

## GAMES CONDITIONS

A lecture given on  
20 July 1961

How are you!

Gee! Green light out there. Look at that! Storm coming. Yeah, green light. I remember being in the middle of a Kansas . . what do they call them out in Kansas? Tornadoes. They call them tornadoes. That's it. It sounds utterly incredible. The wind went up to about a hundred and some miles an hour and you couldn't see fifty feet and everything was as bright green as pea soup. I never heard of it happening that way and then twenty-five pound blocks of ice started raining out of the sky. And I said, "This is Kansas." And then I said, "And they took it away from the Indians." It's quite startling.

Well, I think this is the 20th of July, AD 11. I asked you for questions yesterday and answered quite a few of your questions and today I probably ought to tell you about something, if I can think of anything to tell you about. There's very little doing.

I have an announcement. In addition to the three other course Clears that were made on the HGA Course in Johannesburg, another Clear has been made by the HGC in Johannesburg in the last twenty-four hours. Little girl recently off the HPA Course by the name of Spinder, using Routines 2 and 3. I'm bringing you up to date on the thing.

You see, now, the oddity why some people get Clear and some people don't get Clear has a lot to do with the ability to confront problems. This was apparently the random factor involved in this sort of thing. In other words, the rudiments factors. They were so oppressive with some cases that they went nowhere. And you just ground and ground and ground and picked off a grain of wheat and chaff and picked off another grain off the pile and it was going slow because the rudiments were out, but the person's responsibility was not up to knowing that they were out and so they didn't register. You get what I mean? I mean the guy is so disturbed by his present time environment he never gets down to the basics of clearing.

Okay. Let me see. There was something to talk to you about. What was it? What was it? It had something to do with the aspects of um . . oh, I think it was problems.

There are a number of ways of running problems and I'd better bring this to your attention. When you say Games Condition Process, you mean that it is an interchangeable, negative bracket. In other words, it's interchanged between person A and person B or person B and person C and person C and person B. I don't care how many legs the bracket has got on it, but it is basically a denial of interchange. Whatever it is, it's a denial.

Now, a Games Condition Process . . a model process . . would be worked out on an E-Meter for the pc. All commands should actually be worked out on an E-Meter. I can give you certain blanket commands that will work on everybody . . on some very well and on some mildly well, just because of the variation of the auditing command from pc to pc. Certain things are not meaningful to some pcs and certain things are.

So any auditing command should be cleared on a meter before you run it, any auditing command.

When I tell you to run such-and-so and so-and-so, I will generally give you one that has a high general workability on all pcs. But at the same time, I'm liable to give you one and tell you to "assess the command."

Now, this means that there's probably a much more workable workability to be found for this command in the particular pc you are running.

Now, there are certain vagaries associated with commands which you should know and I, however, am not going to at this time try to sputter off all the rules that govern commands. As far as I know, they've never been written up. I've never written them down in column form . . one, two, three, four . . and said this is the laws of the origin of command, mostly because I know them but haven't particularly articulated them. I can sort out commands and know whether they work and know whether they don't work. It's quite complex. There are certain things that are workable and certain things that aren't and you see all these things represented in the bulk of the work. That is a whole subject all by itself and you should identify it as such. It is a whole subject of its own.

Now when I say a games condition, I mean an agreement on "can't-have" amongst various relationships of people or beings. It is an agreement of "can't-have" and you are likely to find this as the first thing your pc tells you.

"Did you ever deny anybody else a thought?" should be then followed: "Somebody else giving you a thought?" Got the idea? I mean, at once your pc is liable to come up with the fact that it ought to be "have" for self and "can't-have" on others.

Now, that is a true games-condition condition as far as that is concerned, but you're looking for the game. And the game was an agreement, so it is "can't-have" on the other fellow and the other fellow "can't-have" on you and he "can't-haves" on other people and other people "can't-have" on him. you get the idea? And it . . it is just a total agreement about this and only then do you get it nailed in brass.

Now, the disagreements which come up off of this line are immediately and directly on the surface of it and actually could be run. you say, "All right, get the idea of refusing problems to another and get the idea of another giving you problems." You're going to get meter reaction and it will run. there is no doubt about this and there's actually nothing wrong with running it this way, except that it's not very fundamental. You see?

You're looking for the time when everybody was in agreement because it is agreement which nails it in concrete, you see. When you have a widespread 'can't-have' agreement, then you get mass and all kinds of electronic phenomena, see. Everybody agrees this should exist, therefore it is the thing to do!

