

AUDITING TECHNIQUES: SELF DENIAL, RESPONSIBILITY

A lecture given on 18 January 1957

[Start of Lecture]

Thank you.

This is the thirteenth ACC lecture, and this is January the 18th, 1957. And the title of the lecture is Auditing Techniques.

Done a lot of talking to you about theory: agreement, disagreement, and all that sort of thing. Talked to you quite a bit about the theory, here in this ACC. I talked to you about first what you could expect that auditing would amount to, at a fast look, which was of course communication, control and havingness -- that's a fast look.

Then I told you quite a bit about the role that agreement plays. Talked to you about the Scale of Reality. And then, particularly, the role that agreement plays in establishing the effort of an individual to separate from things or to move obsessively into things. In other words, one agreed to be part of the eight dynamics and then elected himself out.

Well, sometimes you get a pc on some downward action of that: He's elected himself out; he's trying to elect himself back in; he's now electing himself out again. You got the idea?

So the sequence of joining, leaving, joining, leaving, joining, leaving, joining, leaving, joining, leaving could be said to be a picture of existence. It is basically a picture of agreement. By agreement we simply mean an individual agrees or contracts to be part of the human race, let us say, and then decides that the contract must not be binding, and elects himself out of the human race. Fine. Having done this, he has, of course, denied himself. And this is the only possible aberration: He's denied himself. In other words, he made a postulate, then he said it wasn't true.

Now, you'll get pcs who are denying themselves so consistently that every time they get into good shape, they put themselves in bad shape; every time they try to exterior-

ize, they zap themselves; every time they think, „*Well, I'm pretty bright,*“ they invalidate themselves at once. The fellow says, „*You know, I'm not doing too bad. Well, I used to do better... Wonder where that phrase came from?*“ he sort of thinks to himself. In other words, it's enough for him to give himself a compliment to give himself an insult. It goes just on a one-two, one-two, one-two basis.

Well, examine your postulates, sequence of postulates: There is the native state and the first postulate and then the second postulate. The second postulate wipes out the first postulate.

Now, on any one given subject, any single given subject, you can have a native state, first postulate, second postulate. Individual says, „*A man is created,*“ then he says, „*There's no man there. I'm not looking at any man,*“ see? But he just created one! He doesn't uncreate it. He denies the fact that he did. You see? Therefore, it becomes unmanageable. This thing, then, becomes unmanageable. He says he created it; now he says he didn't create it. And you have achieved what, for us, is as good a definition of insanity as you will ever find, I am sure, from the framework of auditing.

Oh, there could be much better things that particularly and peculiarly isolated the whole subject of insanity. You see? Could be much better wordings of this, and so on. But for our purposes, insanity on any given subject is simply an extreme irresponsibility. Extreme irresponsibility equals insanity. Got it?

Now, insanity is a little too strong there, so we'll just say „*aberration.*“ But aberration wouldn't be quite that extreme. In other words, he said, „*I am a happy man,*“ and then, while being a happy man, he simply makes a cross-postulate, says, „*I'm a very unhappy man.*“

Now, I'll call your attention to the Axioms about first postulate and second postulates and lies, and the persistence of lies, and that sort of thing. Well, what persists on this denial but the denial? The denial persists. The actuality doesn't persist.

Now, if you attempt to undo the denial, you're apt to get into trouble in auditing. And this lecture does concern auditing technique, not theory. This is just a technical fact. The denial is an un-undoable item.

Why? Because the fact that it is a denial admits -- a part of it, at least -- admits what is. The fact that something is denied admits the existence of what is denied. That man who says, „*There is no God*“ is, of course, denying the fact that he once had great belief in God. The first action is necessary in order to deny it. Do you see that? Otherwise, it's a fact.

Now, if there is a desk here and we say, „*There is no desk here*“ -- while there is a desk here, you understand -- that is a denial. But look over here to my left, and I say, „*There is no desk here,*“ and that is the truth; there is no desk here over to my left. That's not a denial.

Now, if you were to look at a desk and say, concerning any given desk, „*Desk, vanish,*“ we didn't engage in a denial. We just engaged in an obliteration, an uncreative action which, you might say, discreates a desk. There is a desk; we take the actual action of

saying „*No desk*,“ and „*no desk*“ occurs. So this, again, is not a denial. A denial consists of this: There is a desk here, and we say, „*There's no desk*,“ while there is a desk here. You got it? And that's about all that a bank consists of, from top to bottom.

