It's too picayune to have been a problem. So of course, the problem is only the visible evidence of hidden poles which can discharge against each other unknown to one and all.

It's very funny, you know. There's John and Mary and the fireworks is all going off and exploding all over the park and the grandstand. And somebody just threw a match in the residual magazine of supplies for the rest of the fireworks display. And we look at all this, you know and it really looks fantastic. And then we find out, well, she actually loaned his shoes to her brother once and didn't tell him, you see. And he stopped by a widow woman's house for a glass of wine a few weeks ago and hadn't bothered to tell her. And it's just made up a whole bunch of little poles, see. They're all hidden knowingnesses. Data substituted for thetans, see. And all these things are all covered up and forgotten. And it takes the air on this datum, you see, "I like fish; she doesn't like fish," see. "I like fish; she doesn't like fish. Therefore, that's a problem." And he'll go around and he'll worry himself sick about this problem. Terrific consequences occur because of these withholds because they make up . . .

Now, if you miss a withhold, you of course have activated one. That is the difficulty. If you – if an auditor cannot handle withholds at all . . . Let's say you're training somebody and they have just – you've got to have a pc audited and the only auditor you can get to audit them has finished the first day of his Comm Course but nothing else of the HPA or HCA and so on, I advise you *not* to let him audit withholds on the pc. See, I – that's just friendly advice. I mean... You can go ahead and do it sometime. Just see what happens. But stand by with the sticky plaster because the results are actually very, very gory, see. It's horrible because all this auditor will do will be to activate withholds, see. He's asking for withholds and not pulling them and asking for withholds and not pulling them, you see? And asking for withholds and not pulling them.

Now, all he's doing is just charging up these hidden, with – strained, withdrawn poles, you see, of one kind or another. And all of a sudden, there's some dumb, tiny, screwy, little thing that has nothing to do with it, you know. The auditor actually makes a click with the E-Meter and that's enough, man, and the pc just about tears his head off. This is one of the reasons husband-wife auditing teams have so much trouble. Before they've pulled their withholds, of course, they can't really have much randomity between themselves without discharging at each other, see?

So the best way for a husband and wife to audit each other is, of course, have all of their withholds pulled by somebody else and then audit each other. But that isn't successful either.

Actually, the best way to do it i9 just lay in a good supply of bandage and keep at it. That's the main thing It's the failure that busts it all up. It's not doing it all that breaks it up.

Now, here's the system, then, that goes to work. You trigger this withhold, you have triggered a live pole. You see, you've got this little position in space here, this datum and it's now gone *bzzzzzz,* and the pc doesn't even know what it is, you see?

And then you get – it triggers off another one, *bzzzzzz,* and another one, *bzzzzzz.* And by the time you've got some of these things going, you know, the pc is sitting there and he can just feel it start to throb, you know. And all of a sudden he tells you off

Well, he just goes into an automaticity. And you're seeing there simply the *flows* start after the polarity has been set up. After the poles have been set up, why, you get the *flow* going. And that's why it is so dangerous to miss a withhold. You see, you'd have probably never been in trouble if you had never activated it in the first place.

But if you're going to pull withholds, you're going to do marvelous things for cases. But if you're going to pull them badly, get lots of sticky plaster because it's – the pc's just going to be blowing up in your face all the time.

Now, this is the electrical aspects of all of this phenomena that you watch, one way or the other.

Now, pcs have habitual flows. There's always a current running from *bzzzzzzt* to *bzzzzzzt.* And one of the -eight attitudes is in full force on most cases. At least one of the eight will be stronger than the other ones.

In other words, he has to prohibit – pardon me, his outflows have to be prohibited. There actually is a whole nation like that. The Bantu. If you want to get in trouble with the Bantu... I don't get in trouble with the Bantu. They get along fine with me. But I've noticed this peculiar characteristic, that this particular flow is very strongly in force, that their outflow has to be prohibited and they're very unhappy unless you prohibit their outflow. You could work this out for almost any being

He gets unhappy if something isn't happening with a certain thing – one of these flows. One of these flows must be treated reverently, in a certain way. He's got one of these points and it will be goofed up somehow or another, but it has to be handled that way and that's how life should be. And his now-I'm-supposed-to with regard to flows is that one fixed attitude. And one of those eight attitudes toward flows is going to be more dominant than the other.

Now, you know what I mean by a prohibited outflow. You have to make it clear to a Bantu that if he does something wrong, that he will be upbraided for it. You don't have to upbraid him, you know. You just have to make it clear that you will. This is what is so interesting. I don't know if people down there in handling them have ever learned this. But you just say, "Well now, don't you worry about it because I will make very sure that you don't go away and stay away two or three days." And they're very happy. And they go ahead and

then not stay away two or three days. They're very happy then because you're withholding for them. You see how it is?

You're prohibiting that outflow. And they don't believe they have the power to prohibit the outflow, so they feel nervous. I didn't mean to run the color bar in this, but I did want to say they're – that I've noticed this one characteristic on a racial line. I haven't studied any other lines to amount to anything, but I did study that one.