You want to know what happened to man under the Christian civilization . . you had a widespread agreement on "can't-have" of sex. See? It was very broad and I know that I probably get my share of criticism for chopping up other people's religions and so forth. I'm not chopping up other people's religion. I m sure you were part of a space-opera party that planted Christianity on this planet.

This situation of Christianity and a "can't-have" on the subject of the second dynamic: now that is about the most fundamental "can't-have" that you can run. That is "can't create," see. Denying other people creations and other people denying you creations and one and all are in total agreement that we deny creations and what does this do? Man, this not-ises a reactive bank into action and limbo faster than you can spit. If people aren't crazy, they'll make it in very short order.

Now, if you see how idiotic this is, let's put it on the subject of pottery. Let's get some kind of a religious wingding going of some kind or another in which it is an offense against some mythical god, who is all-powerful and who will choke down your throat at the least thing and take your thetan out of your head while you sleep and do all the other things this mythical all powerful might do . . any kind of a god you want to invent . . and then let's have this god have as the finest, highest crime that he can imagine, somebody making some pottery.

All right. Now, therefore, nobody in the society is going to be permitted to make pottery. Now we rig it at the same time that the society is totally dependent on pottery for all of its economic stresses and strains and carry on.

Let's say England . . let's set up England you see, so England has only one thing it can do. It has enormous supplies of clay. It has lots of fuel to bake pottery and it ships pottery to all parts of the world and it depends for all of its food and other things on pottery. And now let's get a game going by which, immediately, it is against the law and a criminal offense to create any pottery.

Well now, can't you just see people going around the bend trying to measure up to this thing You can see it when I put it out there in the clean air, see. They go round the bend. Are they supposed to make pottery or aren't they supposed to make pottery? Don't you see? And they agree that nobody else should make pottery, but they compulsively have to make pottery in order to eat or get paid or have anything to export or use any of their vital, natural resources. And one and all is ready to punish them on the one hand for making pottery, but they're going to be punished like mad for not making pottery.

Now, wouldn't that be an interesting thing You can see this case in court, case number 362, followed by case number 363. And case 362 has something or other to do with whether or not we have fed the family. And the fellow goes to prison or something of this sort for not having fed or taken care of his family. And he tries to explain to "Your Honor." He says, "But, Your Honor," he said, "I have to uh . . uh . . you see . . the only thing I can do is potter and uh . . actually, I was fined last month, you see, for pattering, and uh . . so therefore . . ."

And the Honor says, "Nothing to do with it, nothing to do with it, nothing to do with it. Ninety years," you see. And case 363 comes up and this fellow is accused . . primary crime against the land, of having actually made some pots. They were found in his possession. He was actually . . actually did make these pots, and so forth and Your Honor says, "Well, that's ninety years," see and case 364 would have to do . . .

Well, of course, this is pure nonsense and idiocy, but what could the society do? It was forbidding its own survival. Eventually, all you'd have to do to anybody in this country is just show them a piece of pottery and they would just start screaming, you see.

Now, let's look at the second dynamic. You've got to have bodies. That's the primary vehicle of locomotion used on this planet is a body. You're not supposed to make them, but if you make them, why, then you're supposed to take care of them, but you're not supposed to make them. And you go to jail for having made them and not taken care of them. you see? Or you go to jail for all sorts of neglect charges and that sort of thing but if you really go flat out and start making bodies like mad in all directions, why, of course, you find yourself in court at once. And it's one of these, sort of a cul-de-sac in the Culture, you see. Everybody's dependent when he kicks the bucket, on picking up a new body, but it's sort of against the law to make them.

Now it's against the law also economically. There's a penalty on having children. If you don't believe it, have some and start paying all of the various odds and ends and you can no longer live in a one-room house. You've got to have a three-room house and then you can no longer afford to just sort of sit around in the evening. You've got to work hard in order to pay for the three rooms, which you've just gotten. Only how about the fact that you have to work. Therefore, you've got to have a nanny or something like that to take care of the child and here we go, you see. We're outward bound.

Now, this is a sort of a penalty mechanism. You see, it's actually a sort of a punishment mechanism and yet, one and all are totally dependent on setting bodies made if bodies are their favorite vehicles. If you're going to have a body and an identity, a beingness, importance, problems or anything else in life, you'd better not show up without a body. People won't pay a bit of attention to you!