We could say that the individual suffers, the state suffers, mankind suffers, any dynamic and participation therein suffers, only from one thing -- just one -- just one thing that is really there: A refusal to take responsibility for what it has already created. You understand that?

The only time there is any trouble with any object of any character or kind is when those who created it or agreed to its creation or used it in any way, denied its existence or state or condition.

Now, a denial could simply be this: We mock up a man; we say there's no man there. We mock up a very bad man who is going to run around and knock off everybody in the room, and we say he's a good man. See, by denial we mean a refusal to take responsibility for what has been created.

Or let's define irresponsibility. An irresponsibility is a refusal to admit one's participation in. That's all. That's all there is to an irresponsibility.

A fellow is walking around in a human body and he says, „*I'm not part of the human race*.“ Hey, wait a minute! You know, that's about the wildest thing; he's running around already, he's not part of the human race.

He's a general or he's somebody who is dedicated to wiping out humanity. See? U.S. public contributes the money to the government, by which it can contribute money to some atomic scientists who build an atomic bomb with full permission of the government, and then everybody in the public says, „*It doesn't exist anymore. We had nothing to do with it.*“ We create at once an insane condition.

The fellow says, „*I'm part of the human race*,“ then he says, „*I'm not part of the human race*.“ When he says, „*I'm part of the human race*,“ he mocked up or picked up a body. He said, „*Now, I'm part of the human race*.“ And one day he comes along while he's still part of the human race -- he didn't undo the initial postulate -- he said, „*I'm no longer part of the human race*.“ Dzuh!

How does he get so stuck? How come he gets stuck in a body's head and the body gets so stuck on other people? How does this occur? He just denies any role in it. „*No, got nothing to do with it.*“

A fellow mocks up a mountain of arsenic and says, „*Isn't it terrible how that mountain kills everybody?*“ Somebody comes around and they say, „*You mock up that mountain of arsenic?*“ And he'd say, „*No, I wouldn't have anything to do with that. What mountain of arsenic?*“

Police play this game all the time, and they themselves become a sort of a cancerous growth in a society with great ease. Because they play this game only: They make everybody deny his existence, deny his position. All police are interested in is not-thereness. You see? They're interested, evidently, in thereness, but to avoid them, why, they will only accept not-thereness. So one can say, well, that thing that they are

most interested in must be that thing which they best accept. Actually, they go away if you can prove to them this subject of not-thereness.

Beautiful ballad about this: Down in St. Louis or someplace, a crap game, and one of the brothers that was there was found dead. They're scouting around amongst themselves, trying to find out who's going to stay there and advise the police when they come just how this brother is no longer alive. „*Somebody's got to do it,*“ the way the ballad runs, „*but not me. There's somebody gotta linger, but not me!*“

In order for an individual to remain in possession of his body, it is necessary that he deny to the police his thereness; very necessary. For instance, it would be enough for you to appear at the scene of fifteen or twenty fires to be hauled in and jailed and 'et up, and people wanted to know wherefore. That's for sure.

This has gone so far that in northern Virginia the police there stop cars that have these high-pole antennas -- you know, one of these big antennas that you see on a car? Well, if a car has that, the police will stop the car and inquire as to whether or not they have a police radio in the car. In other words, do they have a receiver in that car which receives police radio and fire signals?

Why? Well, it was explained to me there was so many people got there, to the scene of the fire, and so many people got there, to the murder and everything, and sometimes got there before the police did and they impeded everything.

Most anybody in the society, most active men, are pretty good in handling fire and criminals and things like that. I don't know why the police select themselves out as being the only people able to do this. As a matter of fact, they are amongst the less able to do this or they wouldn't work at it so hard.

What's wrong with the public arriving? Hm? What's wrong with the public arriving at once at the scene of a crash -- maybe where somebody has an artery bleeding; putting a tourniquet on somebody. What's wrong with somebody arriving at the scene of the fire in time to save the babies being thrown out of the second- story window? What's wrong with this?

„*Well, the public is being there! See, that's what's wrong with it. And we've got to stop it, see? We've just got to stop it!*“ See, it's nuttiness! They say nobody must join the human race. See, nobody's permitted to.

And you compose a citizens' committee around, and what have you got? Everybody suspects you. Of what? Not ever of being a citizens' committee. That is too horrible for them to confront! That's something they just wouldn't ever confront -- that citizens would get together and actually confront the government. No, the government is certain that everybody has been so thoroughly trained in not-thereness that they will take total irresponsibility on the subject of government, and then the government can do what it please.

