

THE MISSING PARTICLE (part 1)

A lecture given on 10 January 1953

Alternate title: GRADIENT SCALE, ADMIRATION PARTICLE

[Based on R&D transcripts. This was checked against an old reel for LGC-4, but the reel only contains the second half of this lecture. The start of the reel is marked below. We did not find any omissions. Note that the old reel has the second half of LGC-4A as included below and continues right on into LGC-4B which is in the next file.]

This is the fourth lecture on the Group Auditor's Course; name of the lecture is "The Missing Particle."

First thing we want to know about this is gradient scales. There isn't too much you have to know about gradient scales except this: You takes a small force to move a larger force, to move a larger force, to move a larger force, to move a larger force. That would be a gradient A scale of forces.

I think it was Swift' that says, "Cows have fleas who have smaller fleas upon their back to bite 'em, and smaller fleas have smaller fleas and so on ad infinitum," Well, that would be a gradient scale. This is a mechanistic approach on this; it isn't true, because theta can actually make a particle. You can postulate a particle into existence and it then, evidently, then exists. And that's how the particle got here.

But mechanistically, it operates this way, and this is a low-level flow operation, whereby theta would pick up a tiny, tiny particle as speed, which was so slow that you couldn't tell really any great difference between this particle and no particle. See, you couldn't tell much difference between this particle and no wavelength. And therefore there would be, at this end of the scale, this tiny little confusion, and theta, a zero, would think it was still zero although it had this particle. And then this particle having this particle, it's now not quite zero, and it now has the ability to take another particle. And now that it has these two particles, it now has the ability to take another particle and so on. It can take bigger and bigger and bigger particles. And it would theoretically start out with one which was one over infinity in diameter and would wind up with Saint Paul's [Cathedral]. You see?

And an engineer uses this continually: He makes the force of the river conquer the river. And theta uses force in that degree. It has a force inherent from a past experience, and it uses that force from past experience in order to make or alter a new force.

Every aberrated thought is preceded by a counter-effort. Here, give you a present time example of that: is a fellow walking down the street, and he thinks – he thinks policemen are wonderful.

The aberrated thought is "Cops are no good!" That's the aberrated thought we're going to go to here.

And he's thinking – go walking down the street and he's really not thinking much about policemen, but if he consulted himself about them, he'd say, "Well, policemen are all right. They're there. They protect the law and order and the small children and the home and the government and we pay them" and so forth. And he's walking down the street, you see. He's thinking this or not thinking it, as the case may be. All of a sudden a bobby walks up to him and takes his hat off and raps him over the head. After that, he doesn't think policemen are so hot. (audience laughter)

Now, there is an aberrated thought preceded by a counter-effort. Now, this can be that bad that he will say then, "All policemen are bad." That is his adjudication. He identifies to the degree that he's been smashed into MEST. And when you've shoved a number of particles into very close proximity, you have a piece of matter. And the tighter you shove them, the solidier the matter is. And when you loosen them up, the matter is less solid. That's true of atoms, you see, and molecules and so on. It's also true of compounds. It's also true of sand. Sand can be drifting around loosely and then you feed it into something that compresses it suddenly, you've got a brick – glass brick. You could compress it solidly and you could compress it suddenly enough, by the way, that it would liquefy and actually turn into a glass brick just under pressure, boom. And you'd have a glass brick, quite solid.

The operation of pain is a certain action with regard to particles, a very high level of particles. And life has itself very closely associated with being these particles, which it isn't – and it's holding onto a bunch of these particles which it considers livingness. And some other particles come along and compress those livingness particles too tightly and the sensation resulting is called pain. And this is pain. And it's very measurable and it depends on the swiftness of closure of particles or the swiftness of opening of particles.

You can cause pain either by opening two particles too suddenly bringing them apart too suddenly, or by compressing them together too suddenly. And when we say too suddenly, we mean above the level of – or beyond the level of prediction, that's all, on the part of theta. It's an odd thing, but a fellow who knows he's going to have a needle shoved into his arm doesn't get anywhere near the pain as the fellow who doesn't know he's going to get a needle shoved into his arm. If you don't believe this, you can find some people who are looking the other way and shove a needle into them suddenly and measure the gradient of temper rise. (audience laughter). And if you were to take this same person and stand him up in a line and he watched the needle and he knew he – was going to go in, oddly enough, it would hurt much less.

Now, when he's very aberrated, however, and has – oh, he's bogged down thoroughly in energy and matter and that sort of thing, he will postulate pain for the needle, and even though you didn't shove it in, it would hurt. See? Now, when a person comes down Tone Scale, they do that all the time. And they finally get the idea that pain is just terrible!

You take Home sapiens and say, "Now we're going to take out your left eyeball and rub it with sandpaper," and he winces: one, he has no confidence in being able to mock up a usable eyeball, so there's a scarcity of them, you see? And, two, he knows it's going to hurt.

Now, the terrible part of this is, is one actually postulates every sensation he gets. You think you get sensation from this and from that, you think you get sensation from turkey and you think you get sensation from something else. You're very convinced that sensation exists and that it comes from an exterior source. And the odd part of it is, is the more sensation you "take" from an exterior source, the less you could feel.

