

MECHANICS OF SUPPRESSION

A lecture given on
19 March 1962

And this is the second lecture. What's the date?

Audience: 19 March, 12.

Nineteen Mar. 12. And the first lecture that was not dated there was "The Bad Auditor." And this lecture has to do with the mechanics of suppression.

Now, for a long time you've had a lot of Axioms. You may have heard of them. And they actually contain the basic data on suppressors. The Axioms, of course, are way ahead of us. Always have been. Trying to get technology to catch up with the Axioms is one of my tougher jobs.

But the suppressor is already forecast in the Axioms under the heading of not-is. And it is simply not-isness and what is not-isness. And I for a long time have played with not-isness from various angles and you get a simple statement there in the Axioms – simpler than I'm making now, actually.

And that is you get the *isness* of something, you get the *alter-isness* of something and you get the *not-isness* of something. And a not-isness is, peculiarly enough, a suppressed isness and that is all it is.

And if you redefined not-isness as a suppressed isness: it is the effort to put out of existence energywise an isness. It is an effort to *suppress* an isness. Elephant is standing on the front steps, we say, "Well, elephants don't belong on the front steps, so there is no elephant on the front steps."

Now, whenever you find that running out lies out of a bank – has enormous numbers of applications and there are tremendous numbers of ways you can apply these particular Axioms – when you run lies out of a bank, you, of course, are running alter-isnesses or not-isnesses.

Now, a lie could simply say it was something else, that it's a child's toy on the front steps – it's a live elephant, you see – we could say, "Well, it's a toy. It's an advertisement," you see? "It's something made out of rubber so they're advertising something." Or we could say, "It doesn't exist," you see? And you'd get a lie actually covers an alter-isness and a not-isness.

Now, alter-*isness* is change. And it sits between an *isness* and a suppression. And therefore, we're getting nicely tied up with time here because time is basically, only mechanically so, but is change. Time is change.

Now, a cycle of action does run from a nonexistence to an existence to a nonexistence. That is a cycle of action. And if you look over the time track, you'll find that a cycle of action goes from: there's nothing there; there's a creation there; and then there's changes in the creation; and then deterioration-type changes, but they're nevertheless still changes; and then we finally get a nonexistence again. So we run from nonexistence to existence to nonexistence. And that is a cycle of action.

They are all types of creation and so on, as we know. We know a lot about this sort of thing. But let's look and see how this directly applies. The first material we have on this is Science of Certainty. The Something-Nothing Process. Process in England. You know, they don't work in England unless you call them processes.¹

And the cycle of action was never entered into this. We just talked about, "Think of something. Think of nothing. Think of something. Think of nothing." You know, that type of alternate, to get out the maybe. And that was under the heading of the "anatomy of maybe." A maybe, an uncertainty, a guess or as most people conceive unknowns, an unknown – that isn't really what an unknown could be but it could be a mechanical variation of unknown – is simply the no-man's-land between the certainty that something is and the certainty that something isn't.

So we have these two things. The certainty that something is and the certainty that something isn't. And between those two things, we have the maybe. See, we have "It *is*," and then we have "It is... It is? Uh... it is. Uh... it isn't." And we get the cycle of action.

So you can stack a cycle of action alongside of maybe. And you could say change is maybe. These are approximations, not exact things, you see?

Now, it looks in the reactive mind, then, as though a cycle of action is a maybe – the middle of a cycle of action. So that all change is a maybe. And therefore, if anything's changed, maybe it isn't, you see? And you get all kinds of things.

If we change techniques in Scientology, a lot of people don't think Scientology exists. See? They say, "Well, he – Ron's just changing his mind again."

Oh, Ron hasn't changed his mind about this in a long time, see? But they never look at the certainties we have. They look at the middle, see? And we get something that's very peculiar. We get a new process. And this is a process.

¹ Editor's note: LRH here plays with the different ways to pronounce "process" in England and in America.

Now, to show you how difficult it is to immediately approximate this semantically so that it can be run by a mind, I'll call attention to the fact that the Something-Nothing Process is quite limited in use. It has some value. It – you could do various things with it. And other types of processes all about not-is and so forth, had practically no use at all. There have been many of them. There have been processes about lies, processing lying and that sort of thing and their use put it off into the Step 6 phenomena – Creativeness. We started beefing up a bank and various other things have occurred by lying – the processing lies, you know?

That wasn't very successful. There've been a lot of efforts here. Only thing I'm trying to sketch out for you here is this has a long history and a lot of efforts involved with it.

Well, a lot of things come together at the same point, so we've been around the fringes of these things and a lot of people on the whole track have been around the fringes of us.

But the point I'm making here is I came across a process which is a runnable process, which is a Class I process. You're perfectly at liberty, by the way, to run this process on somebody. I don't care whether you do or don't. It isn't an exactly tailored process yet. You probably have to fish for the wording of it. But actually the process is, simply: "It is. It isn't. It is. It isn't. It is. It isn't. It is. It isn't. It is. It isn't. It is. It isn't. It is. It isn't."

