

## THE ANATOMY OF THE OVERT ACT PART II

A lecture given on  
21 January 1952

### The Transfer of Control Centers

One point of the first hour's talk had to do with the overt act and grief. You will find that it is almost impossible, in many cases, to blow any grief from a case unless you cover the overt act to the person. In other words, here is your preclear whose grandfather is dead. How do you get this preclear to recognize and cry off Grandfather's death? Well, he won't cry on the subject of how nice it was when Grandpa was alive, but you get him to dig up his overt acts against Grandpa; you will find, normally, they are quite minor. Very possibly, then, you will be able to knock off Grandpa's death.

But in running a service facsimile, you are running an overt act. You may have to run several facsimiles on the chain of the service facsimile to finally reach enough emotional shut-offs — physical-effort shut-offs of emotion — so that the individual can spill grief.

Where your individual has not been able to release the grief from incidents or from the service facsimile, he is running on an emotional shut-off. It is a physical effort to shut off grief. You ask the individual, "What do you do to keep from crying?" "What do you do to cry?" "Then, after you've done this to cry, what do you do to keep from crying?" And you get one after another, one after another, one after another, and the first thing you know, you will have the thing worked out on him one way or the other.

If the individual is so thoroughly in apathy that he is in very bad shape, you will find you will have to bring him up tone scale to cry. That is something you shouldn't overlook. He has to come up tone scale. Sometimes he is stuck in a terror charge of some sort which will come off first, and then you will get grief.

But the point is that your emphasis on working a service facsimile should be on working out the postulates — that is to say, what an individual tells himself to keep from feeling bad about things, such as, "It wasn't I," "I couldn't have done it," "I won't admit it," "I wasn't there," "It's awfully unreal," "I could not possibly cry about this," "I had better not cry," "Only sissies cry," "I have to be hard-boiled about it," "I have to make up my mind and go ahead and do it anyway." Lots of these things come up, and they come up with a physical effort. Somewhere on the track there is the physical effort to shut off grief.

Another way to find this is "How did the individuals around you shut off their grief?" or "When have you tried to keep people from crying?" "When have you tried to make people cry and failed?"

Now this hits an auditor pretty hard. When has he tried to make people cry and failed? You will find out that he has a physical effort that he turns on in order to make people cry, and that is his own grief shut-off. You run that out of an auditor, your auditor's case will get in pretty good shape, just like that. Run your emotion, both sides of the emotion. And that is the way it is done.

But when you are working a service facsimile, get overt acts — overt acts. Get the individual's shut-offs to realize that he has done an overt act, the feeling that he has, himself, by which he bars out the overtness of the act. His refusal to recognize his own guilt, in other words, is also his refusal to grieve about it. You blow a few grief charges off a case, you have got a different preclear. You want to work in that direction.

If you are working an auditor, there is a mimeographed list which applies to auditors in particular. It is the number of items which you run on an auditor. And these items, one after the other, when run, will generally cause an auditor's case to run along pretty well.

But a person who is auditing does this peculiar thing of turning on these various physical efforts to shut off emotion, to turn on emotion and so forth. You want to get these experiences of his auditing, and in this wise you will be able to repair an auditor's case.

But there is no difference in repairing an auditor's case and repairing another case, really. All you want to do is get the individual's efforts toward others in his environ, because he will wind up doing what he is trying to make others do, and failing.

Take a schoolteacher: here is a rough case. He tries to make kids quiet. He tries to keep them from talking, whispering, squirming, tries to keep them obedient. This poor schoolteacher will wind up every time by sitting still, not hearing, doing very little talking, being unemotional in general. He will be obeying what he has made others do.

So, what have you tried to enforce on other dynamics? That is the key to this. What have you tried to enforce on the other dynamics? Because to that thing, you yourself become subject. And when trying to resolve a case, if you want to know what is shut off in the preclears it is what he has tried to shut off in others; what is full on in the preclear. he has tried to turn full on in others; what won't come on in the preclear is what he has turned on in others and failed to keep on, and so forth. If he has failed to make somebody happy continually — "What is your effort to make somebody happy?" Well, he has failed to make somebody happy; and he fails and he tries and he fails and he tries and he fails and he tries and he fails. Of course, you are getting this emotional curve, one after the other. And at last, there he is: unhappy.