First, it's more and more you can feel and then less and less you feel. One believes so long as one agrees that he is taking sensation from an exterior source, continually taking it from an exterior source and needs an exterior source to procure sensation, he is in agreement with the MEST universe, which is in itself, one might say, the average or the mean of agreement. It's the average agreement on the actuality of illusion. It's sort of the work-out average of agreements all the way down the track, and we sit here in the MEST universe. You've agreed on it very thoroughly. And by the way, your preclear and your group doesn't happen to want this changed. They know that wall is liable to disappear. They really know that, and so you start shaking them up with a process which is a very shaking process, and they'll fudge on you, they – "Ha-ha-ha-ha. No, no. Ha, No."

Now, the MEST universe and all these particles – evidently a very beautiful set of illusions. Pain itself is an illusion, but what a real illusion. So in the Professional Course we talk about reality and actuality – two different things.

Reality is what we have agreed on in this universe to be real, And actuality: Actuality is what you yourself are capable of making. Now that's actual, because you know you made it. But you've got the MEST universe here, you don't know that you had anything to do with making this, so that's merely real. So let's get the difference between those two things.

Now, here's the test of this whole thing. If you want to better anybody's ability to perceive, you'd think the best thing to do would be to handle energy and have them agree with energy and the laws of energy and the whereabouts of particles. You'd want them to agree with this, wouldn't you? And if they agreed with it and you study this and they would study it more and more, therefore they could perceive it better and better, couldn't they? Mm-hm.

That is the theory on which science has been working, and it is not true. I'm sorry that it isn't true because it would all be so simple. It would be terribly simple if it were true.

Naturally, you could then look at a piece of MEST – matter, energy, space and time, just a composite word – and just look at a piece of MEST here and you would say, "Ha! Now all we have to do is study the anatomy of that MEST and we will know all there is to know." Oh, no! That isn't true.

You start studying this MEST and you start studying it to get data from it, and you plow in deeper and deeper and deeper and deeper and deeper. And you finally go to work for General Electric or somebody. (audience laughter)

Now, I would say – this is prediction, I've never noticed this – I would say the physics instructor at a school had more difficulty in his personal life than the English instructor in terms of handling things, automobiles and things, what happened to automobiles, but that the English instructor would have more difficulty in his emotional life than the physics teacher.

Now, that wouldn't hold at all, I mean, it's just one of those things that give you an example which might be true, because there are too many other factors entering in. If we had one who was purely a physics teacher and one who was purely an English teacher and who had never, one to the other, interchanged physics and English, why, we would find that to be the case.

One has agreed with the romantic and the emotional, has agreed and agreed and agreed with literary concepts, and he's plowed in with them. He'll just plow right on in.

A writer generally goes bad in about three years. When I say, "Goes bad," I mean he stops writing. That's interesting, isn't it? By practice he ought to write more and more and more and more and more and more. And if it were true that just this MEST were actual and so on, he would really go on writing more and more. The more he practised, the better he would be. Everything is sort of founded on that basis, and it isn't true. The writer practices writing and goes bad in three years. There's a dull stale taste in his mouth at every story he writes at the end of three years, believe me, and I don't care who that is.

Now, the person who studies this has a reali – has an actuality instead of a reality – who studies this MEST eventually gets to a point where he can't see it anymore. Well, that's silly. If it worked out the other way, if it had a reality, he would, of course, be able to see it better and better and feel it better and better when he knew more and more about it. And yet, he's getting worse and worse on it.

He's getting worse on distances; he's getting worse on estimations of effort and so on. He starts wearing sporn-rimmed spectacles and getting kidney trouble and all sorts of weird things start happening to this fellow. All he's got to do is keep on agreeing with this, just keep on agreeing with it. And if he agrees with it long enough, it'll finish him. Well now, that's silly, isn't it? You work that out and it's illogical. Well, why is it? Why am I bringing it up at all?

Because there is a way to improve this stuff so that it does. It gets more and more actual or more and more real – any way you want to phrase it. You could get this so your perception of it is better and better, and it's solid and solid and so on. How do you do that? By improving your ability to perceive an illusion.

If your ability to perceive an illusion gets very good, your ability to perceive the MEST universe gets wonderful. You'd say, "Well, this is just a problem of perception," Well, it's kind of strange that it doesn't work out otherwise. If you, ha, let a fellow go out and perceive MEST and perceive MEST, practice perceiving MEST, he practically goes blind. But if you have a fellow go out and perceive illusions, perceive illusions, perceive illusions, his eyesight gets wonderful. So it tells you something about this stuff about which we are so confident, which is so solid.

Now, the fellow comes along and he pounds the desk and he says, "Well, this is solid enough for me, because I can feel it." Huh, very silly. What's he pounding the desk with? He's pounding the desk with a piece of MEST. And he's registering the estimation of the collision of particles in his fist and the particles on the desk, and this doesn't even vaguely agree that

there are either particles in his fist or particles in the desk. Neither one. It doesn't prove anything.