After you've gotten the pc to do the "It is and it isn't and it is and it isn't" for a little while, he'll move on the time track, but he ordinarily will give you a direct application of this process to his case. And he'll deliver up to you the chronic automaticity of his case or the chronic present time problem or the chronic something of his case almost at once. This is quite peculiar.

What you're doing, of course, is running the cycle of action on him. You're running those two portions of the cycle of action which are important to him. And in view of the fact you have said, "It is" followed by "It isn't," you haven't said whether it was vanishment or not-is. And hell always run it as a suppressor.

So you're running direct suppressors. And the thing which he is most closely and most immediately suppressing is the most likely to come into view. His hidden standard or the thing that immediately is wrong with him is liable to appear almost at once.

Now, of course, the thing he's trying to make up his mind about stems from the fact that he at some time or another had said that it is and then he didn't like that, so he has said that it *isn't*. And this has left him in the maybe of whether or not it ever was or is or ever will be.

See, there is – you wouldn't ever get anyplace processing a person this way: "Maybe, maybe, maybe, maybe, maybe, maybe, maybe, maybe." See, you would get no place processing this. "Get the idea of maybe. Maybe, maybe, maybe, maybe, maybe, maybe, maybe, maybe." A person will fog up, go out, go anaten, that sort of thing. Basically, there is no such thing as a

maybe. See, there is only a creation and the conditions of the creation. Because even when a cycle of action has been run, it still stands there as a memory. The person remembered there had been.

See, he got married, got divorced. He actually doesn't get a nonexistence again. He gets a remembrance of having been married. And more deeply in the bank, he gets a recording of having been married. I don't care at what fabulously far-away time it was in time, he'll have a slight inkling of it.

In other words, so you don't get – ever get a pure nonexistence after you get any existence, see? The only pure nonexistence is prior to the existence.

So you get a positive assertion of is-ness followed by a positive assertion of it isn't, you will inevitably get memories and cognitions and various other mental phenomena will occur. And oddly enough, this fantastically simple process – “It is. It isn't. It is. It isn't. It is. It isn't. It is. It isn't” – will produce practically every other phenomenon in Scientology. It stems out of existence and nonexistence, which of course stems out of perception and don't want to perceive – which, of course, goes over into creativeness and destruction. And all the time you're jumping across wild bands of change.

So you're getting the certainty that it is and the certainty that it isn't and the certainty that it is and the certainty that it isn't; and all of a sudden you get all this change boiling up and boiling over. Because, of course, change is simply the different conditions of an existence leading to a nonexistence or a new condition of positiveness.

The uncertainty of the case blows off. Now, the fellow with the open mind, the fellow who doesn't know, the fellow who isn't sure, the fellow who just grinds and never gets a cognition, this fellow who can't find out, the fellow who has no memory of the whole track, the fellow who just doesn't ever recognize that maybe it – “Well, I can say that it does and I can say, yes, I suppose I could assume. Uh-huh, maybe, uh, well, yes...” and all of his conversation is like this. You ever read any scientific papers of the last twenty or thirty years, you know?

“If the universe exists...” They don't want to get stuck with any isnesses. See, they don't want to be guilty of any isnesses.

“I was sitting in front of the meter, of course. I was sitting in a Mark VI type chair using hung-over type lamps. And the reflective qualities on the screen were X970 and I uh-uh-uh-believe that I perceived uh-uh – apparently, uh – as the needle registered – uh – that is, if the machine were on, which would have to be verified by the machine operator – uh – that uh – if I uh – recall properly, uh – and if I am not controverted by the faculty or my immediate superior, there were 230 volts on the mains that day, I think.”

That is a *forthright*, scientific statement. That's just about as flat out as a scientist these days could get without being shot by his brethren.

Most of the boys get upset about me in the field of science is because I will say something is or something isn't. And I don't qualify it. I don't say, "Well, if the faculty gives me permission," you see, or something like that, "then I could guess that maybe adjectival clause modifying paragraph B. that adverbial phrase modifying verb G. might finally turn out to be a guess," you see? And in view of the fact that I don't talk that way, they think I'm unscientific. You have to be doubtful to be scientific.

Well, it sure hangs these guys in an awful muddled mess, doesn't it? Now, the very funny part of it is you could take that exact frame of mind and have the boys say, "It is and it isn't and it is and it isn't. Get the concept that it is. Get the concept that it isn't."

Fellow says, "Get the concept of *what* was? What?"

You say, "Well, just *it*. It. Anything. It. It. It."

"Uh... I don't know what you mean by that," you see?

He might have quite an argument on this other. It'd be very laughable because, of course, he is trying to get the idea that it is and he runs into the maybe, see and he can't get a clean idea that is, see? Nor can he get a clean idea that it isn't.

You'd have to actually rehabilitate him into being able to get a clean idea that something was and something wasn't. You watch. The boys in charge of the A-bombs and the stuff we breathe right at the present moment² are mostly in that frame of mind.

You know, the H-bomb marchers missed their bet, you know? They miss their bet all the time. If they wanted really to wipe out the H-bomb, they wouldn't worry about that. They'd just insist that all the atomic scientists and politicians that had anything to do with the H-bomb produce proper sanity certificates so that they could be – and that they should be examined by psychiatrists and so forth. They'd drive everybody batty.

