Mechanisms of the Mind

From the Special Hubbard Professional Auditors Course

- Tuesday the 14th of April, 1959 -

Lecture 8

Thank you.

Well, today we're going into something that we'll probably cover in a large hurry and you'll catch up with it in two or three years. Now, I'm being flattering because man didn't catch up with this in two or three million. So, I'll show you an entrance point here of observation and you'll get so you can see this and spot it and handle it very, very well.

The subject is mechanisms of the mind. Mechanisms of the mind. It's a very vast subject. Psychology, nineteenth century psychology in its total entirety, and nineteenth century psychiatry in its entirety, did not reach any fundamental mechanism in the human mind. And every time you try to use that information as itself you get into trouble.

Wherever I have gone astray in Dianetic research, and later Scientology research, it is because I have used some data out of the nineteenth century that I had no business using. That's interesting to know. I just give it to you as a research datum. When they said it went this way and then went that way, I finally found out that you could count on it having been the opposite, or the datum was entirely irrelevant to what we wanted.

Now, this is not condemnation. I'm trying to give you solid research material. Basically, in order to view this subject at all it was necessary to compartment life in order to know what to look at. I did this rather heroically. I chopped life up into big chunks on this basis: What had benefited man and what had not benefited man? Solely and completely along this line. Was the civilization using such-and-so body of knowledge successful or unsuccessful? That's a very wide sweep, isn't it?

This is why you occasionally find me sarcastic about Christianity, because the first one to be pushed aside as a subject we didn't have to study was Christianity. Now, why was that? Is it because one was an atheist or one had prejudices or something? I'm afraid not. I'm afraid not. Everywhere I have looked I have found Christianity and insanity with a similarly high incidence.

Now, to do research you have to be cold-blooded. You have to lay aside a lot of preconceptions. And it doesn't matter whether I said my prayers when I was a little boy or not. That has nothing to do with it. When you're trying to look at the whole body of life in one sweeping look, and isolate out of it the fundamental data on which life operates, you certainly have to get rid of certain bodies of knowledge in order to look at anything at all. Do you see the procedure? A procedure by elimination, in other words.

Well, Christianity went. And there's one particular action in Christianity which went out the window further than general Christianity, and that was Christian Science.

Because a check-up in mental hospitals showed a greater number of inmates had belonged to that faith than any other faith. You see how cold-blooded this look was? In other words, if these are contributive to insanity, then they must be on a reverse vector as a body of knowledge. There must be something wrong in that body of knowledge which downgrades sanity and we were trying to find out what was a fundamental. So having swept aside certain bodies of knowledge of this character, we still found certain bodies sitting in view.

Well, the one which sat most plainly in view was the science of physics. And physics, oddly enough, has several fundamental laws in it which are mental mechanisms.

Now, for physics to remain in view was perfectly simple because evidently a knowledge of the mechanics of the physical universe or physics (which is physics) - where it appears, we have superstition, fear, illness and other things dropping out. Do you see that? So this becomes then a body of knowledge which is well worth studying because it evidently breeds sanity.

But here were some other subjects...and somebody will clobber me with this someday or another and say, "He doesn't believe in Yahwah," or something of the sort. I believe in more gods than anybody you ever heard of. And I certainly know more personally than any minister in the business. I'm very far from an atheist. An atheist believes more ardently in God than anybody else. He does because he has to protest against him.

Now, Christianity must have had something in it that wasn't good for people and physics must have something in it that was good for people. And several other bodies of information examined in this character also began to exclude two bodies of knowledge - really three - psychology, psychoanalysis and psychiatry. These were all three nineteenth century developments. They are not twentieth century developments and actually nothing to amount to anything has been added in the twentieth century.

I'm not just being sarcastic. This is true. Psychoanalysis was at its high peak in 1894, and there's been nothing been added to it to amount to anything, except that essay that was written by Freud about 1920 that said it was unsolvable and interminable. I've forgotten the name of the essay. I've read it. It was the cry of a heartbroken man - twenty-eight, twenty-six years after his announcement of the libido theory.

Now, with that we could dismiss sex as the primary thing, because a concentration on sex and researches in sex exclusively had not brought about broad sanity. See, it didn't work. So we just didn't have to examine that at all. You see, your shortcuts. This is how we got this much information this fast, you see? Just by these compartmentations, shortcuts, looking it over, condemning a whole body of knowledge; say we'll look at that later. You know, that sort of thing.

Psychology - psychology could have been born out of physics, but nobody in psychology knows physics or knew physics. Natural philosophy and psychology were considered antipathetic to a very marked degree.