He tries to get somebody else to regret things — works and works and works to get somebody else to regret something. He will wind up by doing a lot of regretting himself. He fails to make the other person regret adequately.

A person who has tried to hold individuals motionless in his vicinity will finally wind up, himself, motionless. And as he continues to do this, he will go right on down tone scale.

Now, no greater proof exists in these phenomena than that they work, that they resolve cases rather rapidly. But it is very odd that they tie in with what an awful lot of people have believed for an awful long time.

The main line of knowledge has obviously been in the field of religion, not in the field of natural philosophy. That is an oddity, isn't it? But it took a conjoining of natural philosophy and religion, to some degree, to put together the thing (with a knowledge of mathematics), in order to make this package come out. And what do we wind up with? "Thou art thy brother's keeper." You sure are! A few remarks made on the shore of Galilee were certainly to the point, even if they were rather badly misinterpreted for a long time here and there.

Well, anyway, we have another phenomenon which goes right along with overt acts and the resolution of cases with which I would like to acquaint you. And this is the phenomenon of the transfer of control centers. This goes along with fixed attention and unfixed attention.

You know, there are three conditions of attention: one is attention unfixed, idling or incapable of fixing; and one is attention so thoroughly fixed that it cannot be shifted; and yet another one is the optimum swing of attention — in other words, a person can change attention at will. That is self-determinism in a package: the ability to shift one's attention at will, know where he is shifting it and then be able to shift it again.

In Effort Processing when you make somebody feel how alive his leg is, he all of a sudden — quite often — gets a pain in the back of his head. Well, he has actually had some attention concentrated on the back of his head in order to keep this pain in the offing, and the second you

shift his attention willy-nilly someplace else, the pain will hit him. There is attention that is too closely fixed.

Now, attention, on the service facsimile: with the service facsimile out of restimulation or knocked out of the case, you have an individual who is able to shift his attention at will. In other words, here for the first time you have somebody who can concentrate. He can concentrate or not concentrate at will — a pleasant capability. But as this phenomenon of the service facsimile starts to move in, one's attention begins to concentrate upon winning. And as he comes down the line, as this thing comes in, his curve comes down toward antagonism; he starts to get very determined about winning and very antagonistic about winning. And then he gets very angry about winning, and then he gets afraid about winning and then he knows he will lose if he wins, and then he goes into apathy and then he dies. And that is the gradient scale of attention — what is attention toward.

Fear is unfixed attention. Grief is practically no attention. Apathy is no attention, unfixed. So you have got degrees of attention fixing, which start in at antagonism and down through anger, where you have got very sharply fixed attention, and then anger degenerates into a condition where the attention is not at all fixed, where the angry person will actually destroy anything in the environment. And then it comes down to fear — fear very fixed or fear spanning out, as in the unknown, of anything. Then we come down into grief, and you have grief about one thing or grief about everything, and then apathy about one thing or apathy about everything. These are the two conditions which happen. There is no optimum fear, no optimum grief nor optimum apathy. But you get these two conditions, fixed or unfixed.

When you fix your attention on something, you are doing something quite remarkable. You are transferring that thing under the control of your own control center. I don't care whether you are afraid of it, in grief about it or in apathy about it: you are actually transferring it under the control of your own control center and as such, in fear, will make it something to be afraid of. If you are in grief about it, you will transfer it under your own control center and make it something to be in grief about. You will cause acts to occur, in other words; it is actually under your control. And so you get this truism of "that thing of which a person is afraid is that thing which will harm him." People will work on you, perhaps, until they can be afraid of you. But they will work on you until you do something to make them afraid of you. You see how it works?

Grief: they will throw a control center over an object which is to be a grief object or is a grief object, and then they will cause the object to eventually be grief to them.

An individual could take a child, and the individual at 0.5 on the tone scale will throw a control center over this child — his own control center over the child — and will work on the child until the child is a source of grief. A rather arduous project, rather grim, but you can see this in progress.

Fixed attention or too unfixed — it doesn't matter where it is on the tone scale, you are going to get such a manifestation.