But the funny part of it is none of these guys could pass, see? Because "It may be all right to drop it, maybe, see, but it might not be all right, but that's neither here nor there. That doesn't have anything to do with us." To even that they add irresponsibility, you see? They all stand in this middle ground. It's the no-responsibility attitude.

So you'd have a hard time on that type of case. That's very low scale as a case. You'd have a hard time getting that person to get positive idea of something *was* and something *wasn't*. And they could get no such clean-cut idea. They'd get "Something was, I guess," and "Something wasn't, *rrrrrrrr*, perhaps."

² Editor's note: This refers probably to the fact that at the time of the lecture there was a lot of radioactivity in the atmosphere due to the testing of nuclear weapons.

So they're always on the verge of having something being revealed suddenly. And it would scare them to death. They make very bad auditors. They in fact won't talk to you about auditing anybody. They'd much rather jump out of their scientific boots and instantly and immediately hold forth with Pope Pius, who said that nobody should monkey with the human mind. I think that's a direct quote. "Nobody should monkey with the human mind." "You or I would not want somebody coming into his basement." I think that was a direct quote. I think it was. It's a papal bull. "And therefore, you shouldn't want to have somebody come into your mind." That's right. "In view of the fact that we got withholds, we don't want to be invaded."

Now, there's a frame of mind that is always on the idea of revelations. Only their revelations, let me call to your attention, are delusory revelations. Tremendous numbers of angels are going to sing on heads of pins, you see? You're suddenly going to get a vision of some holy messiah holding his head in a saucer or something of the sort, standing in front of him.

You're going to get a word which is going to come down from a shaft of light through the heavens, you see, and suddenly all is going to be well; only the shaft comes over the left shoulder. You get terrific superstition. You get all types of religious revelations.

So you get scientific revelations. Well, of course, our current scientific revelation is so out of control that it takes the form of an H-bomb. Now, that's a revelation. *Boom!* And of course, nobody can face that much revelation, so they say, "well, it doesn't exist." So people keep calling attention to the H-bomb, the H-bomb, the H-bomb, the H-bomb, the H-bomb, the H.

Nobody can look at this H-bomb, see? What they got to do is call attention to the fellow who pushes the button, the fellow who pushes the button, the fellow who pushes the button, the fellow who pushes the button. *Ha-ha-ha-ha*. People would look at him.

And you say, "Well, we want to see a psychiatric investigation of all the fellows who are going to push the button."

Immediately, the whole public is liable to get very interested, see? Because they can face the guy who's going to push the button and they can face a button, but they can't face the bomb.

So you see, the H-bomb marchers are trying to get too much revelation for the public to assimilate. So all they got to do is cut back the revelation. Very simple mechanism. Cut back the revelation, to ping, ping, see?

Now, you do that with Scientology. You say, "Well, we make the Clear, we do this and do that and you get healthy and all that sort of thing. And it's terrific and you get more intelligent," and so forth and it's just too much revelation.

Now, if you said to the fellow, you know, “Have you got an ache or pain?”

The fellow says, “Well, yeah, as a matter of fact I got a bad pain in the back of my neck – back of my neck, back of my neck.”

Well, you say, “Well, Scientology would take quite a while to help that.”

“Say, it must be pretty true.”

Then you could do this weird stunt with him, see? You could say, “Well, I’ll show you. I’ll just show you. Now, get the idea there’s pain there. Good. Get the idea there’s no pain there. Good. Get the idea there’s a pain there. Good. Get the idea there’s no pain...”

“Ow!”

You’d say, “There, you see? That’s Scientology.”

The fellow says, “You just about blew my silly head off! That’s Scientology?”

Well, you could say – you could say, “Well, can – is the pain still there?”

“No, as a matter of fact, it isn’t.”

“Well, there you are. No pain? Scientology.”

“No pain; Scientology. There was a hell of a pain there a minute ago.”

Nevertheless he could confront it because it’s slightly on. Did you ever stop to think about that?

He may have an *awful* pain. His stomach may be in *absolute agony*, but he’s got it totally suppressed. So he doesn’t know that. See, he’s going totally to pieces, but he doesn’t ever find out about that until you started running just a general, “It is or it isn’t.” And he was functioning on this and was thinking the ideas. I’d check on this, “Have you followed the auditing command?” or “Have you missed any auditing commands?” I’d do that about every six or eight commands if I were running this, you know. Just check the end rudiment. Do five, six commands. “Have you missed an auditing command?”

“Well, yes, I didn’t get that one.” I’d make him go get that one and then give it to you a few more times. Get him so he was really doing it. And you’ll be amazed. Some of the most fantastic pains that people are totally unaware of will suddenly turn on in parts of the body where they’re having malfunction.

“Nonpainful malfunction” is what drives the medico mad. This the medico can’t understand. What is a “nonpainful malfunction?” You see, there’s no agony connected with it. There’s no pain connected with it. The person is just all out of gear. you see, he should be standing up straight and he makes a picture like a corkscrew. Doesn’t hurt.