Psychology got off to the on the wrong foot, in I think it was 18... I used to know the date extremely well -69 or 89, something like that, when Professor Wundt said, "All thinking is matter." Only he didn't say it that way. He said, "Psychology is a study of physical anatomy. It is the study of brain." And it has followed that line ever since, it hasn't made anybody well and hasn't done anything for anybody but quite the contrary has downgraded a tremendous number of people, because we find people who study

psychology are not very processable. They have made their beingness totally a mass of gray matter and it's very hard to unstick them from it. So we could dismiss that one.

Psychiatry never succeeded in making anybody sane never did. It alleviated the condition every now and then. So we could dismiss that.

You see how we could go about this? So this leaves us with what? This left us with the fact that every country which did not have a good, fundamental knowledge of the physical universe and its laws went into a decline, its people became very degraded, it developed caste systems, terrific inequalities - India, for instance, is an example. So we come back to this and we find basically the fundamental mechanism which differentiates these huge bodies of knowledge and brings one up as better for man than another one. We say, "better" for them - well, he survives better and he dies easier and he gets born easier - you get the idea? He has a better time of it, you might say, and is conquering his environment more successfully.

And we look this over and we find order after all these years. It isn't that physics is true, it's that physics enforces a certain order upon people. It runs pretty good 8-C. When you fall off a cliff you hit the bottom, every time. There aren't a lot of maybes in this subject, you see? That's basically what's right with physics.

When you when you hit a pool ball - you put two pool balls together, and when you hit this pool ball, why, that pool ball will roll away - interaction. When you fire a gun it kicks you in the shoulder just as - with the same force that it kicks a ball out of the nose. Because the ball is smaller, it has greater penetration power and there you are. That's the laws of interaction.

There's no maybes about this. You're living in a very fine universe. It has order. Now, when people begin to study this order and find out how orderly it is, they themselves evidently become more orderly. And up to a certain point this much order is very good for man.

Now, that certain point is a point where he becomes obsessed of looking inside things he has already looked into. In other words, he begins to attack the physical universe, he begins to try to expose the physical universe in some fundamental laws which it doesn't have, and he begins to worship the chaos on which all the order he thinks is built, and a number of things. And you get a nuclear physicist and they're nutty as fruitcakes. They're strictly fruitcake. You could serve them up for Christmas dinner any day and they'd never know the difference.

That's not a bitter statement. You should meet some of them. I'm talking about, now, your high-ranking theoretical boys that are plunging off the end of nowhere. But amongst these crew, the great giants of the subject, very hardly any of whom are around now Einstein and the rest of them - these fellows these fellows also had an orderly look toward life.

Well now, it isn't that the physicist himself as a super-specialist is terribly good for man, because he's about to blow him up. But the subject itself, its orderliness, the orderliness of physics does appeal to us, because people are better where man recognizes the physical universe for what it is. And the basis of that is order. It doesn't interject very many maybes.

I'll tell you, if you lived in a universe when you started to walk out that door, you emerged at the back of the building; if you lived in a universe where it was twenty minutes from now a half an hour ago, and Joe was at two o'clock while you were at six in the same town; and you had tremendous numbers of maybes and uncertainty, you would not be feeling very well, let me assure you. You would have what? Uncertainty.

So we get a fundamental mechanism of the mind is first, order. Order is positive. Chaos is more or less negative or something that you can neglect. You can pay attention to order and bring order with impunity, without any vast consequence to yourself.

But if you start bringing about confusion there is a consequence. That's perhaps the most fundamental of mechanisms. That's why 8-C works when run by a good auditor; it doesn't work when it's run by a sloppy auditor, you see? The good auditor has got regularity there; he's got duplication of command; he has insistence, intent on the thing being carried out as a command. You get the idea? In other words, there's - it's a smooth performance which is what? Predictable. Predictable. A predictable performance as an auditor, then -duplicative, announced, bridged and so forth, brings order to the pre-clear.

Now, it's a very funny thing that all you would have to do is do anything well in an orderly fashion with a PC and you could improve his health. That's a fundamental mechanism.

Now, every time you try to bring order you blow off residual confusion. If there's confusion in an area and you enter order into the area, you are going to blow off some confusion. Now, please, just make up your mind to that as an auditor and recognize it as you go as a fundamental, and stop protesting because confusion comes off of a PC. Where is it going to go? What are you going to do, just dam the whole thing up?

Well, this PC starts to scream. Well, you haven't introduced disorder into him. He started to scream because you started introducing order. The thing to do is to introduce some more order and he'll scream more. And now introduce some more order and some more order and all of a sudden, why, he's got it taped. And he stops screaming and he's squared around and he feels much better.