Now, you'll find a pc gets in a state of an inhibited inflow. He is going to hold off the inflow; he's going to inhibit the inflow. I guess from that standpoint it'd be prohibit the inflow. He's going to say, "Any inflow? No."

Of course, this goes to only certain classes of inflows, but actually can broaden out to a generality where any time he gets an inflow he has to classify it to make sure what it is, you see? And he gets very nervy.

You have people who can be stuck on any one of these points and there are eight of them that he can be stuck on. This pc or any other pc can be stuck on any one of these points more than another one.

So therefore you could list these eight flows and assess a pc and wind up with the perfect Sec Check. Assess it in some particular way, you know. Just write down the flows and just call them off to the pc, see which one reads the most and then take a Sec Check. We were saying last night we might even have a series of eight generalized Sec Checks which each one of which matched this particular type of flow. So you could write them up yourself. You look it over and you will find, then, that during a session, when you are listing, if you've already spotted the pc's automatic flow, you can turn the rudiments on at once after, when they go out. You can get the rudiments back in promptly if you know that the pc is prohibiting inflows.

You ask him some question which adds up to "All right. What inflow did you prohibit just then?" You know, the rudiments go out.

And he says, "Oh-ho, well, I . . . There's a bird singing outside," and you know, he'd stopped that. And of course, he'd parked the session right at that point. You got the idea? He does this obsessively and automatically. If you know which one of these eight is wrongest with your pc or most dominant, rather, with your pc, you can trigger it and get the rudiments back in with speed. So it has use. It has very practical use, all this stuff

He starts withholding the knowledge that this flow has occurred. He withholds it from himself and from you. And then the rudiments fly out. He withholds all this knowledge. But I call to your attention, now, a withhold is a withhold of data or information; it's an unwillingness to talk to the auditor. It's not necessarily a flow.

Now, when a pc deteriorates, we get him into flows. He goes into flows very obsessively. Then he can't help but scold you. He can't help but be apathetic. He can't help but

– you see. This flow just starts flowing, and he follows suit and he can't do anything about it, you know.

Now, you've got a pc who is prohibiting outflow. He's not inhibiting outflow. He believes outflow should be prohibited – make it that way.

In other words, if he outflows he believes some exterior force should prevent him from outflowing And the pc will sit there *yow-yow-yow-yow-yowyap-yap-yap-yap-yap-yup-yup-yup-yup-yap-yap-yap-yap-yap-yap-yap.* Waiting, waiting, waiting, waiting, waiting, waiting, waiting for the auditor, for God's sakes, to please say, "Shut up."

He goes *yap-yap-yap-yap-yap-yap-yap-yap-yap-yap-yap.* He's stuck on prohibited outflow, don't you see. He'll talk until stopped. In the middle of all of this, the auditor says, "Good. Thank you."

"Well," he says, "the auditor was on the job that time. That's better."

You mustn't get the idea that one of these is more social than another one, from person to person. Everybody has his idea what sociality is. And although the majority of a certain race might have a definite opinion of that inhibited outflow is the very best social presence, remember, that's not necessarily true of all races or even all people in that race. See, that might be just a social generality.

Well, you take a German knight. He knew what he was supposed to do: enforced outflow. That was it. He's got it taped. His social conduct. The Romans – Roman officers and men used to practically roll in the ramparts listening to these birds, you know.

They come out there shaking their spear, riding a horse and telling about all their great deeds, you see. And they ride up and down with all of their great deeds at full automaticity, you see. They had to enforce this outflow and knock anybody over the head that wouldn't listen to them, and of course the whole tirade concerned itself with knocking people over the head anyhow. That was the way it fired.

So you get these different attitudes. They make different social conducts of one kind or another.

Of course, if you want to get a pattern of all social behavior, just apply the Tone Scale to the eight flows. They do fit one to another, you see. You get all sorts of ramifications. There's lots of use can be made out of this particular thing.

But you'll have a pc that knows what the auditor's supposed to do. See? The pc is supposed to enforce an outflow on the auditor. Now, you understand that location A can run all flows on location B or at location A. You understand that, see. So he can apply all of these things to the auditor and he knows what a good auditor is: A good auditor is somebody on whom he has to enforce an outflow. You may have even seen a pc like this. See, had to – enforced an outflow. And he'll do everything under God's green earth to make the auditor talk

to him and sap at him and yap at him and bark at him and use heavy control on him and so forth. He knows a proper auditing attitude. He knows what it is. It's enforced outflow. So he enforces the auditor's outflow, don't you see.

Another pc has got the idea the proper auditing attitude, of course, is that the auditor should inhibit his outflow. And he finds the auditor is not properly inhibiting his outflow, why, he thinks he's a bad auditor. Of course, this is just an automaticity firing off, that's all. Hadn't anything to do with reasonable considerations or how to audit, but he gets that notion.

Or some other pc has got the idea that – the – you must have and the auditor must enforce an inflow on the pc. He's got hypnotism or something mixed up with auditing He says, "Well, the proper auditing attitude, if you just enforce an inflow on me, you see, you just shout at me and insist that I accept everything you say and so forth, well, then the session will run off beautifully."