Now, you try to do something for this fellow and, of course, it doesn't hurt and nothing happens. Well, why does nothing happen? Well, he just suppresses you, too.

And you want to see one of these guys twisted up like a corkscrew and all messed up like a fire drill – you try to do something for that person, he lets you, he won't have any cognition and nothing will happen and he'll break your heart. The only thing that happens is he just suppressed you and the treatment, too.

Ah, but you get him to say, "It is, *ha-ha*, it isn't, *ha*, it is, it isn't." I don't care how you get him to say it is or it isn't. You could probably do it by "Feel it, is it there? Don't feel it, now. Don't feel it, feel something else. Don't – don't feel it. All right. Now, feel it, feel it. Good. Now, don't feel it." Probably something wild would happen.

I mean, there's various ways you could do this. It appears, it doesn't appear. It appears, it doesn't appear. You see, that's the "it is, it isn't." There's various variations. But you, oddly enough, don't have to go off into these variations. The mind tries to go off into dozens of variations the second you start to think of it because it gets into this obsessive change, see?

If you were trying to run this on yourself, I guarantee that within five or six commands you'd be running another command. See, I just guarantee it. Because you'd be running another command and you'd never really notice a change. You got on to something that was hotter. That's how you'd explain it to yourself, right? How the hell did you get onto something hotter if "It is, it isn't" turned on the hotter thing. *Ha-ha-ha*. You get back to run "It is, it isn't, it is, it isn't." And the thing that you got on to that was hotter will blow off.

That's just the isness and the not-isness, is really what you're asking somebody to run. You're asking him to run directly suppressors.

You say, "There sits the object unsuppressed. Good. *Ha*. There it sits suppressed. *Ha-ha*. Good."

You're running this identically, you see? "There sits the object, freshly, beautifully created. That's fine. Now, there sits the object beautifully disappeared but still there. Thank you." Get the idea?

"Now, there it sits unsquashed by you. There it sits squashed by you. Thank you." That's what you're getting. And of course, you get continuous, consecutive appearances. Because you get all the appearances coming up that the guy has squashed.

And you get him moving on the time track and you get this cycle of action going. You start him completing cycles of action. We don't care which way he completes them. Some people complete them like, "It is, it isn't," see? And that's a cycle of action. But the other people are completing them, "It isn't, it is." Quite weird. Do you see how this works?

Now, there's only two things can happen to a person is to have nothing appear and have something appear. That's the only two things that can happen to a person, see.

See, even the consequences of having made something appear is just getting something else to appear. So the two conditions of any game are appearance and nonappearance. And we get the anatomy of games, which is where I studied this thing out originally.

I was studying games when I finally calculated down to a level of that. We don't have to know too much about games. We – *Scientology: Fundamentals of Thought* gives you about all there is about that.

But you get down to a more fundamental fundamental and you get down to this fact of that is a game. Something is, something isn't. And there are all kinds of ramifications of, "It is," you see? You don't have to say what *it is*, you know, but you can say, "Put anything in the game in it."

Take the opposite player. All right. He is or he isn't, see? He is behind your goal post or he is in front of your goal post or he is in front of his own goal post or he is in front of you.

You see, that's isness by location, which is a via. But now, let's just take the overall purpose of the game. And the overall purpose of the game is you were the catch-alots and he's the sharks. And "Up catch-alots and disappear sharks," see? So totally the end of the game is, "is catch-alots" that you want, you see and "no sharks." And he wants "is sharks, no catch-alots." And you get your basic disagreement which gives you a game.

Now, this, "It is, it isn't" is all that reads on an E-Meter. The middle between is what reads on the meter. The amount of "is" that the person can conceive compared to the amount of "isn't" the person can conceive finds the disagreement between the "isn't" and the "is" which gives you a read.

All the meter reads is disagreement and that is the basic disagreement. A basic disagreement – you're sitting in the room with a Presbyterian and he says an angel has just descended in that rocking chair. And you say there isn't any angel in the rocking chair. And he says there is an angel in the rocking chair and that's a basic disagreement.

Well, if you had two valences in one mind, an atheist and a Presbyterian – let's say these are two valences that have occurred in the Goals Problem Mass, see, there's those two valences – you get a terrific registry when you hit either one.

Well, why do you get a terrific registry when you hit an atheist? Well, that's because of the pressure over here from – the unseen pressure of the Presbyterian. And why do you get such a tremendous charge whenever you hit Presbyterian? Well, that's because of the unseen atheist. Quite fascinating.

You know, you'll blow just as much charge off by getting the oppterm as you'll get the term. If you list the terminals, if you make a list of pc's terminals – they're giving him

pain the whole way – and you get so much tone arm motion, so much charge and so much blowdown and so forth, if you oppterm that right away, you'll get the equal amount, if you get the exact oppterm.

Sometimes you get gradient scales of oppterns. In other words, you get associated oppterns that are out here some distance and gradually walk in and you eventually collide with the actual opptern. So you can get your hands on one side of the picture and then get your hands distantly on the other side of the picture.