But if the government can do what it please, what's it going to do with all the insane? The immediate question would follow, then: If everybody has no further responsibility in the conduct of government, then what is the government going to do with all of

the crazy people? Then they would have to compose themselves a government of psychiatrists, which is exactly what is happening. Well, I didn't mean to make that remark. It's the truth of the matter, though. When presidential campaigns are conducted totally on the advices of psychiatrists, the American public had better discover that it's becoming irresponsible.

So here we have this component, this factor, of extreme irresponsibility.

These United States of America, just as England -- the United Kingdom, parts of -- were built by thee and me, not by some mandate or stroke of the pen from some potty monarch someplace, or some demented politician. That isn't the way it happened. We put them together. See? And if we don't keep them together, we don't continue responsibility over them, they of course go psychotic.

See, you are part of that nation to which you belong. In our Code of Honor and this associate-membership card, it says definitely (on the associate-membership card) that we expect people to remain part of and loyal to their own countries and governments, see? It says that. That's because so many of these things are in foreign -- different nations, I should say. I don't think there is such a thing, today in Scientology, as a foreign nation. Therefore, I shouldn't use the word.

Therefore, an individual who is told bluntly that he is no longer part of the citizenry can be counted to become a little crazy on the subject.

Now, I can control with considerable ease, as any of you could, a very large number of sane people. But I don't think I could control a very large number of totally insane people. That would be a tougher job than I would like to undertake. They're out of communication, so how on earth could you ever communicate to them anything that you wanted them to do? Therefore, a government of the insane would be impossible.

A government to exist must be the government of the sane, and to be the government of the sane, it'd have to be the government of the people, by the people and for the people. That would be a sane government. Nothing else would be a sane government. You would get randomness at a mad rate.

For instance, if organizationally we put it out that *„Well, you're not supposed to think. You're not supposed to do anything other than your job. You're supposed to stand there and lick stamps, and you haven't got any part of this organization except licking those stamps,“* and so on.

Our trouble is quite the reverse. Practically everybody in the organization takes full responsibility for all parts of the organization, including my conduct. It's one of the wilder things to live with, but at the same time, most everybody's cooking.

I travel at a slightly faster speed than the organization itself, and about the only trouble that develops is when I overreach. And the organization, having further communication lines, then has a little bit further communication lag, see, and once in a while finds out four days late that we aren't on that program anymore. And there's been three or four people working like mad on that program during those four days and they feel a little bit miffed. They snarl a little bit.

Why? They found that they weren't part of the organization for four days. And that upsets them, and they go downscale. See that?

It's very funny, but trying to take a job away from somebody in these organizations of Scientology is about as much as your life's worth. You never heard so much communication go on at the moment you try to remove, from anybody's hands, a function. Now, you wouldn't think somebody would hang on to paying bills -- you know, making out checks and verifying accounts. And yet, just before I came in here I had a considerable amount of randomness on that very subject. Somebody didn't want to be removed off this job of paying bills and didn't want to pass it into anybody else's hands, because there was that stack of bills, and they hadn't been cleaned up, and so on and so on and so on.

It didn't matter what organizational hat was being presented to this person; this person was part of the organization and knew the organization had to pay those bills. And although all this person was supposed to do was make out the checks and verify the bills, the person had already extended over into how much money did the organization have, what were its future plans, and what was its future income, and at what rate could these bills be paid, across what span of time?

Now, that's very interesting that all this was figured out. I finally had to settle it in only this fashion (do this all the time): all the bills would have to be verified and the checks made up and dated, as of the date of the check, and then could be put in my desk, and would be paid at that rate that we had money to meet all those bills. And only then was the person satisfied. Perfectly willing to trust my judgment as to how much money was in the bank.

In any business organization this person would only be performing a minor clerical function. But not in this organization. That's an interesting sidelight.

Now, it doesn't necessarily make a calm view! If you think this responsibility makes a calm view, you're reaching for one direction and we're going in another. It makes for motion and action and, often, argument.

You get three people heading three departments together, each one of which is totally certain that he has a deep vested interest in the other two departments, and they never really do have a department-head meeting. For weeks we've been trying to get one meeting together for each person to report on his own department only. We just achieved it at the last meeting, somewhat. We got them to report verbally. They reported on everything and concerned themselves with everything under the sun, moon and stars. They were doing their jobs, so we can't say that this was irrational responsibility. Each one of them felt a considerable responsibility for the organization, what it was doing; for Scientology, what it was doing; for the people in Scientology, what we're doing for them. You get the idea? And it just moves right on out.