Now, what do I mean by transferring one's control center? Control center is simply another term for "I," or the awareness-of-awareness unit. That thing to which he applies his concentration is that thing to which he is assigning his control center. You get the idea?

Let's take an auditor and preclear. Your auditor sits there — he doesn't just talk to the preclear. he shoves his control center over the preclear. Now, in view of the fact that theta has no dimension or location in space or time, this is very simple and very easy to do. The individual who sits down as an auditor to audit a preclear shifts his control center — in other words, his concentration — over the preclear.

What is a mission — at least one mission — of theta, of life? That is the conquest of the physical universe. So he starts handling, with his control center, the preclear. When he finds

that the preclear is going out of control, actually his own control center is failing; regardless of whether it is over the preclear or over himself, his own control center is failing. It is failing to handle the body, emotions and memories of the preclear, and the auditor recognizes it as a failure of his own control center. And thereafter, that control center will be that less able to take care of the auditor in his actions, because the auditor doesn't know what he is doing and never shifts the center back.

Anyone who has done a lot of auditing has left a control center sitting over the head of every preclear he has ever audited. You start shifting that back and it is very interesting what will happen. Because by shifting it over the head of the preclear, you have elected to control an organism, a section of the physical universe, and in addition, and very importantly, a human life, a human soul. You extended your responsibility over the head of this being, and if you fail to make this being well, active, happy and everything you expect, you recognize your inability — the inability of your control center. So an auditor can deteriorate rapidly unless he knows about this. What you want to do is shift it over and then shift it back. Always shift it back, and always differentiate on what you are applying it and why you are doing it. You want to clear up your failures.

An auditor can't win if his service facsimile is in such thorough restimulation that he has to lose. If this auditor, for instance, is in grief, at 0.5, his control center will try to make the preclear come down tone scale to 0.5 — as a chronic tone, not as grief. By spilling grief from the preclear he can get the preclear uptone; by keeping the grief in the preclear, he can keep the preclear downtone. And don't think your auditor doesn't recognize this instinctively, because he does. An auditor who is low on the tone scale will not spill grief out of the preclear, because his own control center cannot handle his own grief. Therefore, an auditor with a service facsimile in place to some degree is going to fail. His auditing is predestined to failure. He must do something, in other words, to bring himself up to the point where he can win. The best way he can win is get his service facsimile out, and after that he hasn't any qualms about winning. But this shift of the control center is a phenomenon; it isn't an analogy. For instance, the reactive mind in the first book and so forth: that was an analogy; it was a way of describing the thing, it was not phenomena. This is phenomena.

Now, any one of you sitting there can tell me who shifted a control center over you sometime in your life. Who shifted a control center over you? When? How did it feel? You see, there is an exact instant when it begins to happen. And when you are resolving the service facsimile: here is the individual, he does something to another individual. You will find, somewhere on that emotional curve, the moment the individual starts to recognize that the other being is in trouble — that he has hurt his brother. He will shift a control center over that other being in an effort to handle his limbs, motions, heal him up, bring him up to a point where he was before the action. And hardly anyone who has injured someone else seriously but has thought immediately afterwards he would do anything to put this individual back in good condition again — even die himself. The second he does that, he has shifted his control center over this other being.

Now, his life progresses or his lives progress, and he goes on through existence; his control center has been shifted with a shock — a sharp curve — over another person: In order to remain in control of himself he has to be the other person. There is your mechanism — control-center shift.

Later on, people want you to be obedient — Mother, Father, somebody of the sort. They will make you do certain things. They will come into control of your limbs, actions, thoughts, speech and so on. Sometime during childhood, particularly when you had been naughty and were about to be punished or something of the sort, there was an instant of regret on your part, an overt action on the parental part where a control center did a shift — and said, "There you are." You only got rid of that, really, when you left home, but you never completely got rid of it because you never recognized that anything was being shifted over the top of you. You just all of a sudden knew that you were a little bit out of control as far as you were concerned. You

were not quite able to handle your actions the way you should. You weren't as self-confident, you weren't as self-determined, as you might have been otherwise.