Or you have another auditing – another pc and he says, "Well, the proper thing is for the auditor at all times to just have an okay inflow. And that's a proper auditor. It's a permissible inflow." In other words, "Everything I say and do is a permissible inflow. And the auditor must never acknowledge, never give an auditing command, never exercise any control, never stop anything, never do anything and so forth and I just sit here in the auditing session and talk. And that's a proper auditing attitude," you see?

Now, coupled with a proper auditing attitude, of course, have their own attitude as to what is a proper pc's attitude. And these are not necessarily the same one at all.

So you see, you take these flows and stack them up and get a fixed consideration on one point and the same point's consideration of what should be on another point and you get all these various complexities known as social intercourse. And when they get into auditing, you get into trouble because auditing, of course, is the delivery of an auditing command and making sure that it is executed and acknowledging the thing in proper flow; understanding the pc, keeping the pc talking to you and so forth.

Well, now let's suppose you have a pc who is just *horrified,* just cannot *stand* the idea of an outflow and so he is inhibiting all of his own outflows. He thinks it's very bad to have an outflow. And he sits there and you ask him a question and ten minutes later, he answers the question and you ask – you get so you just don't want to ask him a question because you know – you know that it's going to take minutes before this thing is finally replied to, you see.

And he's got an inhibited outflow. He knows the proper way to go about it – the proper way.... Maybe it's some beingness like a scholar. And you see and he knows that as a scholar he should look learned. And the way to look learned is to look wise and not speak much. In some old-school philosophy, you know. So you ask him anything and he says, "Mmm, well. . . " because he's terribly learned. And do you know he isn't doing a blessed thing that whole while? He's actually not going – even going through a comm lag, you see. He's not going

through a comm lag, he's not figuring anything out, he's not doing anything during that period of time. And you, of course, as an auditor sometimes sense this and you get very impatient about what this pc's doing because you see that it's corny. Something is wrong here.

Now, knowing about flows, you should of course be able to understand what the pc's doing That's why I'm going to ask you to graph these flows after this lecture and draw a picture. That is to say draw a picture of each flow. You want to draw the picture for all the flows from one point where the pc is and then the pc's considerations of another point, don't you see?

You know, what should be the flows for another point and what is the point for his point. You got the idea?

So you actually draw them from one point and then draw them from that point's viewpoint for another point. You follow that? That point's viewpoint for another point.

Well, I'll give you an idea of it if you didn't grasp that in a hurry – most of you did – but and that is simply get the idea of, you are a driver and what should be a policeman's flows. See, what the policeman's flows should be, not what your flows are.

So you draw a picture for your flows. And then you would have a picture for the policeman's flows viewed by you, see? Get the idea? So there are actually, he's got a – you've got a whole bunch of considerations as to what his flows should be.

Well, draw all the flows for a second point as viewed from the first and it'll give you good understanding of what is expected and what is being done.

Now, as far as auditing commands are concerned, you can actually put together eight auditing commands in sequence that give you all the aspects of these flows. Just roll them off one after the other and the person will run these things.

Oddly enough, since flows are caused by withholds, running flows unburies withholds. Do you see? If the pole which the withhold is disappeared because of flows, then by running flows, of course, you uncover it. And it's very marvelous how many withholds the person all of a sudden finds as he is running a flows process.

So you can locate a process by assessment, trigger the automaticity of the flow, get rid of the flow, straighten it out. You can run a flows process, you can – and, as I've just mentioned, get rudiments in. You can sec check by finding out which flow the pc has been most routinely stuck on, you see? All of his crimes are on inhibited inflow. Everything is on inhibited inflow.

And you just assess the eight flows and then you find out which one is the most active on the meter and then you just do a Sec Check for that one. You'll figure out what that one is.

You'll find out this is quite interesting from a standpoint of getting data and getting things released and getting the person's bank quieted down and everything down from the high roar that it ordinarily is.

But a pc's bank could not possibly be discharged rapidly by any machine or chemical. It couldn't be. Because the flows are intricate and the ridges are actually composited flows. And you've got to do something to let the flows straighten out, whether it's getting rid of the beingness that wanted that flow or by auditing flows or by pulling withholds – you've got to do something like this in order to straighten the bank out. Anything that just got rid of the bank as one whole block would, of course, never expose the understanding which is underneath because that is the second inversion.

Understanding, of course, is first above flows and electrical nonsense and masses and the sixth dynamic and then inverts and goes under it all. And electricity and so forth is capable of burying all the knowledge in the world in the pc's bank.

The pc would – by a sudden button or an electrical machine, would suddenly be staggered totally and completely into having to confront all of the knowledge of his whole track in a split second. I don't think he could do that. I don't think that would either be profitable nor pleasant. And I don't think it would result in anything. I think he has to take a look at some of the data.

I know that those people who inhibit inflows would rather have a pill and think that the best possible treatment that you could have would just be to slide somebody a pill and he'd be Clear. I think he has to find out something about himself before he gets Clear. But maybe that's just a peculiarity. Certainly enough, empirically, that is the only way a case makes any progress.

Okay? Well, you think you can make any use of this data on flows?

Audience: Yes.

All right. Good enough. Thank you very much.