They're pretty sane organizationally. The saner that Scientology organizations become, the more difficult it is to spread rumors through them or stampede them.

This one's almost rumor proof. I mean, some days people manufacture rumors just to be manufacturing rumors, you know? They never go anyplace.

Yet there was a day in these organizations that the people had a sufficient irresponsibility for the human race and themselves and the organizations and on all the dynamics, that all you had to do was say that a cop had been shot on the front porch and everybody would have gone out and looked. See, you had started it as a rumor. They wouldn't even have added it up to the fact there'd been no pistol shot. See, they would have had no feeling that it wasn't true. They're almost on a stimulus-response: you tell them something, they receive it hypnotically. It becomes true.

Now, the public at large is going to get into that state sooner or later. They're going to get into that state on the subject of the dynamic.

We were just getting an organization together. It was aborning and we were trying to square it around, and nobody knew what his responsibilities were with regard to that organization at all. Furthermore, they felt they'd better not be responsible for the organization, and all kinds of odd considerations and rumors traveled through them with great speed.

I don't say that the public at large is in that bad a state now. I say they're much worse. They don't even go out on the front porch and look. They just know that's true. They won't take truth anymore and they won't take fact anymore. The communication of truth and fact isn't much to be found on public communication lines.

When the newspapers of the land talk only about death -- that's page after page: death-death-death. „*Bill killed*,“ they even say. Legislation death: „*Bill killed in Congress*.“

You see that the level of approach here requires an understanding of the fact that these people were once part of something and now are not, although the something still exists. Got that? The something still exists.

Now, I don't know whether it's aberrative or not to kick out of a head and have the body die. See, I don't know whether that's aberrative or not -- I wouldn't say for sure - - unless the person denies that the person is dead! See, a fellow could kick out of a body's head as the body dies, and then say, „*That body goes on living*“ [There's] many a thetan thinking around that's pretty sure the body went to heaven. „*It's living somewhere*.“

About the lousiest trick that you could pull on a little kid who'd lost his mother or father is to tell him „*Well, he's in heaven now*.“ I've taken that apart in kids who have become preclears of mine, see? I've taken it apart. „*Mama's going on living somewhere*.“ The person had a spook! In other words, Mama's gone, but they say Mama's there. Now, do you get the other side of this technique situation?

I'm still talking to you about techniques, by the way. You will see this in a moment.

Let's define one just for fun then. Technique could be that thing which reestablishes the responsibility for, and uncreates or creates the first postulate. Do you see that? It does or undoes the first postulate. We don't much care which it does.

Techniques can run postulates in or run them out. It can do one or the other. There are some techniques that run them in. It's the same technique, sometimes, will do both.

You could have a fellow go out in the park and you could say to him, „*Now, put strength into each one of the people you see around here. Put strength in that person.*“ See?

Now, you're running out, at first, all the times when he tried to make some weakling strong. See, at first this starts running out, you see? And after a while, he is doing it; he's just simply doing it. In other words, you're putting something in now with the same wording, same technique; he's putting strength into these people.

Now, you'll occasionally see the phenomenon, early in the use of a technique, where both of these things occur simultaneously: you run something in and something runs out at the same time.

That is, however, an isolated phenomenon and shouldn't be confused with this one: You start running something in on the case and something then runs out, although the person is only running something in. In other words, he's not running something in and running it out at the same time. He's running something into the case, and as a consequence, something runs out of the case.

And that is the commonest phenomenon in Scientology processing, and one which you should understand the best. You run something into the case, it runs out.

Now, the best place to observe this is in havingness. You run in havingness, and the fellow lets go of a bunch of old havingnesses. That's on an enough basis; he's getting enough of it, so he lets some go.

But there's another one at work that's a sneaker. And this is, again, another thing; this is yet another thing: You run out the first postulate and the second postulate undoes.

Now, all these things could happen at once. The most important one is (in terms of havingness) that you give him enough of something, and he therefore lets go of something, since he realizes that since he can make it, there can be enough of it. That's rather simple, you see? That's the basic computation. But at the same time you're doing that, you'll get this other one: You run out the second postulate by running in a first postulate. And what you see, then, is the phenomenon of second postulate, second postulate, second postulate.