Now there's more basic law written around the creation, the noncreation, the care of and the noncare of bodies on the subject of the second dynamic than you could easily tabulate up here in the law library in a lot of long English winters. They are innumerable! But running right along with it, worked into the society, is the series of economic penalties of one kind or another.

So it's rather fantastic. Don't you see? You must create bodies. That's obvious, but you must not create bodies. That's also obvious. So when you get R "must" and a "must not," which run right close in together, it isn't enough to run off the contradictory must-must-not situation. You can pull this thing apart because it is in the field of disagreement. These facts do not agree with facts and you can actually start taking them apart with any process you care to take them apart with.

Now a games condition, however, underlies the fact that: how did you get suckered in on this? How did you get so that you could actually accumulate a motivator of this character? And that's the question you'd better ask.

It's like the question I long since should have asked my poor father. He used to complain about money and how it was so expensive, you see, to raise a family. He used to complain about this all the time and of course, the number one question was simply, "Well, why don't you make more money?" Well, obviously he didn't make more money because he knew he was not supposed to. He was already doing something which was just a little bit beyond the pale, you see, in raising a family. Because there is so many penalties connected with having . . with doing so, obviously it must not quite be right.

Now, this of course, gave him no resurgent willingness to go on and make the money to raise the family, don't you see? He didn't have any willingness to do it because he was kind of being punished for doing so, and it's very complicated and it's sort of spun in on the thing. Well, you can take I'll these disagreements apart, and you can cause a considerable resurge in the pc.

But how did you get so you could have a motivator? You must have been party to the "can't-have." You must have been party to the "can't-have" somewhere along the line . . an originating part of the "can't-have." It would be necessary for you to suffer the consequences. You can't suffer any consequences you didn't have any hand in creating, you know. It's just not possible. So you must have done something that agreed to all this and you must have done it with people, not because they disagreed but because they agreed, too.

So underlying all games conditions, you can very easily suspect that there is a total agreement by one and all that we must all "can't-have." And now what we're doing with the disagreement is disagreeing with the game that we made sure came into being so therefore, you can take the disagreements off the game which we brought into being and you can cause a resurge. Or you can undercut this by getting all of the agreements to have this game, because the game won't persist without the agreements. ARC is always stronger than no ARC.

So that's what a Games Condition Process is all about. It reaches for and seeks to isolate the basic agreements on some kind of a wild game of some character or another and the word "games condition" is a derogatory actually . . the words. They mean a very specific, technical fact. There's a technical thing goes along When you say games condition, you mean a package and the package has to do with this: it means a fixated attention, an inability to escape, coupled with an inability to attack, to the exclusion of other games.

There's nothing wrong with having games. There's a lot wrong with being in a games condition because it is unknown. It is an aberrated activity. It is reactive and one is performing it way outside of his power of choice and without his consent of will. He doesn't want to be there. He doesn't want to be playing this game. He's got to play this game. He has to play this game. He thinks he'd better like this game because he has to play it anyway, you see. And actually, it is an overthrow of the power of choice of an individual. When you say games condition, you mean that somebody's power of choice has been subjugated against his will into a fixated activity from which he must not take his attention. That's a games condition. In other words, it's a sort of a mental trap. It's a sort of a doingness trap. It's a sort of a cotillion in a barred ballroom.

The pc will be the first to tell you that the doors are all shut and locked. There isn't anything you can do but to play this game. There is no dance you can dance but this dance. It's different than jail. In jail you can sit there quietly and meditate upon the sins of your jailers. But not in a games condition. A games condition is a cotillion. You're not even permitted to sit still. You've got to do. You've got to assume a certain beingness. You've got to do this. You've got to do that. You've got to do something else. These things are all mandatory, and they must be all done in a certain area and always according to some wild ritual of some character or another.

And although the sun may be shining in the village square and the clouds may be caressing the mountaintops round about, that must not be observed. One must never go out there. One must never walk up and down that village square or look at those mountains. That's for sure. There are other people

around, but if they are not part of the game, one must have no communication with them. The world in essence becomes massless, spaceless, timeless and peopleless very rapidly. Most marriages that go on the rocks are totally cast in the mold of a games condition. If a marriage is going to go on the rocks, it's just some kind of a games condition.

Here's a typical one. This fellow and this girl. She was a man, and he was a woman. Back along the shores of the lower Zambezi when it was a civilization, they happened to be partners to the same execution. Whether they were executed or whether they executed somebody has very little to do with the thing. But they were both involved with this and there was a lot of shame, blame, regret, involvement and "can't-have." And they got really snarled up, man. They really got snarled up. If there was anybody's guts they really hated, it was this other person's guts. And that was something we evidently must really do in some future existence, is get even with this person.