But you will eventually – if you blew a tremendous amount of charge off a case by assessing the case out to atheist, eventually, on some other line, some other time – maybe when you oppterned it – why, you got idol. But somehow or another, you got another thing and you finally wound up and you found out the thing, the package, that put that Goals Problem Mass, you see, the problem versus the problem. You'll all of a sudden find this terrifically *hot* other side, see, the other side. You know when they hit this atheist that it just blew *zoooooom*, see? Well, you're doing – this is ten items later and on a totally independent line, you all of a sudden hit this Presbyterian, see? And it all of a sudden goes *squash! boom! crash!* And it's just the same amount of force and power there was in atheist because those things had to be equal to be in balance. And the whole mass goes out of balance when you discharge one, but that one won't discharge totally. It'd discharge the other one, then they all both go. They tend to go out of line when you discharge one and sometimes you don't find the opptern at once because it's kind of slippery. I'm just giving you examples of the thing.

Now, why are those two valences counteropposed and why do they get so much charge, one versus the other, on the E-Meter? Well, that's because one is saying certain principles are and the other is saying certain principles aren't. And the second one I just mentioned are saying certain principles are and the first one I just mentioned is saying certain principles aren't. So they're in *violent* disagreement.

And you'll notice this is the common denominator of every opposed Goals Problem Mass package, is the fact that you get the atheist versus the priest or something. You get the virgin and the harlot. You get the child and the mother. You get things that make problems, one's against the other. They'll be opposites in various ways.

So you have a saintly person versus the devil, devilish person, you see? Well, it's the disagreement between these two things. And one stands for certain isnesses and certain isn'tnesses and the other stands for certain isnesses and certain isn'tnesses. It isn't that one stands for "is" and one stands for "isn't." But it's practically everything that one conceives is, the other conceives isn't. And then that is reversed the other way to. So that everything the second one conceives is, the first one conceives isn't.

So you have this *tremendous* number of items. All these isnesses are opposed by all these not-isnesses. And then we have all these isnesses opposed by *these* not-isnesses. And

so it – everything is just *blah*. And you hit these two, you get a heavily charged mass and of course, it won't discharge and the person gets somatics and everything goes mad every time you hit the thing in the bank. And it restimulates and has total command over the person, and it's violent. Well, it's simply violent because of all these disagreements.

Well, how could you find it on the meter? Well, it's just because it's full of disagreements, that's all. And that's the "is" and "isn't."

The funny part of this is, is this theory could probably be put into any process. You could probably – I don't say you should – but you could probably prepcheck with this – with this type of a Zero question: "Have you ever considered another didn't exist?" Or "Have you ever insisted another didn't exist?" Use that as a Zero question. Well, it'd be rather hot and very lengthy, but it'd sure run.

I don't recommend it. As it merely would run. "Well, have you ever insisted something was?" You'd get a – you'd get a tremendous number of overts because, of course, every overt he's got either consists of asserting that something was or asserting that something wasn't. And there are only really two classes of overts.

When you damage something, you're trying to insist that it isn't. And when you're creating something, you're trying to assert that it is. And when somebody else is trying to create something, you may be trying to help him create it or trying to keep him from creating it.

And when he's trying to not-is something, you are either trying to assist him not-is it or you're trying to prevent him from not-ising it. And these frames of mind, I'm afraid, are very black and white, Aristotle to the contrary.

Now, Aristotle said that everything was black and white and non-Aristotelian logic is the favorite logic of semantics and modern science. And of course, it insists that they're fantastic numbers of shades of gray. And that there are no positives and no negatives. Well, that sounds to me like an awful big Goals Problem Mass. I admit there are lots of shades of gray. And I admit a lot of gradient scales and I admit a lot of these things, but to say that positives don't exist, from a standpoint of somebody's reality, is going pretty far. That's going pretty far.

You can say *ultimates* are unobtainable. That's a fact. That's a fact. It – course – that's telling you an infinite, an infinite, a total presence or a total absence of zero. These things are – but it would not be maintainable. But to say that merely positives, not ultimates but positives couldn't exist, that would just be pure nonsense. And I'm afraid that is the nonsense on which modern science is making its basic errors.

But you start dealing with positives – after all, you're positive. You're sitting in a chair right this minute, aren't you? Well, you are. It's a good enough positive. We don't say

you're the ultimate. But you certainly are, see? And you aren't at home, are you? Right at this moment, you aren't at home, are you?

Male voice: No.

Well, that's fairly positive, isn't it? You're not at home. Now, to the degree that you've left something home or are going to return home, that reduces the ultimate of home-ness, not youness, you see? And to the degree that you're not going to sit here all night, that's no ultimate of hereness.

So what you get is as time drags out, positiveness reduces. The less concept a person has of time, the less concept they have of time, the less positive things seem. Get the idea?

So we get all of our concepts of present time, the hereness and nowness of it. Have you ever had Havingness being run on you and all of a sudden the walls got awfully bright? You know, I mean, common experience.

What you actually did was not having the walls get any solider or brighter, but you became more aware of the nowness of the instant. That's actually what happened. All you have to be is very aware of the nowness of the instant and you get quite a lot of is-ness. And the odd part of it is you get a lot of not-isness.

But your not-isness goes from not not-isness to nonexistence.