Now, this mental mechanism you will not find in any of man's studies - up and right until now - Scientology. But out of observing tremendous masses of information, subdividing all the information that man ever had into groups, studying it and so on, we finally arrive with this conclusion. I've only given you a very rough idea of how we arrive with this conclusion, but you can observe this happening.

Now, you start straightening out an organization. You take a small organization and as an auditor you start sort of auditing it and straightening it out. And what are you going to find? You're going to find that all of the confusions which are residual in the thing are one way or another going to blow out. You're putting order into it; confusion is going to blow off of it. And before it finally becomes totally ordered, you're going to see a lot of confusion arise.

One of the first things that happens when you start to straighten up an organization is those exact points where the most disorder and the least understanding exist, those exact points will practically blow your head off. They'll come right in and they'll say, "No, we can't do this. We can't follow that order. We couldn't possibly accomplish this and it's not possible, and there is no way by which we could bring this about" and so forth, "and we can't. We're - and really... And I've just been sitting here" or "I've just been sitting here all day and I can't do anything because I just don't understand the executive order which you just handed me." Get the idea? The executive order said that all red plates should be stacked on the right and all blue plates should be stacked on the left, see? Boy! That's order, see? You come in and you find all plates stacked behind the person. And you say, "No, on the right, on the left, on the right, on the left. That's all."

"Yeah, well, I couldn't see any purpose in it," and apathy and so on and so on and so on. Well, don't give up. Show him again, go on to some other point in the organization.

Come back, show this guy again. By this time he's got all the plates; he's got one third red, one third blue, one third red, one third blue stacked up on his head, see?

You say, “No.” You say, "One color goes here, one color goes here. That's it. That's the way you do it." You get them all stacked up. Show him.

Don't be surprised if in a few days this fellow comes in to you and he says, “I just - just realized that if all one color is stacked in one place and all the other color is stacked in the other place, that you can count them and find out how many you’ve got very easily.” All you did was blow off confusion.

Now take a girl - take a girl from an ordinary business office and put her at a typewriter in a very orderly organization. Let's say the tapes she's to type come in a basket, and they're brought by a messenger - they're brought in a basket. They go through a certain exact procedure. Letters emerge at the other end. And the tape accompanies these letters and they go back and they're taken away on that side. She'll almost blow her brains out.

Now, you could produce the same phenomenon of confusion blowing off by having her touch her typewriter; just sit there and touch the typewriter, touch the desk, touch the typewriter - and she feels giddy; touch the typewriter, touch the desk, touch the chair, touch the floor, look at the walls, look at the window, touch the typewriter, touch the desk, touch the floor. She feels confused. She'll have feelings of apathy and confusion and other things coming up. Do you see that? There's an exact co-ordination then between the action of processing and the action of doing the job. And the more order the person is capable of, the less confusion comes off. And the person that has the most confusion will receive at first the least order, and the most disorder comes off of.

It's a very remarkable thing, but you get some pre-clears and you start processing them. and they suddenly start to sweat or they start to smell bad or the - or they start to shake or various other wild, weird things occur.

Well, don't worry about it. That is unaligned or misaligned, contrary, upset, unestablished, mysterious, uncertain data, motions and so forth. These things are just - they just start coming off of the PC. It's the most remarkable thing you ever saw.

So man could be said to be at his best when he is a creature of order and at his worst when he is disorderly. That doesn't mean particularly you should protest against disorder, or take it on for your randomity. You can actually neglect it. Now, here's another odd thing. The only time you ever got into trouble was when you neglected order and totally fixated on disorder. When you did that, you were in trouble. In other words, the difficulties of man stem from an exact reversal of this state of affairs.

This foreman who rushes around all over the place trying to straighten up every piece of disorder and never once issues an orderly order or straightens out anything fundamental, will be found merely to stack up more disorder in his zone of influence. He'll just bring about more and more disorder. And the very next thing you know, you're hardly able to do anything.

Now he has to wind up, usually, doing the whole thing himself or something like that. Any job that's to be done around there, he has to do it - why? That's because all the disorder snapped in on him and the only person you could bring any order to would be the foreman, you see? And you could try to bring some order to him, but that would be about all. Because he'd no longer be capable of really bringing any order that he himself didn't have right up here.

Now, that's what's happened to most thetans. They've attacked disorder and attacked it and been subjected to it and thought it was important and bowed down to it - the "god of calamity" and the "gods of chaos" - to a point where they're totally governed by chaos or disorder. And we get another mental principle which is: confusion and the stable datum.