You can recall a time when you felt as a little child very competent and very confident, and then later times when you weren't. Two things have happened: By a control center being shifted over you by a parent, your overt acts have kicked your service facsimile into action and you have started to operate slightly on the losing-valence side yourself. So you are running on this double stack of control centers. Both of them say to lose. How can you Win!

Now, an auditor who is sitting under a parental set of control centers — teachers, parents, grandparents, law-enforcement agencies, anything and everything you want, have put control centers over this individual one way or the other. He is actually working under a set of alien control centers. How can he be himself? He can't be.

Here he is, then; actually, his own limbs are working under the manipulation of others. And where is his? And why doesn't his control center merely banish all this other stuff, with ease? Well, I will tell you: his is sitting back there five hundred or five thousand years on the death of his brother. Grim. You run out the service facsimile, the rest of this stuff resolves, because nobody can just esoterically shift control over you.

Any time you tried to train a dog, you concentrated on that dog, didn't you? You took your own control center and you put it over Fido and you said, "There you are, Fido. Sit up, beg, bark, roll over, come here, go there, drop this, pick up that." Of course, if your Fido is rather disobedient you are going to be unhappy with Fido. Fido is going to start making you nervous. Why? Because his presence tells you very adequately that you are not in control of the physical universe because you are not controlling his body, and you have elected to control his body by putting a control center over him. So the second that you elected to control his body, you also elected to lose if he was a disobedient dog. And then one day Fido disappears, and there is your control center, hanging over Fido, and he is gone. What is grief? Is it the loss of Fido or loss of your control center? Well, it's a little bit of each.

Now, your auditor, your preclear, your normal — anybody — is concentratedly concerned with fixed or unfixed control centers. A psychotic, for instance, may be one whose control center has been shot out over the whole of existence and then lost. He lost it, and he will look around until he can find a control center that he can use. He will actually fall under the control center of a person he has damaged by an overt act. He will put himself under that by election. If the person he damaged went mad as a result, you have a psychotic.

Be careful what you do to make people go insane. You want to know why people in institutions go insane? Well, they have driven people insane; that is easy — simple.

Here is your control-center theory or phenomenon in operation: A hypnotist sits down, he makes a subject be very quiet and then he starts to tell the subject what to do. The subject is supposed to do this and do that, and the fellow is under hypnotic control. Well, this is all very interesting, particularly for the hypnotist. The subject goes around after that to some degree under the hypnotist's control. But the hypnotist — and here is the grim joke — is responsible to himself for every act of that subject subsequently and every injury to that subject. And your hypnotist will suffer everything the subject suffers.

I am talking to you about concrete phenomena. If anybody knows hypnotism, they know the sudden shift and feeling of responsibility for a person who has been hypnotized, just as you know the strange feeling of responsibility you have for every preclear you audit. It isn't that you are hypnotizing people, but you are taking responsibility for the movements of that body and the past life of that individual. The second you do that you move your control center over that individual, and after that you feel very responsible for what happens to him. He goes out and walks down the street and gets run over by an automobile, weeks later; you don't know why your back somatic cut in, but it did. You see, you shifted a control center over the person and you didn't shift it back.

Now, actually, it is about as mechanical as pitching hay. And it can be done just about as selectively and with as much will.

Well, this is also the phenomenon of faith healing. In faith healing you will find out that the individual, with a laying on of hands, will actually take unto himself the ills and injuries of the other whom he is trying to heal. Any person engaging upon faith healing can be fully prepared to receive a great number of somatics.

This is why we talk about the burden of Christ. Lord knows, he tried to heal the whole world. You would have to be a pretty strong man to do something like that. Myself, I am going on a fishing trip to Greece in October, quick! I can't play in even the faint lower orders of such a league as anyone who would try to suddenly throw out his control center over a whole existence.

There is an interesting phenomenon of the transference of physical pain. The actual physical pain itself does not really transfer, and in faith healing, actually, it is not an actual transfer of the somatic, evidently — and I qualify this again: I just feel that this is true, I do not know that it is true.