Now, the person is sitting there and he's *surrounded* by these masses. There's just *masses, masses, masses*. You know, he's just got masses, oh boy, you know, just packed in *blah*, and so on. Although he's a rather thin person, he has to have a truck move him, you know? And he got masses, masses. Those are all not-isnesses. Those are all nonexistences.

The first thing he'd say about all of them is they're nonexistence. That's – that's what – his first declaration concerning them: "They don't exist."

So you see, as he came up to present time, the walls got brighter, these things would disappear, see? But when you're running some people on Havingness, it comes from not-isness to nonexistence on such a clear-cut track that as you run Havingness on them and make the walls more real, their bank *materializes* and they have people standing in the room, you see?

What you do is run off the not-isness by running on the isness of the wall, see? The wall gets very real to them and they're getting their time track stretched out, you see, and they're getting more here in this particular instant of nowness, you see, and they keep looking over at the corner and you finally say, "What's the matter with the corner?"

"Well, it's just that my Aunt Agatha seems to be standing there and I know she isn't there, but she's awfully three-dimensional."

A few more commands. "Well, how's Aunt Agatha?"

“Well, she’s gone. Why – why are you worried about Aunt Agatha? I wasn’t worried about it.”

In other words, the not-iness which *pushed* this mock-up of Aunt Agatha into invisibility *released* as the person’s reality on the wall increased. You ran out the invisibility of the isness. Here you understand that a person could actually conceive this – these sheets of paper to not exist while at the same time he was looking straight at them. Well, there’s a funny mechanism in the bank where he can go kind of squash with energy, you know? And he makes the mental image picture just disappear. Well, you make the wall get real and of course you make this not-iness run out and what do you find the fellow beholding? He beholds this three-dimensional picture, *ulp!* He beholds Aunt Agatha in the middle of the room.

Sometimes in auditing somebody, if you’re being very successful in running some process or another, doesn’t matter what process – Havingness or bank or Prepchecking or anything else – he might have two or three dead bodies lying in the room at the same time, awfully solid. So solid that he’s absolutely sure he can reach out and touch them and they’d be solid. But if the fellow’s fairly well adjusted in existence and the auditor is running a smooth session and that sort of thing, you very often aren’t told this fact.

He says, “All right,” he knows what they are. They – it’s a bank manifestation and they’ll go away. And they do. And he forgets about it.

What you did is, they’ve always been there and he had them not-ised so that he never saw them. But my God, did he have to be careful in life. Every time he sat down in a room he’d have to make sure that this body, this body and that body were not-ised. Somebody would say, “Well, how are you, Joe?”

And he’d say, “I was reading the stock exchange papers today and I saw some very interesting things.” People wouldn’t ever notice that he’d never said it – answered how he was. *Ha-ha*. Well, monkey.

You say, “How about giving you a little auditing, Joe?”

“Well, I don’t think I’d... well, actually, we don’t have much time, you know.”

You’re liable to have a materialization of dead body number one, dead body number two and dead body number three. And he just doesn’t like to look at them. I mean, after you’ve killed people, been responsible for their deaths, you don’t like to stand around looking at them. Some people don’t. They’re peculiar.

I know I have at times gloated. Not like you on the track, you’ve always been social about the thing. I’ve actually been crass enough to stand there and say, “*Ha-ha*,” but it’s not the thing to do, you know? So I have to withhold that.

Actually, he knows, because he's learned, that if he sits down in a certain type of room, this thing starts to loosen up and he starts to feel sort of peculiar, so he has to get very interested and he has to get very occupied and he never can sit quietly.

A woman made a funny remark to me one time. I told her – I said, “Well, I think I'll sit down for a while and rest.”

And she said, “Well, what are you going to do?”

And I said, “Nothing.”

“Oh, you're going to read, huh?”

“No, no, no. Just nothing.”

“You're going to think about something.”

“No, no, no.”

“Why?”

All of a sudden she practically spun in, you know? The idea of just sitting down and not doing anything and not thinking about anything and not having your mind occupied – this caused her to get a sensation of spinning in.

What was that sensation? Well, you had to keep yourself distracted. If you didn't keep yourself distracted, something would appear.

Well, the question is what would appear? It's actually a mental image picture that will appear. And that's all that will appear. And they're *deathly* afraid of mental image pictures or the *appearance* of something.

All right. The fellow that you audit and audit and audit and audit and audit and go on and on and on and on and on and on and audit and audit and audit and audit and audit and audit and audit and audit and they never get any pictures – *oooh*, you're dealing with a classic. You got a total suppression. Nothing's going to appear. What's the matter with him? Well, what's he afraid is going to appear? That's a simple question.

You make a list of things, “Who or what would be afraid to find out?” You're asking for appearance, you see? Just to have him list that. *Ahhhhhhh!* That would be the most horrible thing you ever tried to do to that poor fellow. Ruin him. Ruin his case. The odd part of it is, as you went at this and went deeper into it and opptermmed the terminals you found and found other analogous lines and so on, you would get appearances. Place gets haunted from time to time, you know, the dead bodies start to show up. Yeah. He's got them all beautifully squashed. And sometimes they bleed green and this is very startling.