You will see a case for a while run irresponsibility on almost any technique you can give him. The early stages of a case are peculiarly marked by irresponsibility. You say, „*Mock up a man.*“ „*All right, mock up a man.*“ „*Okay, mock up a man.*“ Ask him if he's doing it. He doesn't know whether he's doing it or not. „*Are you doing that?*“ „*Well, a man is occurring*“; that's the best he can tell you. See? He's not taking the responsibility for the actual fact that a mock-up is happening. See, that's an irresponsibility.

And sometimes on this particular process („*Mock up a man. Mock up a man. Mock up a man*“), this irresponsibility mounts up and begins to run off, and he gets to feel terribly irresponsible -- which can come up to a point where he feels good. Mark that. He feels good because he isn't part of anything anymore. It's just this irresponsibility half run out so that he doesn't feel, then, chained down to anything. But he is. You've only gone part of your route with the technique.

Now, when it is run out a hundred percent, he is simply and only creating. Nothing more is happening. He is creating, and that is that. But what would be a hundred percent on „*Mock up a man*“? It would be a real live man standing in the room. That's a hundred percent. I can guarantee you that's a hundred percent. That does happen; that would happen, inevitably.

But boy, that's a long, long distance. That's a far cry. That's a long way along the track.

Well, up to that point you're then going to get irresponsibility, aren't you? The fellow is going to feel kind of irresponsible: „*I may be mocking it up. Maybe I'm not mocking it up. Maybe I am mocking it up.*“ These would come and go. „*Maybe I'm doing it. Maybe I'm not doing it. Well, men. Well, God put them all there. Well, I don't know; it looks like a man. I don't know whether I'm really making this form right or not. It's probably a repeat from some pattern I have in the bank.*“ All this sort of thing goes through the fellow's head.

So, it could be said that on any technique a certain amount of second postulate will occur, which is denial of authorship.

Now, if you can just define irresponsibility as denial of past participation, agreement or authorship, you have it down there pretty close. It's denial of past agreement or authorship, but participation can be part of that. All right.

Now, what then is the score here? What is the final look? The final look is that all the time a preclear is being processed, he's being irresponsible.

This of course creates a great tendency on the part of an auditor to soak the preclear with irresponsibility, since the preclear is soaked in it. This is it, see? Becomes a great tendency on the part of an auditor. You'll understand this better when I say an auditor starts to audit somebody who is very irresponsible and who is not at all capable, and never notices the fellow changes at all. That's his idea of the fellow, and he operates from that point thereon from his first summation of the individual. Therefore, the individual could change all over the place and the auditor wouldn't notice it.

Another thing he tends to do is, after a while -- because processes work as they process -- after a while this individual's determinism will rise. And very often, the auditor doesn't respect it. Why? It's been gone so long; he doesn't know it's there.

The preclear will pass over from a reactive reaction to the auditor, in protest and so forth, to a conscious reaction to the auditor. Somewhere along the course of any series of auditing hours, this will occur. A fellow goes over the bridge, you might say, and arrives on the other side of the stream.

That is not the time to insist that he is still reactive on this subject; that is the time to shake him by the hand and say, „*Hello!*“ They always kind of expect to be too, by the way.

A fellow gets some vast cognition that women are different, something like this, and they always expect you to say,

„*That's good,*“ or something of the sort, but what they really want is „*Hello!*“ See? The fellow has swum through a swamp. He's arrived somewhere.

We used to see this most prominently when we'd throw people back on the track. We'd move them back into the past and then move them back up to present time. It was a very, very funny thing that when they arrived back in present time they were very often disappointed when an auditor did not say „*Hello!*“ To the auditor, the fellow has been there on the couch, lying there stretched out, and hasn't been anyplace. To the preclear, he's been all over the track; he's been in all kinds of towns, planets and places, you see? He's been gone. And he actually experiences a feeling of disappointment that the auditor isn't glad to see him back. Of course, the auditor thinks, „*Back, hell! He's been here all the time!*“

Where it comes to observing the reactions of a preclear, an auditor must be fairly sharp. And he must understand the reactions of the preclear. He must understand to a marked degree and predict these reactions. Otherwise, he won't know where he's getting; he won't know what he's doing; he won't know where he's going.

And when one of these expected actions occur, if an auditor does not know what it is, then he doesn't know he's gotten anywhere and he's liable to misinterpret it completely and say, „*Well, that's just some more irresponsibility.*“

But the keynote on the part of a preclear as he goes south is this thing called responsibility and irresponsibility. Now, that's just a little bit esoteric; that's just a little bit difficult for the preclear to grasp. He would rather grasp it in other ways: Is he guilty or not guilty? Was he right or wrong? He believes himself to have a penchant for making people wrong. He thinks all the people around him have tried to make him wrong all of his life, and if he admits he's wrong, then he's in bad shape.