Now, an individual will assume a stable datum in order to get out of the confusion. Now, the way he normally did this was in order to look at random particles at all, he had to assume the viewpoint of one particle. I spoke of that the other day, do you remember this? They had to ass... he had to assume a beingness of some sort in order to see these other particles. Well, when he then becomes afraid of these other particles and says, "Their disorder is so tremendous that I cannot even vaguely stand all of that motion and disorder," then he clutches solidly onto this one particle, which is apparently motionless.

If you throw a bunch of paper up in the air, by the way, all particles of the paper look disorderly, right? Well, now if you threw the same batch of paper out in space, without the reference of the walls or floor, they would again all look disorderly, wouldn't they?

But if you took hold of just one and saw all the others from it, regardless of what this one was doing out in space, it would look motionless and all other particles would look in motion. Do you see that clearly? All particles, then, could be viewed from all particles minus one. See, that's a simple mechanism.

Well, he gets an idea that something is motionless or something is orderly and views all other particles as being in confusion and being disorderly. Got the idea? And then stacks up because of fear of disorder or fear of violence or something of the sort. Everything is bad, then, except the one thing he is holding on to with a horrible clutch.

Now, he'll freeze on to this one datum in order to withstand the confusion he is surrounded with. In other words, that's the most order this individual could have, is simply the apparency of motionlessness of one particle while all other - while all particles actually are in motion. Get the idea? Well, that's the confusion.

Now, the - all particles minus one in motion is the confusion to this person. And the one particle he is viewing everything from, whether it's a piece of paper or a head or a grain of sand or a drop of water or a spinning airplane or anything else, that, he says, is motionless; that is solid. He attributes various virtues to this thing, you see, and assigns all order to this one particle.

Well, as soon as he does that he's lost.

We get into the subject of randomity that we're not terribly interested in. You should look over the axioms of randomity; plus and minus randomity, how much a person can tolerate in terms of exterior motion. Now, there's both too much and too little, but it's according to any man it's different. Almost any person has a different answer to how much motion is too much motion. And almost any person has a different answer to how little motion is too little motion.
-

I used to know - a person - I used to tell this person I was going up and sit down. And they'd say, "What are you going to do?"

And I'd say, "I'm not going to do anything. I'm going up and sit down."

This person every time I would say it, he would almost faint.

“Well, how long are you going to sit down?”

“I don't know. It's a couple hours till dinner time, I'll just sit down. That's all and…”

“Oh, then you're going to wait for dinner?”

“No I'm not going to do anything. Nothing! Just nothing - not for two hours. Haaaah.”

Aren't you going to read a book? Aren't you going to think? Aren't you going to do anything?" You see? They couldn't - this to them - this to them was really super minus randomity, you see? This - too quiet! You know, it's fabulous.

Now, you go out to the racetrack, you take hold of one of these cars that some of the boys drive and you wrap yourself around the steering wheel; and you're going to get it up, going around the track, to about if you're not experienced at this - you’re going to get it up to 35 or 40 miles an hour and you're going to say, “Boy, we’re traveling. We're really going.” 35, 40 miles an hour.

After all you're in an unfamiliar area, you're in a rather narrow track; tracks are not nice and smooth like turnpikes. There are lots of things wrong with racetracks from the viewpoint of the average driver. You'd say, "We're really going." Also, racing cars these days are rather small, low to the ground, and so on. They're a little bit different than passenger cars. And you'd say, “Boy, that's really going.”

Well, that isn't really going to a race driver. He doesn't think he's gotten her out of second gear until he's going about 80. And he really doesn't start getting any sensation of speed until he's going something on the order of 100 to 125. And then he says, “Well now, this is about right.”

You'd have to take this boy up probably to 195, 215, something like that until you got plus randomity. But you've got plus randomity at 50. Got the idea? I don't say you would get plus randomity at 50, I'm just saying that's the way it is.

I notice I know one time - one time I went down to a little kiddie racetrack and they had little two-and-a-half horsepower cars; and they had little tiny wheels and they had governors on the things so they wouldn't go any faster, I think, than 12 miles an hour. And they had a very small track. And I got to talking to the mechanic and that I had known up on the speedway. And he says, “You ought to drive one of these things.” He says, “It's pretty wild, you know,” words to that effect. “"t's pretty crazy.”

And I said, "Well, I couldn't even get in one.”

And he said, “Oh yes, you could. If you stick your knees up in the air and so forth, why, you can just barely get down there." He said, "Here, let me take the governor off of one of these things, and you take it around the track a couple of times.” He says, “There's no kids here right now.”