Just because a MEST particle can collide with a MEST particle is no reason MEST exists. All we can infer from that is the fact that as long as you can perceive that, we know that your ability to perceive it exists. And any time we go out any further than that, as a truth, we get in trouble, we get in real trouble.

We say, "We perceive this, therefore it exists." Well, for heaven's sakes, add these words to that: "for me" or "for us." Now, that's all you have to do and it's a correct statement. "I see this, therefore it is," is an incorrect statement. "I see this, therefore it is for me or for us," is a correct statement.

So, this beautiful, thick, solid, heavy, trying, painful, wicked stuff called MEST is just those adjectives to the degree that you agree with it. And when you start turning the current back on it and saying, "Nuh-uh," you can then and there, and only then and there, start controlling it.

The funny – funny things happen. It's not esoteric. By the way, all this is very easily traceable because we are dealing in natural law with the consecutive agreements on which we have agreed to agree down the track. And that includes the law of gravity.

We agree that when you have this lump here called Earth, it's got gravity on it and you'll stick there. And as long as you believe that and so on, you'll stick here. But the second that you just don't – not just disbelieve it – the second that you make it unnecessary to believe it any longer, I won't guarantee that you'll stay here, but your body will.

Well, let's see, this is – we're going out now into a realm of it that in a short series of this character we really have no business talking about. But we are dealing, oddly enough, with nuclear physics, because the first fellows to say this, the first fellows to come down with an ax on the reality of the MEST universe were the nuclear physicists. Who was it said at the end line of his book, "And when all is said and done, I cannot help but believe that this universe is just an idea." Any good physicist can reduce it reductio ad absurdum to a zero. And he does it with great speed. Atoms? Oh, yes. Sure, sure, public consumption. What's an atom? I don't know. Neither does anybody else. And the odd part of it is, they've never seen one, and the odd part of that is, they probably never will. But I suppose a few of the boys agreed that you would get a quantum of energy when you thought a certain thought, and after that we get an atom bomb. It's as silly as this. Now, all of this I want you to know – take it or leave it, it doesn't matter – but I want you to know it for this reason, so that you won't underrate the progress which can be made by bettering the ability to perceive an illusion. If you better the ability to perceive an illusion, you will better the ability to perceive and handle and act in the MEST universe. And that's what you're trying to do.

When a child is trying to study, he's trying to find out how to act in the MEST universe. You want to better that ability, don't you? Well, you can better it right there at the start by bettering his ability to perceive an illusion.

Now, a child is pretty good at this. You'd say, therefore, a child should be able to get along very well at this. No, he's in a very unmanageable body. He's something on the order of

a – a young child is something on the order of a pilot who has just been put in an eight-motored bomber. It gets switches, and you got hydraulic this and that. I mean, he's ... Gee.

As a matter of fact, little babies can understand you. Nobody ever took the care before to ask a little baby something or other or give him a signal. They can understand you before they're very old. You can talk to them. Only you have to talk to them. You don't say, "Dah-dah, da-da" and so forth. And you expect them to answer you in English with a voice. And you're not going to do that because they're not in control of those vocal cords, but that doesn't mean they couldn't answer you. So you see, you don't quite know that until you investigate it all the way. You don't, just don't take it for granted that babies don't know anything.

Now, we'll take a five-, six- and seven-, eight-year-old child, we're really having fun now. This person first began to learn how to run this eight-motored bomber – doing all right because they started in just naturally. They kind of got it by postulates and they were getting along all right, and then suddenly somebody said, "Don't go here, don't do this. Stop, stop, stop, stop. Start, start, start. Change, change, change." Somebody else was handling this bomber.

Did you ever try to fly a plane, by the way, with a pilot on each wing as well as one in the middle? And after a while, the child says that this is all energy. "I have to handle all this by energy." So he gets worse and he gets clumsy. And then the next thing you know ... Of course, that's very silly. Why, how could a child handle anything by energy? Well, you handle things by energy by postulating you've got some energy, and then the energy will handle it.

Now, a child has a hard time. And he's practically out of his mind by the time he's five. He's very hard to get in communication with by the time he's five, six, seven, eight. You see, parents sometimes will say, "Oh, aren't my children having a good time." The children are out there having psychotic fits! You know, they're running around the yard and running around a tree and they're falling over tricycles and banging each other up and ... Gee. Just horrible.

Oddly enough, what was destroyed in those children was dignity. If you ever want to see an awful lot of dignity, take a little baby that has been left alone, that is to say, hasn't been handled much and is – so on. Great dignity. Oh, you'd think they were the king of India or something. And you insult that dignity and they'll really come down on you, too. The child has been handled and pushed and bossed and pushed and handled, and their dignity is shot. The second that goes – bang.

Now, the most hectic, excitable, and below that, apathetic children, or adult, will be those who have been forced to handle things with energy, and they've been kind of pushed at things. Force has been painted up to them as being really something. They've been manhandled pretty much, and they're kind of spun in. And they have a very harsh agreement. I mean, they believe in this universe. They believe they're going to get hurt. They believe in all sorts of bad lions. And they have this idea that they can't handle anything unless they do it with force or with motion. The apathetic child knows he can't use any force, and so therefore can't handle anything, And the one who is hectic and so forth, believes they have to use all this motion in order to get something done. In either case, their dignity is gone. They have been used too much as a particle.