So the millennia roll along and one day while calmly picking lotus leaves, one looks up and sees passing by in a boat this person. Recognizes him on a sort of a wavelength, God-knows-what principle, you know. Wow, see. Enters into a series of intrigues and eventually gets executed by or executes the person or goes through the whole dramatization again of shame, blame and regret, see.

Now, life is totally narrowed to this point, you see. And time goes on and one is sitting calmly enjoying his martini in a bar in Manhattan and this person sits down at the other end of the bar. Well now, we know by past experience, it does no good to get them executed swiftly. Murder is out. So let's wear them down slowly and the other person, of course, simultaneously gets the same idea and there ensues some kind of a love-hate cycle, resulting in matrimony and we don't know what the devil we're looking at. Of all the misemotionalisms you ever cared to see, you are certainly going to find it in that relationship. Because it's basically based on a total agreement that neither one must have anything: life, liberty, happiness, money, houses, nothing.

Now there have been disagreements with this and one is actually living in the world of disagreement. Of course, the other person must have a house, don't you see. Of course, the other person must have life, of course. And of course, the other person has rights, of course. And every one of these "of courses" are in violent disagreement to the basic games condition, which is a total "can't-have" on life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness . . . total denial of any one of those factors. Their tenderest moments are, of course, their moments of wildest disagreement. I mean . . . not disagreement from the standpoint of fighting, but when they sit down and they say, "Well, we're very fond of each other and everything is going along well," this is the wildest disagreement of it all.

It's pretty goofy to watch one of these things go. Pretty goofy. You can't make head nor tail out of it. All of a sudden one of them gets a chance and it's an oblique chance and they whip out a bayonet and plunge it . . . deep, man. But it's usually a legal bayonet of some kind or another.

And out of this, we get all sorts of interesting maxims, none of which are true. Like there is "Hell hath no fury like a woman scorned." We read this off, you know and all we see is the later-day disagreement and we see this later-day disagreement and we say well, "Good heavens, what produced all the fury involved with that situation, because they were getting along so well for four or five years, you see. They were getting along so very well and for this to suddenly blow up like that, well, he must have scorned her and she must have gotten even with it, so this thing of jealousy and so on, these are very, very powerful emotions. Oh, they're very powerful." And we assign it all to jealousy and hate and get a whole bunch of cockeyed rules here that have nothing to do with it. No, this thing is not based on some nebulous thing called "jealousy." This thing is based on a desire for sudden death. You see? it's the agreement and disagreement on the motives involved.

When two people get in this condition with each other, they will fixate on each other and the rest of the world ceases to exist. They stop going places. They stop doing anything. They stop going anywhere. They stop living, actually. They sort of sit and stare at each other. It's a fact. You've seen it, I'm sure. That is the end result of a games condition.

Now, there are your conditions of fixation and there is your "cotillion in the locked ballroom." Well, it's like two fighters being strapped together and made to fight and they can see no part of the horizon except

the fight. Don't you see? Now that's basically what you're looking at. Games conditions can exist on any dynamic . . any dynamic.

I got in a games condition one time . . I'm sure you have, too . . I got in a silly cycle. I don't know, a trillion, trillennia, trillennia, trillennia ago. And every time they had a war, why, I went out. I would either be a pilot in, or commander of, or somebody connected with an interceptor squadron on the outside of the capital. Societies used to last longer than they do now. And it wasn't anything for a society to go a billion years without much change.

But, every time the society would get into trouble, usually with the same adversaries, why, that was the drop of the hat. That was the signal. The whistle had gone and you would go down and snappily report to the Seventeenth Interceptor Squadron, which had in charge of it the protection of the capital, don't you see? And the enemy would come over and you would take off in an interceptor and you would go up to the center of the airport and you would either shoot down the attacking plane or be shot down and always at the center of the same airport . . for a billion years.

When I ran into that mass on the track, I said, "What is this?" you see. [ could see the airport okay. That was fine. I look around and what is this? What is this nonsense that is going on here? Because it is a total stop exactly above the middle of the airport. Of course, there's your overt-motivator sequence always takes place exactly above the middle of the airport. You know, if an enemy attacking the city can just keep the interceptors on the ground, he's got it, you see, and if the interceptors can just get up, why of course, they've got it. They've got protection accomplished. So one of these two things would get accomplished every time there was a war, but nearly always in the same place. I don't think the perimeter varied as much as a square . . as a cubic mile.