There are people around who do nothing whatsoever but insist that everyone else around them is always wrong. See there? No rightness is permitted.

The granting of beingness can be summed up in this. A person who always insists that everybody is wrong, of course, cannot and will not grant any beingness.

All right, now that's the behavior of a process. A process, a good process, properly run, inevitably restimulates and runs out irresponsibility on anything to which that process is addressed. That's a common denominator of what occurs. And you watch that, and you watch that go.

Therefore, your preclear is liable to get down to terribly low levels of irresponsibility - - so much so that the bank itself is more responsible than the preclear! And you find yourself talking to the bank. Very often in sessions you talk to the bank.

You're running 8-C, Part A, on this fellow. He's been going along smooth as can be, and all of a sudden one of these big charges of irresponsibility you know, „*I'm not the author of it.*“ Denial: „*I didn't do it. I'm not part of the race. It's not a wall. It's all unreal anyway. I can do the technique because it isn't real anyhow.*“

I had a preclear tell me that one time: „*I can do that technique easily, because the wall isn't real anyhow.*“ After he'd practically knocked all of the skin off all of his knuckles he had to concede with me that it did have the power to stop his fist. That was a big cognition on his part. After he'd hit it about twenty times, he found the knuckle was

skinned. Big gain for the preclear too, by the way. He didn't think there was anything in the whole universe that could stop him, and he knew he couldn't stop himself

We have a condition where the restimulated irresponsibility causes the preclear to say and do peculiar things. Preclear wants to blow the session. The preclear wants to use his left hand. The preclear wants to sit down for a while.

The commonest expression of this amongst smokers is to want a cigarette. They want to knock off for a little while. „*Can't we take a little break and have a smoke?*“ It depends on the preclear, but I sometimes shove a cigarette in their mouth and light it for them, and give them the next command. We don't take any break. You'll find out they couldn't care less for that smoke. They wanted to surrender to that irresponsibility and I didn't let them.

You get „*let's quit.*“ You get apathy, covert hostility. You get anything as a result of this phenomenon.

And that is why, during auditing, the bank is so much more likely to take over than when the person is walking around the streets of the town. This perhaps answers a bit of a riddle for you. It's been a riddle in Dianetics and Scientology for a long time. Why does a person behave so aberratedly and so abandonedly in an auditing session who doesn't behave any other than sanely in his workaday life? Why does he do that?

Well, when a good technique was addressed to him, it ran out charges of irresponsibility. However, what tone or anything else you want to call this, it was still irresponsibility -- on some dynamic or agreement or subject. So we had, then, the individual behaving differently.

Of course, in real life, he would strike restimulators -- now, get this -- he would strike a restimulator on some past situation and would react with an irresponsibility. But because he would try to go on and be responsible while something was being irresponsible, he would get into a conflict which justified his having denied the whole thing in the first place.

A theater marquee restimulated him and restimulated irresponsibility. So he's the fellow that changes the letters in the theater marquee. That's a job he just got. He climbs the ladder and falls off the ladder and hits the pavement and bungs up his ankle. Well, he just knew that he shouldn't have anything to do with ladders -- about as close as he could come to it. He had a feeling like he shouldn't be working. Wasn't up to him to earn enough money to do so-and-so, or to pay the car payments; let somebody else pay them. See, it's a feeling of irresponsibility.

The restimulator always restimulates an irresponsibility, otherwise it would not have any power over the individual. The individual would simply look at it, tape it and that would be that! You got it? You'd have to have an irresponsibility for its existence for it to continue to exist with that much force and power, always!

The force and power of anything, then, consists of an improper taking of responsibility or refusal of responsibility for it.

If that wall has the power to give you sinusitis, it would be because you had refused to take responsibility for it or because you had improperly, in some fashion, taken responsibility for it. You can make yourself just as sick. But again, you're altering participation or authorship or agreement. You're altering something. To alter something denies the first of it.

Now, that which gives people the most trouble, the MEST universe, sixth dynamic... They're interiorized into it, so that it must be giving them trouble. See? It follows, one-two, that if they're interiorized into it, it must be giving them some trouble one way or the other. If it's giving them trouble, it must be because they're interiorized into it. And it follows the one-two-three: particles, objects and spaces. Those three things.