Well now, the wheels on that thing were not more than about a foot in diameter, if that, you see? You know, those crazy little cars would go about 40. And there’s nothing but bumps. Thing is uncontrollable. Man, I took that thing up to about 30 miles an hour and that was 550 as far as I was concerned. I was... That was plus randomity, that's all. It was just the circumstances of things.

So actually, the miles per hour doesn't mean anything. It's just what you consider in

terms of speed and security and a whole bunch of considerations go into this sort of thing.

So you could have too much motion or irregularity or too little motion or irregularity, don't you see? And nearly everybody has an optimum. Some. where in between too much and too little, he's comfortable. He's very comfortable.

If you notice on long trips that your concept of the right speed keeps going up. You notice that? Till finally you consider the right speed probably up there around 65, 70, something like that. That doesn't seem very, very fast to you. But if you've been just driving to work every morning or something of that sort, why, you'll find out that the right speed seems to be about 40. And when you first start out on the trip, why, cars are going by you at a mad rate, you see, on all sides. And you're saying to yourself, "My, they're certainly traveling fast." And then you condition yourself to this upper randomity and you're all set.

All right, that's a mental mechanism: plus - minus randomity - how much motion is too much motion. Therefore, the definition of confusion - definition of confusion would be, really, too much motion for anybody.

But you could get the same thing from too little motion. Person could still be confused. Individual walks out on the plain, there's nothing moving anyplace - there's nothing moving, there's not a breath of air stirring; there isn't any change in the horizon; and he all of a sudden feels totally spooked. It's too still! He becomes afraid. He has various emotional reactions.

So this too much and too little combine into an optimum, and this optimum to a person seems to be still. And that's something for you to know.

This will also coordinate with how much order is order; the speed of travel of particles, the neatness of pattern of particles. And you'll run into some mad men, sometime or another, that have to have their hat exactly here and their coat exactly there and their shoes exactly there. They go around adjusting things by the millimeter, you know? And dinner has to be served exactly this way, and so forth. And they appear to be very cautious and very careful about everything, you see? Ah, this individual is probably - probably three quarters around the bend.

It isn't important. This much order is not order. This much order is just a trial by patience or something of the sort, you see? That's just too much order for most people. But it's just the right amount of order for him - total meticulousness. How much order is order? How much motion is motion? How little motion is no motion? All of these things are considerations. But we can still handle these things with broad looks.

Your PC will only be jumping up and down and shaking his head from left to right fifteen or twenty times a second, and will appear to him to be motionless. There's an old process known as, "You walk over to that wall and you hold that wall still," you see? Well, how still is "still" to the person? That's a question that only the person can ask. But your insisting that he make it still is usually your insistence that he make it an optimum stillness for him. And when he can achieve this, he can then have a wider zone of what's optimum. Do you understand me? You actually broaden his randomity. You make him familiar with stillnesses, and he gets so he can tolerate them.

Now, the whole test here is familiarity. There's no such thing as conditioning. Psychology was mad when it invented conditioning, because there is no such thing as conditioning. They thought that things were piped into some kind of a sub-conscious and went on automatic, and the individual could then do an action. They thought that a musician, for instance, was a better musician if he was less aware. Then how is it that you

can make a better musician by making him more familiar with music? But how is it they can never make a better musician by burying it further in his sub-conscious? Here's a question of what was right and what was wrong. Here we're into two opposites.

All progress could be said to be associated with familiarity. Familiarity. A person can do an action so many times that he becomes totally aware of the action and requires so little of his attention to be aware of the action that it appears to be submerged. He doesn't have to think very hard to do this action, don't you see? So now, in the nineteenth century they made a blunder. They said it's because it's submerged and gone and he isn't noticing it. Now, the best driver is an automatic driver or something like that.

Now recently - recently, they made a test, and they found out that those people who were driving the most unconsciously had the most wrecks. That I agree with 100 percent. That's absolutely true.

Someday, just for fun - this will throw you for a while - if you have a vehicle of any kind such as a body or a car or anything else, try driving the thing totally conscious of driving it. Drive it totally in PT, 100 percent. Make every motion you make with it utterly conscious. If this is a car, you will wind up almost wrapping it around every - every light pole and every curve and every abutment that you run into.

But to send that car forward with intention, and to be totally aware of everything you are doing is a vast trial on your nerves. Because you can throw things down into an unconscious action a conditioned action. A thetan has that ability. But you're just getting further and further from being a driver. Yeah, that's not good.