Now, when you're dealing with children, you're dealing with particles, really. And you have to bail them out to a point where they're no longer particles, but they are something that makes particles. When you do that, they have recovered their dignity, and they've also recovered their poise, and they are also orderly and can now learn the MEST universe. But you know something about the MEST universe is they have to have a lot of imagination to counter-balance the necessity of agreeing with the MEST universe. And that is mostly denied them.

A child goes around with a great deal of imagination. He imagines, imagines, imagines, imagines. And people come down on him rather heavily for it. Well, they're closing the line. They're closing his road to any stature by coming down on this. You're not trying to rehabilitate the ability of the child, however, to imagine. Don't make that mistake; this has more purpose than that.

You're actually bringing him back to a point of recognition of what he really is, rather than just a particle.

Now, here we have this gradient scale. At the bottom: the child as a particle or the adult as a particle. They're an object or a collection of particles. They're solid. They know they're solid. And they also think slowly, act slowly, are erratic, cannot concentrate and so on.

Now, the less that condition exists, the brighter they are. And so they come on upscale and they're less and less a particle and more and more a thing which creates and controls particles, and they go right on upscale. And you have to get a child pretty well upscale before they can concentrate and before they can absorb information.

Now let's talk a little bit more about this thought, emotion and effort. Way high on the scale, if you have energy at all, it would be called in the band of thought; lower on the scale we have the band of emotion, and below that we have the band of effort.

Effort is heavy. Those particles could be considered to be not just large, but particles which went crunch, which ran into things, which handled masses of particles and so on. We could consider this on this level: thought we might consider a gull or a bird or something like that, and emotion we might consider some relatively earthbound but still free particle, and effort we'd consider a bulldozer – real heavy! They can push, push and so on. That's the band.

Now, effort is way down there towards zero on the band. Men who have to do hard work over a long period of time rapidly lose all of their ability to soar rapidly. And they use hard strength and hard work in general. You don't see very many people stepping out of the ditch-digging business into the upper realms of poetry. Once in a while you do, and of course that becomes very, very sensational.

Well now, what we have here, then, is a gradient scale of, you'd say, a type of particle. At each one of these levels you might say there's a particle. There's certain particles would be just below 40.0, and then there would be a certain class of particles down around 20.0 and there would be a class of particles around 0.0

Well, supposing we had a road, and this road consisted of half road and half bridges. And you tried to walk down that road and you were getting along fine, and all of a sudden

you found a bridge missing. It would leave you – if you couldn't span that area – it would leave you on the heavy part of the road, wouldn't it? I mean, it'd leave you on the part of the road you had traversed; it would leave you in a certain area.

Now, let's say that a person starts down Tone Scale and goes from particle to particle to particle down Tone Scale. In other words, somebody who was fairly high on the Tone Scale suddenly starts using heavy effort, and then turns around and starts to go back up the Tone Scale again and finds a bridge out. It would leave him with heavy effort, wouldn't it?

Now, that's just a very crude analogy, because it isn't exactly what happens. A missing section of the Tone Scale would then inhibit one going back up.

Well, let's say you had some kind of an idea that particle A was mergeable with theta and usable with theta and one could be theta as long as he had this particle A, and it was perfectly safe to go over into a more detached particle; that is, a particle that wasn't quite as intimate with theta. And then he gets over to B or C or D or down that line. And then he turns around and he says, "All right, now we've always got particle A, and so we can merge back into being theta again." And one day he puts it to test and particle A is gone. He can't get back into theta again; this leaves him in emotion or it leaves him in effort. Another analogy. Apt or not it's painting a picture by it, I hope. Let's take a mixture. There are certain chemical compounds which require a dash of something before they become other chemical compounds. And supposing you took this catalyst in some process – this catalyst that would turn this whole chemical compound over, and you just remove that catalyst and made it unavailable. The chemical compound never would be anything else but the chemical compound it had become.

Let's take something else. Let's take a bomb and let's put a fuse in it. Now, a bomb fuse generally runs into something like fulminate of mercury, which runs into granular TNT, which then explodes heavy TNT, This fellow handles this bomb on a gradient scale, in other words. This little flash explodes a little greater flash which is then capable of exploding this great big mass. And that bomb isn't going to go off at all, it isn't going to work if the fulminate of mercury is missing, You could try to blow up that granular TNT all you pleased. And as a matter of fact, even if you put a match to it, it would just burn. That bomb won't explode. In other words, we're getting further and further away from workability.

Now, similarly, if we consider particles to exist in the mind, we might say – and with a little study on this subject you will see the facsimiles, running facsimiles, behavior of particles, ridges, all of this, flows – you can observe all this. But the point is if there was a particle missing in the mind (crude analogy) the mind could safely then adventure into the handling of all sorts of things, and then turn around and find there was a missing bridge; or try to blow up these memories in order to be free of that experience or something of the sort and find there was a missing fuse; or try to make this compound into something else and have no catalyst all of a sudden. That would be quite serious.