Don't forget those three things. Particles, objects and spaces. Those are the proper things to address in a case. Why? Because they're giving the case the most trouble.

Now, if the case can see only communication lines three feet in diameter going through the room, you would have to get down to lines before you could advance into solids. Do you see that? That's lower. But nevertheless, we're still fooling around with particles, objects and spaces.

Now, particles, objects and spaces alter, and that alteration in general we call „*time*.“ But time itself is a consideration, and a person denies time, and he begins to have trouble with time, and he has trouble with these other things. So we have three easily approachable items and one difficult abstract which has a dependency on these three items.

But what do you know, if you will change around particles, objects or spaces, you change around time considerations. Therefore, an attack level on a case consists of some combination of these four things, and communication and control.

Now, creativeness is the one thing the fellow has come to deny. Now, of course, you've got MEST-universe space and you've got space in the bank. You've got MEST-universe particles and you've got particles in the bank. You've got MEST-universe objects and objects in the bank.

And heretofore, we have believed these things were completely and entirely different. But in Dianetics and Scientology we have come to find out that they are not different at all. They're the same order of magnitude.

Now, if you think you have to discover the proper authorship to the physical universe before you can get out of it, you are mistaken. All you have to do is accept responsibility for the authorship. Ha-ha. That's a bit different, isn't it? You don't have to knock out and as-is the entirety of the universe. All you have to do is to knock out and as-is the irresponsibility connected with it.

Your target is not every object, particle and space and time increment through which you have ever existed. That is not your target. Your target is the responsibility with regard to it. Irresponsibility keynotes any difficulty with it.

Now, we know this very well in automatic machinery. We know that automatic machinery is some of the darnedest stuff. You set something up and it goes whir-clank, and after that you have no responsibility for it. Man, you're going to have a picnic, and I don't care whether that's in life or otherwise. It's just you set up something totally automatic, and so on.

Now, it'd be quite different -- quite different -- to continue to run it or to continue to be responsible for it. Oddly enough, you could run it either way. If you continue to run a piece of automaticity, you may just be wasting your time; may not be worth running. It isn't necessary that you run it, but it is necessary that as long as it is running you continue your responsibility for it. You see that clearly as a different thing?

All right. It is running, and you say, „*Well, I started it, and that's the thing that is running*“ and so on. Once in a while you distrust yourself. You say, „*I'm not going to let it keep on running. I must bury or hide the fact that I authored it, so it will then persist.*“ This is just a consideration that when you do that, why, it will persist, you see? I mean, it's a consideration that if you make this other consideration, then your basic consideration that it will persist will then persist. You get the tangle that this thing could immediately become involved with?

If you make the consideration that something is and it will persist, you've made the consideration. I mean, that's all.

Now, all you have to do is to have a continued responsibility for having created it. That doesn't mean you have to run it, but that means that if it runs into somebody else's mock-up and knocks an arm off, or something like that, you have to say, „*Well, I knew I shouldn't have made that doggone thing. I'm sorry, Joe.*“ If you caught it at that point, by the way, it would all come out all right. It comes out all wrong if you say, „*I wonder who made that horrible mock-up that walked over and hit your mock-up and knocked its arm off?*“ Now you're in trouble. Now you're in trouble.

People know instinctively that the right thing to do if they commit a crime is to confess to the crime. Get this low level of response on this high level truth. That's not necessarily the best thing to do at all -- if they are living in a life which has agreements in all other directions in disparity to it. See? That's not necessarily the best thing to do at all (if they committed a crime, confess that they committed a crime).

But we also have people going around confessing to having committed the crime, who hadn't. For every real gruesome, bloody murder, there are always a dozen confessions come wandering in. So much so, the law will no longer allow the admission of a confession to murder in a murder trial. That is, in most civilized communities; they are aware of this.

In other words, an irresponsibility takes place -- a misresponsibility would probably be a better term. A person does not fix proper ownership, authorship. „*Who did it?*“ „*I don't know.*“ Or he doesn't know, and he says, „*I know.*“ In both of those you have a false responsibility taking place. It's an irresponsibility or a misresponsibility.

Processes that do not undo these conditions which I have laid before you here are not good processes! Because an individual had a hand in so much more than he admits

having a hand in, a game condition becomes an apparent condition of processing. Preclear at cause, everything at effect, see? That's an apparency. It's only apparent that games are apparently necessary, that the individual must play a game, that he must get into all this trouble, that he must get this involved. See, that's only apparent. He'll go along with that. Yes, he'll go along just so far, and find the preclear without any further problems, and he will make some.