Or you can build it up into higher and higher familiarity and more and more awareness and you will eventually improve your driving. A person who has an hypnotic implant of the directions to drive, in other words, will gradually lose his ability to drive. He'll drive worse and worse and worse until he gets to be the one you meet in the US consistently - the seventy-year-old person who has eventually gotten enough money together to get the biggest Cadillac there is. He plants it in the middle of the road and drives at ten miles an hour and you've had it. Driving with total care and then they run over all the abutments and into the light poles and so forth, and it's pretty messy.

Now, you could go in for this: “I must be able to do it without being aware of it.” But that is the death of a skill. A skill declines. It submerges out of sight to the degree that it submerges out of consciousness. The direction to go to improve any skill is to push it further and further into consciousness. In other words, be more and more aware of what you're doing. And you'll find out you get better and better and better, and after a while you wonder why this car has a motor.

You can take it and throw it down the road and make it turn the curve and so forth, and you sort of hold on to the steering wheel with one hand and yank it around the corner and so forth. But you're pushing the whole car, you're regulating the whole car, you're totally controlling the car. And you'll find out that if you had to make an emergency stop, you will make it in tenths of seconds faster than anybody who merely has been driving for a long time in an unconscious fog. You get the idea?

So the direction to go for skill is further familiarity, further consciousness and further awareness. So we get a mental mechanism involved here: The further one departs from awareness or knowingness, the more difficulty he encounters in any sphere of activity.

This is this is a rule, this is a law. The more disorder he will find himself subjected to, and the more thoroughly he will have to grip on a stability in order to keep going. That's the direction when they pass out of consciousness, you see? When they get less and

less conscious, they're running into more disorder, they're running into more accident, less predictability; they are more and more the effect of the environment. This is - this is, by the way, a tremendous thing to know. This is brand new knowledge. See, because you'd find-you'd find the nineteenth-century psychologist can test this with oh - with torts and retorts and ink would be flying in all directions and the mice would be squealing, you know? It'd be a terrible mess. He'd almost go around the bend if you told him he had to be conscious to be better.

Now, the whole subject has been departing into unconsciousness, so that today the psychologist is to some degree lost to the Scientologist. The Scientologist makes some effort to bring him up to date, to rescue him, to do something about him professionally and so on. But you're at once in contest with this one thing. He says, "conditioning" and you say "familiarity." And you're talking about two different things which are the opposite poles of each other. And the direction you're going: toward greater consciousness, greater awareness, greater familiarity, as the lesson to be learned; and he's going toward less consciousness, more automaticity, bury it from sight, hypnotize them a little bit further. And you just come to no agreement whatsoever because he cannot now observe what you show him. That's the pity of it. That's the horror of it.

This fellow, originally when he got into psychology, he wanted to cure people, he wanted to make them smarter, he wanted to take them apart, put them back together again, he wanted to be able to tell his government how to win a war, he wanted to do all kinds of things, don't you see? And then he gets hung with this answer of less and less familiarity, more and more unconsciousness and more and more conditioning. The thing you ought to do with a soldier is to take him out and make him less and less aware of what is going on and make him more and more of an automaton and cut him down further and further and then you'll have a good soldier and then his country loses the whole ruddy war - boom!

"Oh," he says, "if you don't make soldiers unaware they'll be frightened." What a backwards look! The only people I ever saw scared to death were people who were on shore-base and couldn't look at the enemy. They were being made to be withdrawn, don't you see? And if you look at the incidences of insanity during war, you will find that those who were furthest from the combat lines had the highest percentage of insanity. That's a fascinating thing.

By the way, the Zulu method of curing a soldier - one of his warriors - departs so far from his ordinary practices of witchcraft as to astonish one. Here was a piece of brilliance, surviving from Lord knows where. The witch doctor came along, bound him up one way or the other. They had herbs that grew mold (penicillin) and they tied these things into the wound and so on. And they made this warrior take a stick, like a spear - badly wounded as he was - and poke it three times in the direction of the enemy where he'd had the fight, and each time intone something to the effect that, "I have struck you, I have struck you, I have struck you." Now, that's just a little bit advanced. They were running out the overt act-motivator sequence on the overt side. They didn't know what they were doing because they only made him do it three times. See, that's nothing. But it was still contributory. They're making him more familiar with the action of fighting.

Well, this coordinates with modern forces. Those soldiers which are left in the front lines, or in front-line hospital to recover recover much more rapidly when returned to their unit; are in much better shape than those who are removed to a base hospital far from the lines. Got the idea? It's fascinating.