One turns on a duplicate facsimile of his own, but whether or not this can be done without even knowing is a subject in para-Dianetics. I am not much talking about para-Dianetics; I am talking about just what we know — what we know, actually. I can cite you many instances where people have known immediately the death of a loved one. And also, when you feel the counter-emotion of somebody dying in agony in your own service facsimile, or something of the sort, you will begin to wonder whether or not it isn't a straight transfer — whether or not your impingement of pain, your painful impingement of force upon another organism, does not immediately result in an injury to your own organism.

That is why wars are vicious, you see; nobody ever won a war. The United States is carrying all the wounds today of Germany, actually. She is also going to be liable in a very physical sense to all the wounds of Hiroshima and Nagasaki. Grim thought.

Now, the administration of an overt act might be considered to be almost mystic in its suddenness and completeness of somatic transfer. But it ceases to be mystic the second we nail it down to a physical-universe phenomenon — and that phenomenon certainly exists. You can discover it in yourself. You will find out you may not get any somatics of your own. They can take you back through your tonsillectomy and your last time you had your hair curled, and you won't feel anything. Now, go back there to the time you kicked your sister in the stomach, and you will have a stomachache. Interesting, isn't it?

All right. The transfer in a service facsimile of the pain — fascinating. But the transfer and concentration of a control center is actually no less actual. It is phenomena. It is a phenomenon; it belongs in the field of phenomena because it is demonstrable as phenomena, just as the transfer of pain at the moment of impact against another organism is a phenomenon.

Now, I would like to differentiate: in the fields of mysticism and so forth — these are routes. Once you have recaptured an actual phenomenon and you have laid it out by its own latitudes and you have said this is it, you have something as solid and as physical universe and as actual as that table. So don't fail on your differentiation.

Every single thing that is done in an automobile at one time belonged in the field of mysticism. You will find that many of the miracles in the Bible are today elementary physics. You can go through the Bible and you can read the various things that happened, and a good physicist can look at these things and say, "Why, yes, of course. Naturally, naturally, naturally." They say, "Well, Moses was just a good Red Sea guide, that's all." A fellow who knows the Red Sea, who used to write an adventure story, very interestingly told me that the miracles of Moses are done today by Red Sea guides — people who know those deserts and wildernesses. The water

out of a rock — that is the way they store and protect water there. If you are a good Red Sea guide, you can always get water out of a rock, providing you know the right rock. The tides of the Red Sea sweep back at periodic intervals, and if you knew the exact tide table, you would be able to pass the Red Sea almost dry-shod and have it wipe out the army that came in your immediate wake.

Does this make them any the less miracles? No — not because you can reduce them to physics. But somebody goes over and he looks over Moses, and we find out that Moses could command an awful lot of physical universe and the heavens. He sure could, and maybe the Red Sea guides learned from Moses how you did these things.

Once upon a time they were mystic, magic, miracles. And then one day they become as solid as this table, at which time they are established phenomena.

Now, that is what we are dealing with now, and in Dianetics I have tried consistently to deal only with established phenomena, no matter where it came from. It is very odd, but much more phenomena came out of the field of religion and mysticism than came out of any other one subject. But don't think that other subjects weren't investigated.

For instance, hypnotism has been in existence — that I know of — for about thirty-five hundred years. The phenomena of hypnotism in those thirty-five hundred years was known just as far as it went. It was recognized that you could relax another human being and what you said to him would then become effective. Or that you could cause this other human being to dream or travel to far places while he was under this “spell.”

Now, here we have phenomena. They have known that. Charcot tried to establish other phenomena in the field of hypnotism — posthypnotic suggestion and so forth. Later on they tried to work out a dream therapy. Strangely enough, no new phenomena were recovered.

And now we come up in Dianetics. Hypnotism was practically in its virgin state: there were maybe four or five phenomena known there, and we have suddenly taken these, we have taken them apart, we have looked at them, and out of them we have got about twenty phenomena and we can use them.

And one of those phenomena is the shift of the control center. You can watch it happen. You can watch it occur and you can feel it occur. It is a physical sensation. It is a physical sensation to your preclear and it is a physical sensation to you, the auditor.