Or is he, by making new problems, avoiding his responsibility for existing things in his immediate environment? Why is it that people are more out of present time than in present time? Must be that there's more in present time they're trying to avoid than out of present time. You ever think of this?

If being out of present time is the common denominator of madness (which it is -- it's disability, and that sort of thing; being out of present time is that), then why is everyone out of present time?

Well, we say the trouble is in the past. Well, I don't know that the trouble is in the past at all, because I'm not at all sure that there is such a thing as a past. I'm not at all sure that time is. Very abstract thing.

If I pretended to know time by any more than the signs of time, I would be telling a lie, you see? You see that time is passing and time passes and that's that. Time is an abstract consideration of one kind or another. Like all considerations, it depends on masses, and so forth, to have validity to most people and preclears.

All right. Now, if we look over a case, we find the case out of present time, there must be a lot of things in present time that say they shouldn't be in present time. We could then say it is the factor of time that is doing this. Present time is racing along at such a speed that he's losing it all the time, and he gets dropped back into the past by present time... Do you see?

We're crediting this fellow with total irresponsibility. See, we're actually crediting him with total irresponsibility, don't you see, if we do that. We're saying he has no power to come into present time. And we have inherited in Dianetics and Scientology the error of psychoanalysis and psychology: „*Man is a creature without will.*“

One of the most despised books in the world today is Schopenhauer's Will and the Idea. The fact that Hitler and some other fellows made this their textbooks kind of makes it antipathetic to people. Not necessarily a bad book, a good book, a true book, or a lying book, but it certainly expresses the idea rather forcefully that man has a will and can do something! And people don't like that. Because the second they said they could do something, then they would have to do something, they think. Somebody might compel them, then, to change their mind or make up their mind or do something else.

So whatever they're trying to prove, and however many complexities they're trying to introduce into your life as an auditor, the fact remains that they are irresponsible or misresponsible. That fact remains. And the next fact is that there are things in present time which they do not care to confront -- that it is easier to confront the past and their own banks than it is to confront the walls, ceilings, floors, particles and spaces.

The bodies they're in -- don't think when I say „*objects*“ I'm simply saying walls and planets. I'm also saying heads and medulla oblongatas and tibias. It's much better to be confronting some demon of yesteryear, or some engram of some horrible operation, than to do this terrible, wicked, mean, vicious thing: be in present time. To be jumped on from all sides at once? To be in communication or connection with the entirety of the universe? Drrrrrrr!

From Dianetics until now, all processes have aimed to bring an individual into a relationship with present time, and present time consists of particles, objects and spaces, with the abstract, time. That's a lot to confront. So processes which introduce this ability on some gradient scale are valid processes.

Therefore, all Creative Processes are quite valid, because they permit the individual at some point on the backtrack to mock something up as a substitute for the fact that a man is, and men do exist in present time. So he can mock up men-men-men-men-men at some point on the track. And you'll find out he will mock up closer and closer and closer and closer and closer to present time. Irresponsibilities will run out. He has no responsibility for looking at it at first. He can't even see the mock-up sometimes. But he can do it, and he can move on up.

He can mock up women. To a man, men's bodies are the hardest to confront. To a woman, women's bodies are the hardest to confront. And you could go on up from men, women, couples, walls, spaces, anything you like. But you could work it all up from the place he is in the bank, up to present time. You would eventually have established present time.

Only when you've established present time have you established the immediacy of the environment. The environment itself is composed of pictures, and you'll notice that the bank is composed of pictures. Pictures with perceptions in them.

What's giving him trouble in the bank? Pictures with perceptions in them. Well, then you and he are just totally unaware of the fact that it must be pictures in present time that are giving him trouble, and that present time is composed of a lot of pictures. But they are much more savage, violent pictures than on the backtrack, even though they're pictures of operations. You get the idea?

So you get a perfectly valid process: „*Mock up a picture. Make it a little more solid. Mock up a picture. Make it a little more solid. Mock up a picture. Make it a little more solid.*“ Now, you can complicate the process and say, „*Mock up a picture. Make it a little more solid and say it's harmful.*“

These, then, are intensely valid processes that I've been talking to you about, because they rehabilitate the ability to confront present time and all within it. And if your pre-clear could do that, he would be an OT.

Thank you.

[End of Lecture]