As a matter of fact, the Indian soldiers, sepoys and so forth, particularly a regiment like the old Guides or something like this, will not permit their wounded to be removed from the front lines. They reserve the rights to stay right there, no matter how badly chopped up they are. Now, I don't know what piece of wisdom has seeped forward or

what piece of observation has brought this. They couldn't tell you why this is, beyond the fact that they have the right to. Actually, they recover faster. When you remove somebody injured in combat, from combat, you're burying the idea of combat with him, aren't you? Make him less and less familiar with all of this.

You're taking him away from it. You're taking him a distance. And the test of it - he heals up much more slowly than somebody who was left right in the front lines. It's fascinating. Fascinating to see these things.

Of course, when nobody has looked at these things at all, they can't pick one of these data out from another data. They don't know any guiding or coordinative data. So we have to know this mental mechanism that, that with which the mind is (theoretically, of course) completely familiar, has lost the power to harm one. Those things from which a person is retreating will increasingly be able to harm him.

Similarly, those things of which a person is less and less conscious become more and more able to injure him. It's quite fascinating, but the mechanism is right there as a mechanism.

Now, some knowingness, however, is necessary for any communication. Another mental mechanism: Some knowingness is necessary for a communication. Some - doesn't matter how. And the only catastrophes to anybody occur after a communication has occurred.

Here's a mental mechanism. ARC precedes all injury.

Now, once in a while when you have somebody in good condition, he can blow what you might call an ARC break - a severance, a chop of ARC that he's had, and he can audit straight at ARC breaks, ARC breaks, ARC breaks. If he's in very bad condition, however, he can't approach that. He can't blow it. This is called a second postulate.

He can't blow the ARC break. The only thing you can audit him on is ARC, ARC, ARC. A time -"Recall a time when you were in communication with somebody." "Recall a time you were in communication with somebody." "Recall a time you communicated with somebody," or some such process of this sort would have to precede. And then you get these ARC breaks coming off; because the orderliness here is the criteria. The communication was order; the communication break was disorder. The disorder flies off when you enter the order in. You see that? When you revive the order the confusion can come off.

The universe is upside down as it's been conceived by certain religions, They conceived all was chaos, and then it got welded together into order. Oh no. All was order, and then it got chipped up into chaos. Processing proves that to be the case. Primarily there was order and then came about disorder.

Now, what I'm saying right now, then, is that order is always senior to disorder. And what I'm telling you further is: disorder cannot occur unless order has first occurred. You must have had order before you had disorder.

Familiarity with anything, then, is the establishment of order or the re-establishment of order. And if that order is re-established, the disorder will depart. All injury is disorder. All discomfort is disorder. All mysteries and problems and superstitions and maybes and not-knowingness these things are all disorderly things. But they’re based originally on having been in communication with something in an orderly fashion.

There is nobody quite as mystified as an ex-magician that knew all the answers

once. Now man, this guy can get more mystified than anybody you ever heard of! The fellow who really gets mystified is the hypnotist who knows all the rules, he thinks, of hypnotism and has hypnotized many people. And then one day he goes halfway around the bend and turns up on your doorstep saying, "Save me! Save me!"

"What's the matter?"

"I'm so confused. I don't know what I'm doing."

Get the idea? Of course, his is the overt act of making people submerged. His is the overt act of putting people into a heavy conditioned state that evaded analytical inspection.

So you might say the basis of the universe is order. The basis of thinkingness is order. And disorder can occur only where order has existed. Except of course when you simply make the postulate "Let there be disorder." But then, even then, you'd have to have an idea of what order was in order to do it.

Now, as we look over this as mentality and so on, we find basically the only thing that is wrong with a mind. The mechanism on which it is built is not necessarily the right mechanism, not necessarily the wrong mechanism.

Things are only right or wrong for a certain time track and for a certain zone of influence, for a certain set of considerations or agreements. Rightness and wrongness are established by what you want. What is your intention? What are goals? and so forth. If you want an orderly society, of course, wrongness is disorder.

Therefore, the time track on which we exist has conceived of certain mechanisms as being senior to other mechanisms. And this basic mechanism of order, confusion and the stable datum, order primary to disorder, the mechanism of familiarity versus forgettingness, you might say, are all part and parcel of this track. The people who are on this track operate on those mechanisms.

Now, you could invent a whole new universe and start it out with wholly different considerations and wind up with entirely different, let us say, mental mechanisms amongst its people. Do you understand me? But they wouldn't be here. And you would never have them as a PC, because they're not on this track. Got the idea? But if you did pop over into some other time track or some other universe which was built on an entirely different set of rules, apparently, to these basic mental mechanisms, you'd still find one that worked.