We've talked continually for years on the one-shot Clear. Well, I've been thinking for a long time about there must be a button within the button within the button. We've got lots of buttons. We isolated about thirteen or fourteen buttons; they were quite important and they appeared on the Chart of Attitudes.

But there must be one button. Well, there isn't so much one button as there's one particle missing. And this missing particle – it boils down to the fact that we were searching, really, for a missing particle that would have – there was something gone: a catalyst, the bomb fuse, the bridge, it was missing. And we couldn't quite make the whole jump. When a case was very bad off, we couldn't make the jump hardly at all.

We could do it and do it on a sort of a gunshot principle, skirting it one way or the other and just gunning through somehow or other. But there was something that case that was the worst off was missing the most of that some other cases weren't. So it required considerable thought on this basis, and as soon as it started working with a gradient scale of particles going back up to theta again, it began to test particles. And I've tested lots of all sorts of particles. And it was interesting that an empirical test is, with our other techniques, very, very possible today. We can make a test, in other words, a laboratory test, just as though you were dealing with test tubes.

You're working a case. Well now, what solves this case? And you could say all sorts of particles were missing, and sure enough, you would find evidence in each case that this particle evidently had something to do with it, but it was not THE particle.

Now testing case after case after case one got the idea after a while that there was some sensation missing. All right. If there was sensation missing, then maybe Freud was right, hm? Maybe it was sex. All right. Now, let's take that sensation and find out whether or not this was the missing particle. Hm-mm. No.

Now, let's try and just run the concept of love. The Christian says that love, you know, all is love, love, love, love. Let's run it. Bogs the case down – bang, boom. Oh! Oh, boy, that's one you don't want to play with.

Now, somebody else says, "Truth is beauty and beauty is truth, and never the twain shall meet," and so we try that. Does it work? Nuh-uh.

Well, do we know whether or not the thing will work? Oh yes, we do, because the preclear will turn on, now be able to remember and do lots of things that – IQ go up and all sorts of things would happen; facsimiles would disappear, deformities would go by the boards. In other words, got plenty of visual, testable evidence if that's the particle.

So we go on down the line, We find out that – well, I don't know. Oh, this MEST universe is in wonderful condition on honor and justice. Justice, oh, boy. That's one everybody will write about. Let's test justice as though it were a particle. And what do we find in the testing of justice? It's a restriction. It's just an aberration. That's a horrible thing to discover, isn't it?

You tell people that injustice can exist and that justice does exist, and then you feed them injustice and that makes them outraged and pushes them down Tone Scale and they can be controlled. This doesn't say that justice is not a highly desirable, high-level thing. But in the engram bank, in the reactive mind, it's just an operation. So that wasn't the particle.

Well, how about nobility? Well, people should feel noble and so forth. Did that work? Uh-uh. No. That's another one.

Well, what about dignity? What about this, that? What about sacrifice? What about knowing? What about responsibility? What about the rest of those buttons up there at the top of the Chart of Attitudes? None of them fit. Isn't that funny that they just didn't fit, until all of a sudden we run into a particle you wouldn't quite have suspected offhand had any horsepower in it. But a bridge or lead azide or this fulminate of mercury is nothing compared to this particle.

It's interesting, it's just a little bit upsetting because it's a particle that everybody agrees is kind of unworthy a little bit. It's something you shouldn't have too much to do with. It's a little sophistry, flattery and there's other things like this and it's kind of bad, and we won't give this one out. Well, you should have suspected that one as the first one then. Because this universe is sort of booby-trapped. And you should have suspected that that one which was the least of would have called in all of the liabilities of scarcity. Because of course the particle that was the key particle would be the particle that everybody said was the scarcest, or that shouldn't be used at all. And that particle is admiration. My, that's horrible, isn't it? Admiration.

Now, a person goes along just so long in life, and he – admiration you know, he works to get some admiration; he doesn't get it, and it sticks him into working for some more admiration; and he doesn't get it, so it sticks him into working into some more admiration; and he doesn't get it, and it sticks him into working for some more admiration; and he doesn't get it, and it leaves him stuck as a very unadmirable character. It'll even make a Home sapiens out of him,

Now therefore, we are looking – when we look at this scale – we're looking at a scale which has a little particle in it that we can mark. Part of that gradient scale is a particle, and we can call that particle admiration. And it seems to answer up with people here, there, around – admiration. Now, that's the particle. And you don't have to know – you should... Of course, you know an auditor has to know about all kinds of things the way he has to handle flows and particles and things, but this – the point we're making here is that we've got a missing particle which, in its absence, causes effort and emotion to jam on the track. It is the catalyst particle which permits a flow between two terminals. And in the absence of this particle the communication line between two terminals won't function, It is the grease on which current runs. Now, you talked a little earlier about terminals; you don't get an interchange between two terminals unless you've got that admiration particle in there. And the second you don't have it there you lock up a terminal and lock up a whole section and lock up somebody in heavy effort. And you lock him up in engrams. Just like that. (snap) There he is, there he is. He's stuck. He's stuck with it. And he'll go on dramatizing it until he can get that particle.