Now, sometimes somebody has been in a weakened condition, has suddenly taken his attention off one of these things and it's materialized. *Auggggggg!* Fair slaughtered him, it did. Actually, practically scared him out of his wits.

He'll say he's been blanketed. I know of a case sat down in – well, this case absolutely shattered – sat down in a dentist's office, I think it was, something like that or away in a doctor's office and all of a sudden, this fantastic, terrible, dizzying series of cones turned on over the body.

Case went stark staring mad. Went home and never left home from that year to the next until finally audited on an engram in old Dianetic days. Now, that's not one – just one case, see?

The case for a moment, peculiarly, just didn't not-is this particular mass and it went into action. Case changed its mind in a certain way and got this thing materialized, see?

Well, it was always there except they took their not-is off of it and it went *zzzzzzt*, and then they *stopped* it, see, with a new suppression.

And they said something had happened to them. Yes, that's true. Something had happened to them. They'd stopped not-ising for a moment. Pretty desperate. So this case in being audited, of course, afterwards, would be – very carefully not-is and then answer the auditing question. Not-is and then answer the auditing question. Except they wouldn't do it consciously, so that it'd never wear out. Well, the case wouldn't ever really ever make any progress, would it, at all. *Ha-ha-ha-ha*. Case knew they'd better not let their mind change.

Now, actually, there are some pretty hideous phenomena occur. There are various sensations and motions and sick stomachs and terror stomachs and backs of heads falling off and noses disappearing and all of a sudden the pc looks down and can't see himself from the thighs down; you know, it's just all vanished. You get upset.

Well, the thing to do is to go on through, see, and not let the pc stop on such a thing or be upset about such a thing because you're just running into an "is" and "it isn't" type of manifestation. And if you can get an "it is," you'll certainly sooner or later get an "isn't." And this used to upset auditors once in a while in the old days, when we were running Not-Know – notknowing people's heads and hats and so forth and "What could you not-know about this one?" And auditors would go mad on this, you know, every once in a while. That'd – you'd never hardly get anybody to run this cleanly because the pc would say, "Well, yes, I did that."

And the auditor would say, oddly enough and mistakenly, say, "Well, did what?"

"Well, I not-knew his head, all right. He's walking down the street with no head."

And the auditor would get so curious at this moment – this was the worst trouble with this process, why we don't use it anymore – the auditor would get so curious that he'd stop

and question the pc as to what happened and how it happened and everything else and then walk around in circles and not finish the process and skip the whole thing. Well, of course, this was terribly restimulative on the subject of this “not find out” button, wasn’t it? You were running straight into the not-is and the auditor all of a sudden had been running a process – he didn’t realize that he was in that much danger but he was running a process which would turn off and turn on not-isness. *Ooooooooooh, oooooh*. Maybe it’d all go the other way, you see?

Many people don’t have a time track. They have a series of not-isnesses. Many people don’t have any present time at all; they just have a generality of comfortable not-is. They are the calm people, you know? Calm as a whiz-bang on Guy Fawkes, Fourth of July.

Anyhow, the manifestations you see as a result of this particular activity of not-is brings about an isness. Because when the not-isness disappears, the isness materializes. And of course, it can be guaranteed to occasionally scare pcs spitless.

And after it’s happened to him once, after that they make sure nothing happens to their case. “Oh, it’s not going to happen to me again. No. I want to keep that from happening again,” which is a no duplication and nothing happens. You see that?

An isness appeared because a not-isness ran out. Then you get a manifestation. You get pictures. Actually, solid objects will appear in a room right with the pc. All kinds of wild things will occur.

I know what this is because one time I was running – being run through something and ran into something. And I ran into a European battle where the columns of soldiers and the grass and the soldiers and everything and the guns and the smoke and all perceptions were much more there than present time was there. They were all lined up firing at each other in volleys, you know? It was quite a surprise, do you know? Quite a surprise.

It didn’t last very long I didn’t have hardly time to duck before the... But it was startling to say the least. Now, much brighter than this room appears at the moment, you see.

Facing up to and exchanging volleys with other company – in company front formations, you see. What bigger overt is there. About twenty paces between the ranks. Slaughter, you know?

Well, there is a lot of isness there, man, because, you see, firing the gun is an insistence on beingness, see? Somebody comes along and says, “You’re not so much.”

And you swell up at once like a frog, you know. *Pooooof*. See? “I is,” see? “Here I is. I is. I’m big. I’m big shot. I’m not this thing you’re trying to not-is.” You see? Get the idea? “*Ooooo*.” See?

Girl immediately puts on more lipstick. Men swell up or fire guns. It all depends on what civilization you’re living in. Girls adopt bustles and falsies. There’s no telling what they’ll do in the manifestation. But that’s representing an isness, see!

Somebody else comes along, says, “They’re no good,” see. “They shouldn’t do that.” “Paint’s bad. Dresses are bad.” These things. “Everybody should be natural.” All kinds of campaigns.

“Oh, my dear, what a beautiful hat. I’ve liked it ever since last year.”