And you talk about a games condition! Once I collided with the middle of that airport in the bank. I could practically spot the middle of the airport in the physical universe. The area still exists, somewhat decayed, but it still exists. And you talk about a fixated area, you know. you get your attention on it, you just can't get your attention off of it. Your attention goes clang! What it is, it's a games condition. It's totally aberrated, has nothing to do with reality, has nothing to do with anything. If I'd had any slightest idea during this whole period of protecting the capital, I certainly wouldn't have operated in this other sphere, because that wasn't my normal sphere of operation in that society. That's what's goofy, you see.

I simply would have gone on and done a better job diplomatically or politically, don't you see, or moved into diplomatic or political spheres which I wasn't in. See, I would have done something effective or I would have developed some weapons or developed some defense mechanisms or something like that. They didn't do any of those things. War is declared, you know exactly what you're supposed to do. you go out to the Seventeenth Interceptor Squadron. You take down your cap off the wall and they run out the plane. You get in. Up you go. Clang! YOU have either protected them or not protected them as the case may be. you know, a billion years is a long time to go on the same treadmill.

Frankly, wars being space opera type wars, they rarely lasted more than about thirty days at the outside. So you never had a chance to do anything else but just clang, you know. You're shot down or you shoot somebody else down. Fabulous. Fabulous.

You get what I mean now? That's just a total cycle. I didn't do anything effective for the society at all, ever. Did nothing effective for the society. Because let me assure you the last effective thing you would do with a society is permit enemy planes to approach to the interceptor field on the outskirts of the capital. Well, for heaven's sakes, an enemy ought to be halted somewhere out around the borders of the empire, if you read it in any of the textbooks, you see. But no, that was the thing to do. you got the idea?

That was the thing to do. No reason could interpose in any way, shape or form against that action. I'm sure that people could have stood around by the hour and tried to talk me into the idea that, "Look, if you're so interested in the idea of the capital being protected, then why don't you get interested in training up better pilots for the interceptor squadrons? And put interceptor squadrons out around the borders of the empire. Why don't you do this?" I would have said, "Nope!" You see? "That doesn't sound sensible to me." And it wouldn't have. It wouldn't have sounded sensible either. It would have sounded stupid.

Any good excuse served to go straight back into that same dramatization, don't you see. Bang! Bang! There it was . . . over and over and over and over and over and over and over and over . . . and in the course of a billion years, how many times do you think the capital might have been menaced in a very dangerous society, at the rate that if every lifetime we have had a major war here on this planet? Well, they happen even faster in space opera societies. So it must have been about three times a lifetime, for a billion years. Same motion, same movements, they defied all reason and here's what's crashing about it: It wasn't fun! There was no amusement connected with it. There was nothing connected with it. It was just the machine, "Now I am supposed to." you got it?

If you were to train an armed force with implantation . . . the way they normally do in space opera societies and the way this society is going right now . . . you would get nothing but that kind of reaction. Nobody would ever do anything effective. Nobody would ever do anything really sensible. The only thing they would ever do is just play the exact game they were implanted to play or were implanting others to play. you got it? That's what they would do: Bang! Bang!

All right. Let's take the case of a Clear I know of right now, who has another person who is not Clear. And this other person cannot understand that there is any slightest advantage in being effective on the standpoint of a continent, you know . . . effective. Let's do something. Let's clear the people on this continent or something of that sort. No. This other person has two or three games which must be played, you see and none of them have anything whatsoever to do with getting a show on the road in this planet . . . I mean on that particular continent.

You see, these are all so reasonable! This other person has got to do these games. One, two, three, you see. He's got to do these games and he's very impatient with this other person who is Clear because this other person who is Clear now says, "Well, there's a much broader game. Can't . . . can't you see?"

"No, no, no. Well, you wouldn't be able to do anything like that and we've got to play these games," you see. And they don't have anything to do with anything. You get the idea? It's a "fixated into this weird cotillion, got to do these things, got to do these things" and "would you like doing those things?"

"No."

"Well, why do you have to do these things?"

"Well, you have to. you see?"

And you say, "Well," let's see, "what are you trying to accomplish in doing those things?"

"Well, that's beside the point."