===== LGC-4 continued

[This is where the old reel labeled LGC-4 begins. The R&D version was checked against the old reel from here on.]

Continuing this fourth lecture on the theory of admiration, that thing which is admired will disappear, and that thing which is nonadmired persists. Now, that's a heck of a note, isn't it? This universe is rigged backwards unfortunately. It is actually, and people complain every

once in a while about its contrariness and not-admire its contrariness and make it even more contrary.

So that, naturally if you get a free flow only in the presence of this particle called admiration – you get free flow then, it'll just flow itself out. And if you get no flow in the absence of this particle, you just get a stuck.

Let's take the Indian and his raising of children. He did a very interesting thing. He raised his children with enormous praise for all the things that were good. His theory of raising children – and this is a North American Indian – his theory of raising children was to praise all the things they did that were good.

Little boy – the whole tribe would gang up on some little boy. He'd be carrying some water or something of this sort, and they would – everybody that would see him going along they would say, "What a good boy." Or he'd be packing some game for Papa – "What a good boy." They went out of their road to admire what he was doing. And sure enough it cohesed the tribe. And on an analytical level – you must never forget there is an analytical level – he was quite proud of doing these sort of things, but they had – nonadmiration was playing in there on the subject of not being good. And you had an entire race with a thirst for torture and human bestiality which was unequaled anywhere else. Interesting, isn't it? In other words, they ran out of the kid all the human characteristics and left in all the inhuman characteristics. They did a big job of evaluation on him.

Evaluation is itself aberrative when it is on a conduct level. All angels have two faces. An angel has a good face and a bad face. It's traditional. Man has been saying this and using this data and building his idols this way since time immemorial. There's the good angel and the bad angel, but it's the same angel.

"I am the God of Vengeance," says Yahweh; "I am the God of Love," says Yahweh. Sure. In order to be a complete unit – two terminals in one being – he'd have to be the God of good and the God of evil.

In other words, you'd have him two terminals in the same being. But do you know that that's not top scale by a long ways? It's about 8.0 on the Tone Scale. Up above that level – good, bad? No, no. We have practicality and alignment or misalignment without thought, really, to whether it's a survival or nonsurvival activity. We just have something being done because it, well, should be done. We don't have tremendous condemnation, we don't have tremendous evaluation upscale.

It tells you that in terms of conduct and behavior one of the most aberrative activities in which man can engage would be to condemn and not admire a certain strata of action and to admire greatly another strata of action because it will run the second one out and leave the bad one in.

In other words, nothing will flow on these other terminals where you have something bad. And so you get more and more crime, more and more insanity, a world hitting a dwindling spiral, which is what you behold today.

Now, it's horrible, isn't it? The remedy for this, you say, is going around maybe and admire evil. No, no. No, because evil is evil, there's no doubt about that. What's bad for man is bad for man. But people on a nonadmiration basis will get so they go out of their road to evaluate. "Now, we must criticize. We know we must criticize to do this and to do that," We must nonadmire, in other words.

A person goes out through the bottom quickly on this. If you nonadmire something high level like painting, why, the fellow will paint, paint. Paint. Paint! (gasp) And he's going to grrrrr-urr. And then he doesn't paint so much and he doesn't paint and then he doesn't paint. Oh, no. Then he's painting? Hm, You see, now he went right down through the Tone Scale from enthusiasm on a nonadmiration basis into finally apathy. And so it will drive somebody down into apathy.

So the law in punishing crime on a nonadmiration basis, which is really nonadmiration, exclamation point, just wants to drive a bunch of people into apathy. And do you know there's nobody more dangerous than a person in apathy. That's not a good solution. A criminal in apathy is still a criminal. Only now he doesn't care who he kills. If he kills anybody, it might as well be you, his wife or so on. He's going to go that way. If he does that way, he's just lost his determination on the thing; he's just all mixed up, in other words.

So evaluation is tied in with this rather well. And high level on the scale, you don't start noticing anything wrong with this because a person has a tendency to be in present time in the future all the time. And he doesn't have any past hanging up to amount to anything, but as he goes downscale, he'll start to get the past hanging up. Why? That's because why he keeps carrying along with him all the things which he thinks should be admired which haven't been admired. He starts insisting on his right to do these things, all kinds of aberrated things here.

Your little kid being bad or being stupid is running on a course of action which is a nonadmired course. The therapy is not to admire the bad course, because that hits him on an analytical level, and we're after all just addressing an illusion when we're addressing it. So we'll just not worry about that. You don't misinterpret this. We're not saying that a person – the way of existence is, in living in present time, is simply to admire everything. No, no. No, we're just trying to get a fellow unstuck out of his past and make him evaluate in terms of future very easily.

Now, if he can go around and sneer at everything he pleases, that's his right, nothing wrong with that. So, when it catches up with him, he ought to know enough to run it out.

You don't have to tolerate, drive yourself into apathy, everything bad because nonadmiration of it will hang it up on the track. Use it sometimes. Be mean, qualify the thing. You'll find out there are many ways where you could just delete the particle and you get a persistence.