Think of the last time you audited somebody — when you sat down to audit them. How did you feel at the beginning of the session? How did you feel at the end of the session? At what time during the session did you start to actively control the limbs and memories of your preclear? Is your control center still there? Well now, actually, all you have got to do is sort of say to yourself “Just take it back,” and your own feeling of individuality will go up.

You take a preclear and start this preclear on the line of “When did your father start to control you?” It is interesting.

In an overt act you will find the exact instant when the person suddenly identifies himself with the other person. It is a precise instant. He can feel the shift of identification. His control center actually shifts over the other person. He is trying to control the body; he is in control of the body and his sudden failure to control the body nails his control center right down there with grief. His inability to control the physical universe is a direct occurrence from that point.

You know what happens to the president of the United States? You know why he gets to be an old man fast? You have all noticed this. He shifts a control center out across the entire country, God help him. Particularly, he shifts a control center over the House and Senate. And look what they do. He is responsible; his regime makes or breaks, not on the names, more or less unknown, of a few congressmen or senators — but it's the behavior and rationality of this

group up on the Hill that he must use and fight, so forth. And of course he fails, so he gets to be an old man.

In auditing, in a service facsimile, in a grief charge, in any overt act, in any situation involving sympathy, look for the shift of the control center. When does the individual suddenly become the other individual? It isn't that he becomes the other individual. It is the moment when he determines that he shall control or help the other individual. The second he starts to help the other individual and sees the other individual being destroyed, at that moment his control center will hang up as a failure over the other individual. And his overt act will result in the fact that his control center of himself will operate on a level of self-destruction. Hence you get succumb below 2.0 on the tone scale.

Now, you understand that? The individual tries to help somebody else who succumbs anyway. He tries to do a life continuum for him. This life continuum is only the manifestation of being somebody else. It is really wonderful to behold.

Well, you get your overt act; that is administration of non survival to another dynamic. That is an overt act. When it is very, very severe non survival and has no reason connected with it, it becomes a service facsimile. Or if there already is a service facsimile, it becomes part of that chain. This contains the liability of an individual sliding down that emotional curve every time somebody drops a curve on him, eventually winding up as the dynamic he hurt or harmed. Any atheist eventually winds up with the delusion that he is God. Interestingly true. If you don't believe it, go down to the local spin bin and find your boys who think they are God, and you will discover an atheist. Interesting.

The mechanism of Jesus gives an individual an opportunity of having his service facsimile forgiven in the absence of processing. He has his service facsimile forgiven because Jesus shouldered the burdens of the world — the crimes, the overt acts of the world. And after that, the individual can walk off with his soul clean and continue on along the line and go on living under our various codes of behavior. Lord help somebody who sins against Jesus — overt act. The time when somebody went into that church and burned all that plate and destroyed the crucifix — oh, boy!

An overt act against Christ on the cross is a very interesting thing, because it winds the preclear up on the cross! And if you don't believe this, see how many preclears you can run through the crucifixion, and you will be able to get every fifth or sixth preclear to run the crucifixion. It's interesting, isn't it? He will run it with full somatics — nails, thorns. Fascinating! Have you noticed this strange fact?

You will find that the individual gets so concerned on this dynamic and he is so high on this seventh-dynamic operation — I mean, it is so subject to thought, imagination and so forth — that there is a moment's shock somewhere on an overt act against Christ to such a degree that the individual will shift his control center, or attempt to, over Jesus. And the second he does this, he becomes Christ on the cross. Oh, that is a grim one. He may die then and go off someplace else, and he will live generations, maybe, before he gets the curve dropped on him enough to someday — as one girl is doing in Spain — start bleeding from the holes.

There are lots of them, by the way; they start bleeding from the nail holes, from the thorn — the pains in the appropriate places. They will do this on Easter regularly. There is some terrific service facsimile in the matter. And in this Christian society you have to take that one into cognizance, because that is the overt act on the seventh dynamic. You really have to take it into cognizance, because it is a crime against all man. That is a grim joke, isn't it, that the individual will carry those wounds the second he declares war upon that. It is no wonder that Christianity forms an impregnable fortress. It has the perfect answer: Attack it and you will carry it through.

Now, I am still talking to you about phenomena, not religion. You will find this in your preclear and you had better do something about it. Where a service facsimile is against the

seventh dynamic, you will find these manifestations. So don't be surprised about them or don't be upset particularly.