Various types and degrees and grades, you see, of isness and not-isness, you know?

Well, of course, where a person in the bank has been asserting isness and somebody else has been asserting not-isness or somebody else has been asserting isness and where he has been asserting not-isness, you get – there are various bank phenomena. And they turn on and they turn off and one hardly knows what’s happening.

But it’s where they get stuck that the pc gets worried. So if he gets into these things, he gets afraid to find out. Things will materialize, you see? Something is liable to materialize. Something is liable to appear. God knows what will happen. He’s got somebody talking about his bank, so Lord knows what’s going to appear. He’s just shocky on the subject of things appearing. That is the only thing wrong with this bad auditor.

He gets leery having things appear. Pc is liable to materialize something. He’s liable to get restimulated. No telling what might happen.

Well, the thing to do is get him over being scared of this sort of thing. As I say, you can get him over it educationally. You can get him over it directly with a process. Before we only had education to get him over it. Now we have a direct process to get him over it. You can get a person over not-isness in various ways.

“It is. It isn’t. It is. It isn’t.” That’s kind of lengthy.

3D Criss Cross, various types of not-isness in Prepcheck questions. And more important than these other manifestations at the moment is... you can go ahead and do this and I’ll give you a bulletin on it. And if it doesn’t work out, why, that’s fine. But I know it’ll work out because I gave it a little more testing and checking – and that is a change in the Withhold System that gives you this same manifestation. Now, your Withhold System goes What, When, All and Who. Isn’t that right?

Audience voices: Mm-hm.

And that’s the totality of the Withhold System.

All right. Now, let’s buck the Withhold System up and have it take care of suppressors. And I think you will find – although I don’t guarantee this; I haven’t done as much testing on this as I should have – I think you will find and that you’ll be on safe ground, that it will run an engram if you do this. So that you could prepcheck and if you ran into an engram... And that’s the primary reason why you shouldn’t go whole track with the thing; it might not run an engram, you see? I think with this additive, I think you will find it’ll run an

engram – that’s just a good guesstimate. That’s an expert piece of guesstimate by my part – if you add Appear before you add Who...

You’ve got your Zero question. You get your What question. I’ve been working on this trying to make Prepchecking a little easier for you. And I have some other little changes in Prepchecking I’ll give you later, but you can use this one at once. Now, these are just how you get the subject of your Zero question, so it doesn’t influence what I’m talking to you about right now.

And you say When, just as you have been, All, just as you have been, Appear and Who. Now, how do you say Appear? “Well, what might have revealed itself at that point?” Or “What might have appeared at that point?” Or “Is there anything that should have shown up?” Or “Is there anything that didn’t show up?”

You see, any variation on this subject of appear. “What might have revealed itself at that moment?” And just run that in before you say Who and What.

You say, “Well, what might have appeared?”

And the pc says, “Well, *ha-ha*, the cops.”

“Well, who didn’t know about it?”

“Well the *police* of course.”

Yeah, here we go. And you took the suppressor off the police. See? So this is just removing suppressors. Just a little mechanism for the removal of a suppressor off of a withhold, which should make the withhold much more rapidly cleanable.

I’m aiming in the direction, however, of using the – this question system of running an engram. I haven’t expected it to run engrams. I’ve just been expecting to run locks of withholds.

But I think beefed up to that degree, there’s a possibility that it will *directly* run engrams. Not that you use it directly on an engram, but if your pc got into one, there it’d go.

“What might have appeared?” Do you see?

“Should anything have appeared?” Anything that makes sense and just use the word “reveal” or “appear,” (question mark). You get the maybe off of the thing. And just run that in. It’s all right. You can go ahead and make a few mistakes first time, you’re getting used to the When, All, Who. Well, it’s When, All, Appear, Who.

“Is that all of it? Well, what should have appeared? Okay, and who should have found out about that and didn’t?” And I think it’ll take the suppressors off.

Well, now there is the constituency and the consistency of the mind as regards to auditing. Talked to you first in the other lecture about the inhibitions of the auditor. This has been more on the basis of what happens with the pc.

And if the pc has something materialize which then mysteriously disappears and the pc sits there comfortably forevermore, *ha-ha*. I think you must have missed. Do you see how it would be?

Pc says, "Awful pain in the – . Well, that's all right now. Go ahead with the next auditing question. It's all right with me."

He just suppressed the living daylights out of that one. Well, how're you going to work around it? Don't. Because if you're running on suppressors, the rest of it will run out. Doesn't require any particular or special handling if you're running an appearance.

So the suppression that you often got – you know on running early sessions – have you noticed that running some early sessions, a person repressed past lives or repressed this or repressed that and so forth? Well, now running withholds, you'll probably pull off those suppressors and the thing shows up.

Now, there are possibly other ways of handling suppressors. There undoubtedly are. There are possibly neater ways of handling this and so forth and they will be developed as they develop. I personally at the present moment consider the ways I've given you completely adequate to your purposes.

All I need to give you now to smooth out your Prepchecking completely is a method of finding the Zero questions and so forth, accurately and instantly on this particular pc and I got that worked out, too. But it's late and I will talk to you about that next time.

Thank you.