Familiarity would bring about skill. Familiarity would bring about ability. You could be at cause over that universe. That law would not be violated and by familiarity you could easily dig out the mental mechanisms on which these people were proceeding. Because no universe could exist without knowingness, because nobody would ever know it was there. You understand that? Simple.

Furthermore, no universe can exist totally without not-knowingness, because it couldn't have time. The mechanism of time is simply not-know/know, not- know/know, not-know/know, not-know/know, not-know/know. The rate at which a person does this is the amount of present time he has. I see I've exceeded you a little bit.

What happened to the second that just went by, huh? What happened to the second that just this instant disappeared? Oh, you remember it? Oh, you have to know it again, don't you? But at the moment - this instant, now this instant right here, now this instant - you know, don't you? This instant, see? You have big awareness right in this instant, see? This instant. Big awareness. Hey, what happened to this - heh! What

happened to the first "this instant" that I said? Where's its awareness? Well, you must have done something with it, that's all. I'm afraid you just didn't sit there as total effect. If you want to see time go zzzp! and go around a couple of curves on somebody or something of the sort, just get them to run not-know in some old version. A lot of old processes, not-know. "What could you not-know?" And all of a sudden you'll get time speed-ups, slow-downs, jams, un-jams; various things happen on time.

Unfortunately, it's too high a process. For years I've been inventing processes that were too high. Gradually these have scaled down. Now you can run the whole backtrack of research from now, back to the beginning, and you will find this consistently going up-scale on a case. Get the idea? Because most research has been directed toward undercutting a case.

Now, what were we trying to undercut? What mental mechanism in the PC were we basically trying to reach?

There's a basic rule in auditing and that rule is this: You find something a PC can do - you find some ability of the PC and you increase it. You follow that? Some ability of the PC and you increase it. That is the fundamental golden rule of auditing. If you apply that to a cat or a little baby you'll still get there. Find out something the baby can do and get him to do it a little better.

A lot of Scientology kids have a rough time because their parents are always trying to get them to do something a little above what they can do. And the little kids go into apathy. You look around and you'll see this. And on a couple of occasions now, or more often than that, I've taken pity on one of these little kids, you know, that was being stretched out and they were going to be a super-genius and all that sort of thing. And I've said to the little kid, "Lie in that bed. Thank you." That, by the way, is the origin of that process. "Lie in that bed. Thank you." "Lie in that bed. Thank you." The kid could do it.

All of a sudden he'd cheer right up and beam and smile and be happy about the whole thing. Nurse standing around giggling, saying, "Heh-heh! You think the baby can understand you?" you know?

And I'd say, "Heh-heh! What's the matter with you that you don't know babies can understand you?" Silly as this. But the baby could do that, couldn't he? He could lie in that bed. Well, he knew he could do that. Now, do you see what I'm saying now? He knew he could do that.

So the most undercut undercut there is, is to find something with which the PC is familiar and increase the familiarity. At the same time, if you can undo something he doesn't want to be familiar with, you're really rolling, and you have the Overt-Withhold Straightwire Process. You pick a terminal that he knows that's real to the PC and you improve by knocking out the reasons why he doesn't want to know about it, because he's done things to it - you improve his familiarity with the terminal. You find something he knows and make him know it better. And that's the under-cuttest process that you can undercut. No further undercut.

Now an unconscious person is capable of knowing in a sort of hallucinatory dream world that someone is there. Just like in sleep, you sometimes get the idea that somebody has walked into and out of the room while you were asleep. It's very vague, you know? But that's the highest level of knowingness of an unconscious person.

You make this person more and more aware of the fact that you're there, and they will eventually become more and more aware and wake up - even people in a coma. But there you - again you've applied the same rule, you see? You found something the PC could know and increased his knowingness; or you have found something the

PC could be familiar with or was familiar with and increased his familiarity with that. Now, it's very simple, you know this in the rough. You know that to start a conversation and get something going with somebody, you have to have some point of agreement. That's why everybody talks about the weather. They all have some familiarity with the weather, they all been rained on or snowed on or something of the sort, you see? So that's a point of knowingness.

Now, to expand his knowingness of you or his friendship for you or any other way you want to do it, you start from some point of knowingness on his part and increase his knowingness one way or the other, not too suddenly or painfully, and eventually the individual knows that you are real. And when you become real he considers you a friend.

Now, these are the basic mechanisms on which the mind operates and that we process on. There are other mechanisms which are more mechanical, but no less necessary to know and I'll talk to you about those in the next lecture.

Thank you.

Re-typeset and formatted
March 4th, 2023
by AOGP:jb