If your preclear one day, driving down the street, knocked over a little boy on crutches, your preclear this life or the next is going to be on crutches. Or if he hurt a human being so that human being had to go on to crutches, your preclear is going to be on crutches. What you are actually doing in auditing is knocking out the source of a crime against another dynamic.

It is odd that suicide is a crime against self.

I got into an interesting incident the other day. I evidently had been bunged up one way or the other and was sort of flipping a coin. There was just too much pain present to go on living, and too damaged to go on living, so I evidently cut my own throat and that was twice as bad. It made a very interesting incident.

You get the idea? There is a maybe there. There is no solution to it, so you take the wrong solution and commit an overt act against the first dynamic.

So don't expect not to find overt acts on the first dynamic. You will find a lot of people who will tell you that they only have overt acts against the first dynamic. This is held in doubt, but they certainly have a minor chain of them. When you hurt yourself purposelessly, you committed an overt act against yourself for which you probably have not forgiven yourself and which still hangs you up with a somatic. But that is the only time you can hang yourself up with one of your own.

As techniques improve, the length of time required for rehabilitation will nil and shorten. Also, the age of people who can be treated will increase. I do not know now but what there isn't a top limit with present techniques on auditing of the aged. Because, you see, it is a very, very bad thing to do, to rehabilitate somebody who is very old, because unless you could rehabilitate them to the point where they would be strong, young and healthy again, you would be wasting their time. You are going to let them go on for years and years and years and years, when evidently by the mechanics we have discovered all they have got to do is die and get born again and they are all set. And Dianetics will be in good shape up that track anyhow — they can get processed a lot quicker. They probably have it all figured out, back of their minds.

Now, I don't want to give you the impression with tonight's lecture I am being very esoteric or that I have suddenly gone off the deep end on anything. I am talking to you very solidly about phenomena — the phenomena of human behavior. And that behavior as studied and as phenomena exist seems to demonstrate — and does demonstrate very concretely, just as when you put sodium into water you get an explosion — that an individual has, as his first and foremost goal, survival on all dynamics, and that it is very, very often much more important to him that another survives than himself, and that selfishness itself is born out of a misconception that the individual one killed was selfish.

One does a life continuum on a selfish person. After all, it was you yourself who established the fact that the person was selfish. So you have to be selfish to do a life continuum. You have to be afraid of pain as a life continuum, but are you — as a human being, as an individual — really afraid of pain at all? You ought to be afraid of death on account of somebody else, but are you afraid of dying yourself? Are you yourself? Do you know yourself?

Now, that is how the problem became complicated.

I know of no part of religious creed, for instance, which debars this particular strange fact of consecutive lives. On the contrary, it is mentioned in the Bible that these exist. These have been a backbone of Hindu religion for a long time. I don't know who got the idea that we only lived once, but it won't work. It particularly won't work in processing. And that is what is important to you. And as far as this transference of somatics is concerned, you had better know about that in processing. And as far as the control center is concerned, you had certainly better understand

that, because these things will resolve an awful lot of cases for you that won't resolve otherwise.

And so we find out, when we have shaken the basket and we have assayed the gains of these years of research, that man is probably too good for himself rather than anything else. And the physical universe knocked him in and damaged him a bit and eventually, somewhere or other, he went off the line and he started to harm another. Right away he became his brother's keeper, and he went along in that wise and he harmed something else, and then in order to justify having harmed he had to be harmed himself, so that he could justify being harmed so that he harmed something else....

And it has gone on this dizzy billiard of crime upon crime, injury upon injury, life continuum of your concept of what somebody else was like — not what somebody else was like, really — until we have evolved a society which is willing to believe that every man is selfish, every man is evil, where illness can only be treated organically, where the human soul does not exist, and where a wonderful world has to be destroyed by atom bombs. And I think it is about time we got to work, now that we have the tools, and resolved this problem as rapidly as we are able.

The first person for you to resolve, of course, is you. You want to resolve a few preclears. You can produce miracles, with rather mathematical precision if you want to, and you had better let yourself be your first miracle.