Now, a child who studies well gets praise, praise, praise. Fine, that runs it out. And there you go, see, it's gone. And the child who in – but he doesn't know algebra; that's because he doesn't know arithmetic. Well, nobody – you'll find out that he hit a nonadmiration for error. He made a mistake in arithmetic. And he made several other mistakes in arithmetic, and

the next thing you know these were not admired, not admired, and he goes right on making more and more mistakes in mathematics. And you catch him at the age of twenty-two or twenty-three, and he adds six and six and gets fifteen every time.

Well now, what do you do? You just have him admire arithmetic; the lock will turn up. That's all. Just get him admiring arithmetic. And he'll suddenly say, "I don't know whether I admire this or not, here's a time I got caned for..." so on.

You say, "Well, admire the stick, admire the cane. Now let's make a mock-up and admire it a great deal of somebody being caned." Next thing you know, he gets six and six and gets twelve. Why! The held-down five. How do you hold a held-down five? How do you hold one down? It's a missing thing that prevents the flow. There isn't a flow through five rather than a held-down five. And when there is no flow to flow through five, five keeps adding itself onto the equation time after time after time after time.

When you take all possible admiration out of five, you'd think nobody would do five anymore. Mm-hm, no. Five just then goes down and stays there. This comes because of evaluation, you understand. Somebody has – but you have to have made this adjudication: "I will be admired," the individual says, "if I study arithmetic." He studies arithmetic and he gets his throat cut. So it leaves him stuck with a necessity for admiration on the subject of arithmetic, but mostly with failure, And he just keeps putting forward the errors of arithmetic. And he says, "Someday, somewhere, sometime, somebody is going to give me the admiration that requires – to knock this out!" That's a horrible joke. The only person that can give him any admiration that will register on his bank is himself. And that's horrible, isn't it?

Now, all the admiration that you will get, it wouldn't matter if you were the key star of the cinema; it wouldn't matter if you were the most admired king, god or beast that existed; it would not matter at all. That admiration is not going to run out your bank! You just think it is, which keeps you plowing forward, plowing forward, working for admiration.

You notice that people work and then get paid? They don't get paid and then work. All right, there's why. They worked and then somebody didn't pay them. So they worked some more and then they didn't get paid; and then they worked some more and didn't get paid. And the next thing you know, there they are on the LCC staff. Well, anyway ... (audience laughter)

We have – you see, the effort won't run itself out. The only person that can pay them is themselves in terms of admiration. It doesn't matter much how much admiration.

Once in a while somebody will walk up to a person and say something to them and then they will realize that they should turn on some admiration from themselves, so they dub-in some admiration from this person over to themselves. They say, "He is admiring me." They put the admiration there and feel it. And then they say, "Tsk. Ha. Guess I'll have to work harder," something of the sort, You get the idea? He puts – "See, I got to find some way to get some more of that admiration."

This is nonsense, you see, to think that a current is actually going to set up, because it won't, and it doesn't. But you could cause a man to turn it on himself, And when you cause him to turn it on for himself, it will run him out and bring him up to present time because he's stuck in all the times in the past when he thought he should get admiration and didn't. And he

just hit that, bong, hit that, bong. So he's bogged down and he's stuck. You want this man in present time and the future. You don't want him in the past.

A psychotic is living in the past. A neurotic is only in present time and a very sane person is in the future. He's living against the future. All right.

This adds up then. And you will know that two things are wrong with a child or an adult, A child has got a nonadmiration for badness, and it's that very badness which you see him dramatizing. And that's not admired, not admired, not admired, not admired, and he's making it stick, making it stick, making it stick. Now, you can drive him into apathy so he won't act at all in any field on anything – some people have this as the definition of a good child – or you can simply get him to run it out.

Now, how do you get him to run it out as a member of a group without addressing this problem at all? Well, instead of reading sight and sound and other perceptics at the bottom of the page on Self Analysis, you just make the kids admire their mock-ups. Doesn't matter what the mock-up is. Get them to admire the mock-up and so on. Once in a while have the mock-up admire them.

It doesn't matter what you do. Every once in a while you have a somatic turn on in one of these kids. They'll say, "Yah-yah-yah-yahyah-yah-yah." You say, "Well, the next somatic you get – on the next mock-up you get, put it where you got the somatic," And that will run it out. Because their mock-ups are terminals, terminals. A man is as sane as and has as much energy as he believes he has terminals. See, he's fixed on this two-terminal idea. It's not true, but he uses it all the time.

And so he puts these mock-ups up around him and he knows he's got terminals. And his confidence – his confidence in getting an energy flow is his confidence in getting terminals. That's all. And so, if he can put up terminals, he knows that he can get all the admiration in the future he wants. Why, sure, he can put up terminals into the future. Nothing to that. That's all. It's quite simple.

Now, as far as actual terminals are concerned, you will find that child is in the most serious trouble who has lost a terminal suddenly or gradually. Had a father and a mother. There were two terminals. He didn't live in himself at all, he lived on those two terminals. He sort of had a body and he ran around and everything, but he's Father and Mother. And he had a terminal and they had an interchange. And a father and mother admire each other, boy, that's a good, smooth, flowing terminal. Nothing goes wrong, everything is fine.