You would get some very, very interesting reasoning going perhaps, but it wouldn't have anything to do with anything except there's two or three games here, you see, that are . . . just have to be played and maybe the game is so silly . . . as silly as this: One has to go down to a particular restaurant and order a cup of coffee and insult the management once a week. And if one can't do that . . . if one can't do that, why, just one isn't living, that's all, that's it. The game can be as idiotic as that, don't you see.

You get what I mean when I say a games condition? It's a person who is doing . . . now here's the clue to it . . . a compulsive confront. In order to do the compulsive confront, he must compulsively assume a certain beingness. And in order to play this game, he must deny a certain havingness. Part of a games condition is really not having, you see. It's denying a certain having. The United States right now in the last two wars has demonstrated itself to be in a war games condition because it cannot have any of the fruits of its victories. They look on it . . . they got all kinds of explanations, you know. All they do is take this poor conquered nation and throw it to the wolves. You know, just throw it in the soup . . . splash.

It is an irresponsibility of such magnitude that you go to these countries and you find that they're kind of mad at the United States. "Well, they conquered us. Well, why don't they do something about it, you know? We're not supposed to have a government now. Where is the government?" Don't you see. The

United States is not doing it. The United States is not actually fighting a war. The United States is just getting a kind of a compulsive games condition internationally.

And this compulsive games condition summates into the fact that if certain conditions occur, war will occur. If certain conditions occur, war will occur. And when war occurs, then one goes through certain evaluations and then one makes very sure one only loses havingness . . . make sure one doesn't gain any havingness. So we isolate another characteristic here of a games condition is: no matter what the person says, he always winds up with no havingness.

You'll see some writer (quote) (unquote) "in Hollywood," who is being a (quote) (unquote) "writer." You'll see this character. He will be dead broke. He'll be assaulting the studios all the time. He'll be knocking down the doors. (He doesn't, by the way, ever write any stories.) And he is just caroming around and banging around and he is being a writer. He is doing all the actions of a writer, except writing. And if he did suddenly, miraculously move in sideways on actually selling a play or a scenario to TV or something of the sort, he would be the first one to lose the lot. See, somehow or another he would lose every penny of it or something wild and incredible would happen. He would make sure he didn't have a "have."

So you get a plus beingness or you get a beingness which is an obsessive beingness, a doingness which is an obsessive doingness and you get a "can't havingness," and that's how you identify a games condition. It's a "can't havingness." A "can't-havingness" is the other end of the thing.

Now, you'll sometimes get a maintenance man around an organization or a janitor in a building or something like that. And this bird is doing everything but the job of janitoring. He can't have this job. He's got to be this, see. He's got to do this. But he winds up running a "can't-have" on you on the building. He'll run a "can't-have" on the heat, he'll run a "can't-have" on the electricity and so on. And then he will work it out so that he eventually doesn't draw his pay. And then he'll work it out so that he's backed totally off of the thing while still fighting into it.

It's a very interesting thing. He's in a games condition on the subject of buildings. His games condition is the attack and destruction of buildings. So he gets a job as a janitor and he goes through some of the weird motions. The motions are weird, but they look almost like the job of a janitor, don't you see. But you don't get any janitoring out of this and you don't have any building and he doesn't have any building. He's totally individuated from this building and he'll eventually back himself totally off the roster. This is quite interesting to watch.

I'll repeat this because it's quite an important factor in a games condition. You get a beingness: compulsive, not wanted; a doingness: compulsive, not wanted and you get a no-havingness. And that's the easiest way to spot a games condition. Now everybody's got a few games conditions, but very few are playing a games condition to the total limit. Those that are playing a games condition to the total limit are up here in the spinbin. And you'll see those boys playing a total game. All you have to do is identify what game they're playing. It's pretty interesting. You always can, too. Except nobody ever looked at it like that.

All right. You get generals this way and they just become generals because they're supposed to become generals. And they don't want to be generals. And they hate to be generals. And they hate the doingness of generals. And they mustn't do. And they're always saying they hate war. What's he doing as a general if he hates war? That would be the first thing a Roman would ask him: "You mean you don't like fighting wars? Well, what are you doing as a general?" And of course, that's a very sensible question, isn't it?

All right. Now he'll wind up with no havingness. One way or the other, he'll wind up with no havingness. He's trying to run "can't-have" on the troops. He's trying to run "can't-have" on the country and he himself will wind up with a "can't-have." One of the ways he winds up with a "can't-have," you'll see his old age get accelerated madly. He's running himself out of a body, you see. He's running himself out of all the beingness that has anything to do with it and so on. It's all quite interesting.

When you see one of these games conditions, if you've got your eyes open, you inspect one of these things going on and they just defy all logic, of course, because they're obsessive. And they haven't



anything to do with the real universe. And that is true of all aberration. Aberration is aberration simply because it has nothing to do with anything that's going on anywhere. It may have a lot to do with what has gone on. But it's got nothing to do with what is going on. The guy is way out of PT.

I imagine there's somebody up in Manchester right now making buggy whips. I'll just bet you. I'm sure. And he'll give you a thousand reasons for it, you know, and they all sound so logical. But this rationale that reasons out a games condition has holes in it. And if you sit and try to argue with it, you're a fool. That's all. You're just a fool to sit and argue with a games condition once you know what it is. Audit it, don't argue with it. you cannot educate a person out of his aberration and that is the end of it. you can audit him out, but you can't educate him out. you can show him, cleanly and clearly.

Well, little Arthur was upstairs just this afternoon, swinging two swinging doors, madly. And he was grabbing hold of the doors. You know how you grab two swinging doors? If you get a coincidence whereby the two doors come together where the hand is also between the two doors, there's no room. Well, he was having a good time swinging doors . . now we know how that door got broken. And I showed him the mechanical characteristics of a pair of swinging doors just a little while ago and showed him when his hand was in there when the two doors shut. I showed him there was no space, you know, if they came together at the same instant. And he looked that over and he inspected that very, very carefully and he sort of says, you know, "Well, what do you know," you know and knocked it off. He hadn't realized there would be no space between those two swinging doors. He was no-games-condition with regard to swinging doors.

Now, if he was in a real games condition with regard to doors, you would have found him up there ten minutes later doing the same thing, don't you see, even though he'd found out he could get his hands squashed. Got the idea?

So you stand around and you try to tell this fellow that if he keeps riding this motorcycle at ninety-five miles an hour on wet roads . . which motorcycles aren't supposed to be run on anyhow . . flat out, particularly with no attention to his brakes or anything else and you just keep telling him that when you're on a wet highway you should take it easy, you see, on a motorcycle. You give him safety rules, in other words. Hasn't anything to do with it and nothing to do with him. He's in a games condition on this subject and a games condition is going to wind up with what? Can't-have! No motorcycle, no body.

Now, it's very much better if somebody else also winds up with no vehicle and no body. That's much better. Get the idea? And here sit all these road safety committees. And by the way, I resigned the other day from the Road Safety Committee. I didn't tell them why. I didn't tell them why because they won't adopt a program. That's why. you could lick all these traffic problems in ten minutes. You'd have to screen the drivers and that's the one thing they're unwilling to do.

You'd have to find out what drivers present are in a games condition on the subject of driving. You'd have to screen that out. It'd take 10 percent of the drivers off the road, bang! Just like that. Your accident rate would go down. Somebody could drive on the roads.

They're not about to do anything like that. That's an invasion of privacy. Oh, I don't know. The last time somebody shoved a radiator through my bonnet, I thought it was an invasion of privacy, too.

Well, now you understand a little more about this?

Audience: Yes.

All right. Now, let's take up another subject which is quite comparable to this. I'll take up both of these subjects one after the other here, mostly because I'm going to have a week holiday on you. So I won't be talking to you next week. I'll be talking to you promptly when I get back. you haven't digested all of this yet, so why . . .

I haven't had a holiday for some years. Anyhow, the . . and I'm not taking one now, actually.

The situation with regard to the person who cannot influence his bank with thinkingness is of great interest to a Scientologist. The gradient scale of inability to recover from aberration is the gradient scale of lessening ability to influence one's own thinkingness or mind. In other words, less effect, less effectiveness.

The gradient scale of less effectiveness eventually winds up in no ability to affect . . . no ability to affect. And now you give this fellow an auditing command and of course, he really doesn't do the auditing command, but anyway, if he did the auditing command, he still wouldn't have any effect on his thinking. Got the idea?

Now in view of the fact that this person is the one who breaks auditors' hearts and gives people losses, an understanding of the anatomy of that phenomena . . . this is not, by the way, a peculiar case. This is all cases I'm talking about. All cases sit at some level of inability to influence the reactive bank. When you clear them, you have simply raised their ability to influence the reactive bank, that is all. you got it? I mean that is all you've done, if you say this. Now they are effective and can be effective and what they think is effective, don't you see, and so on.