Papa and Mama don't like each other Nuh-uh-uh-uh. Nuh-uh. Or if there's just one there, or one of them is very mean, you'll get a terminal proposition of the child using himself as one terminal and using the other parent. And you get this "You did this," and Olympus [Oedipus] and other things happening.

Now, therefore, you as – in a school can become a terminal and a child can be very fixed on you. And then one day you get transferred to another class. Don't go back and look at the mental stability of some of the kids of the class you just left. You just robbed them of a terminal. You're quite sensible of this, by the way; you can sort of feel this with the kids. You're a terminal.

And whether they think you're a good terminal or a bad terminal, you're still a terminal. And those children that were missing a terminal at home, or those veterans or adults who don't have any terminals, they're using you as a terminal. Well, it behooves you to keep your nose pretty clean, because you're the only terminal they've got. And when you stand up in front of a group as a Group Auditor you are, whether you like it or not, becoming an integral terminal in this person's existence. Therefore, it's very good to swap around the auditors a bit so that you don't get too fixed on this. All right, all right.

I hope you can understand this very easily. It isn't terribly complicated. It's what is not admired persists. And this is horrible, by the way, just is horrible, because it works out – it works out such ghastly computations.

Now, a fellow who is living in the past is living in the past because he's sure he had a terminal in the past and he knows he hasn't got one in the present or he knows he couldn't possibly ever get one in the future, So he can't have an interchange, he can't flow. There is no flow there. Nonadmiration. He gets into the past, this nonadmiration will persist, persist, because he's still got a fixed terminal. It's still sitting there, it's still a terminal. It's – obviously can be used, but it doesn't work. And you get the bafflement of the psychotic. He's using these terminals in the past, and he knows they're terminals and he knows they should work, and they don't work, and he doesn't know why they don't work. And he'll haul those right up into present time and try to use them as terminals. Because he's sure he hasn't got a terminal in present time much less have one in the future.

Now you take a neurotic, he's holding on desperately to terminals in present time. Terminals plot against time, you see? It's time change that makes an electric flow. You got to change the time and the terminal at the same time, so you have a past-future, past-future, past-future in any electronic circuit. All right.

He hangs onto these terminals in present time and plots them against something a little bit in the past, or he hangs on to terminals in present time and plots them against something in the future. That last is a very healthy thing. That is the child who is holding on to the toy gun. He's holding on to that toy gun because one of these days he's going to be a cowboy. And he's got a mock-up out here in the future. See, there's a cowboy. That's his terminal. He's going to be this fellow. And he's running on that as energy, he thinks. All right, that's his energy line. Zing, zing, zing. That will be terrifically admired. And one day you see him and he just looks like he'd trip over his chin, it's so low.

And you say, "What's the matter with you?" If you plowed into it, you would find that he had some kind of a mock-up of him that he had mocked up for the future. He said this is a future mock-up. You see him mock up into the future very easily because you're not in the future anyway, there isn't any time.

Anyway, here's this future mock-up and it's a cowboy. And somebody has come along and taken his mock-up away from him. How did they do it? They have simply convinced him that cowboys are no good. And he hits bottom. How does he hit bottom? He just stops getting a flow. He has no more flow. That's the end. It's just like you turn off an electric light, The kid will look like that. You've destroyed a mock-up. You say, "Cowboys are no good." You've convinced this kid they're no good and he doesn't want to be a cowboy, and so on. I almost

got killed one time, actually, in a little Spanish village way back up in the mountains down in the West Indies by simply telling a bunch of natives that that was a bad Western picture and the cowboys in it weren't actual. It was one of these little two-bit movie houses, you know – the silent film, filmed lord knows how long ago. And I just explained this, that there were better cowboy pictures than this – I was trying to say that. And I just said these characters weren't real. And I had taken their mock-ups away from them, and believe me, the fellows I was with almost killed me! Didn't realize what I was doing.

Well, you will find, then, that life goes most smoothly which goes on a high level of admired illusion. Sure, the kid will change his mind, he'll change his mind about wanting to be a cowboy. But as long as he wants to be a cowboy, you better not change his mind, because he's got a terminal there and it may be the only other one he's got. Maybe you're one, and it's the other. And if you were to tell him that cowboys were really no good, you'd probably send him home and he'd have a case of measles or something. It's as sudden and as explicable as that; these childhood illnesses and upsets.

Now, you take a veteran and he starts coming up out of apathy and you – something tells him this is all no good. He'll just sink back into apathy again. Well, your job is to get him up above that level so that this sort of thing doesn't happen to them. And it's relatively easy to do with the processes we're using. Because if they become confident of their mock-ups, then they're indestructible. Nothing can destroy them.

You see, an illusory terminal, that is to say, a created terminal by imagination is more valuable to the individual than a real terminal. It's on his wavelength. And the real terminal doesn't flow at him anyway. He just thinks it does.

Okay, let's take a very short break here.

[End of lecture. Note that the reel continues on into LGC-4B, which is the next tape in this series.]