Now therefore, it is of great interest to you how they get into a condition where they cannot affect the bank. How do they get into the condition where they cannot affect the bank? I've been talking about this phenomenon now since 1954 and I've said it many times. I never had a clear-cut way of stating the exact anatomy or its immediate cure. We have the total recovery on this now.

Now, how does he get into this condition so that he cannot influence his bank or his aberration or anything else and so you have difficulty auditing him?

Well, it's the story of withhold. This fellow is backing right on out from life, see, withhold, withhold, withhold, withhold. He's denying this, that and the other thing. He's in games conditions of various characters, but basically with part of his games condition is withhold. And you can recognize at once that a withhold is a denial of something to somebody else, so all withholds have something to do with a games condition.

All right. So he develops a withhold. Well, now that immediately gives him a "can't reach." If he's withholding, he can't reach. So you get a "no reach out" and a "pullback." All right. Now we multiply this. We get another "no reach out" and a "pullback" and we get a "no reach out" and a "pullback" and a "no reach out" and a "pullback" and a "no reach out" and a "pullback" and a "no reach out" and a "pullback" and we keep doing this. And eventually this fellow practically exits from the dynamics one after the other. And the gradient scale of how he leaves various dynamics has already been discussed as early as 1950, in the autumn. Departure from the dynamics.

Now he can't leave the dynamics, so he inverts in them. you see, he's doing something he can't do and nevertheless, as far as he's concerned, his effort is to leave the various dynamics or livingnesses or universes or whatever.

So his effort to leave, of course is compounded with a withhold and a "not reach." So you get the withhold combined with a "not reach." And, of course, you get an apparent departure while he's still there but you certainly get an ineffectiveness, because you cannot drive cars that you are in maybe, but you are not reaching in any way and from which you are totally withholding yourself. You can't sit in the back seat of a car and drive one. That's not possible. Not unless it's specially built like an old Ford I fixed one time and used to stand everybody's hair on end. twit in the back seat smoking a stogie with a derby hat down over my eyes and drive around town. It was very upsetting to people.

The "mustn't reach" is a "mustn't be reached," of course and you get how punishment downgrades because punishing other people and people punishing him, this just compounds the withhold, don't you see. So the person is less and less reaching, less and less reaching, less and less contacting.

We see this in many ways. Eventually where the contacts will be so sporadic and so ineffective in certain directions that they amount to practically destruction. Everything they touch, you know, like machinery . . .

you've seen somebody with machinery and every time they just look at machinery, it all stops or the gears go clang or something like this.

Well now, that is a games condition with machinery. And one withholds himself from machinery and doesn't reach the machinery and withholds himself and doesn't reach the machinery and withholds himself and doesn't reach the machinery, you see, because his "can't-have" on the machinery prevents him from reaching it and then he withholds and he withholds and eventually, he can't communicate sufficiently with machinery to do anything but wreck it. Even though he intended to fix it, he'd wind up wrecking it.

A little kid who was just trying to rehabilitate himself in the next lifetime, you see, and you give him an alarm clock. And he might have been a watchmaker at some time, but that doesn't prevent him from wrecking the alarm clock. His ability to reach the alarm clock is so unaccompanied with any ability to understand the alarm clock, because he can't communicate with it, that it winds up with the destruction of the alarm clock. You got the idea?

Well, below destruction of the alarm clock is no influence of any kind on the alarm clock. He cannot do anything to the alarm clock, not even destroy it and you've got a total withhold from the alarm clock.

All right. Add up all these withholds and all these "can't-reaches," "can't-haves" actually, on the . . . all dynamics and you eventually get a person who's totally withdrawn. He's individuated. And he individuates further and further and less and less effectiveness and of course, eventually he can't affect his own mind. Now that's the exact mechanic of it. I don't care how complicated anybody makes it. That is what it is.

Now of course, when he runs "can't-have" on people, he is running the . . . a tendency toward unfamiliarity. He's making people less familiar with something, so people are more withdrawn from it and then, because of the overt-motivator effect, naturally this reacts on him and that explains the exact mechanism of how it comes about that he stops reaching and starts withholding.

A "can't-have" results in a "stop reach" and then this results in a further withdraw. And when you get this withdraw up there to a total a hundred percent . . . crash, bang, exclamation point . . . of course he can't influence anything and you say, "All right. Now, get the idea of disliking cats." He does.

You notice that every time a cat walks in the room he gets a black eye. I mean he sees a cat and his eye goes black, you know and you say, "Well, I'm going to fix this up for this man." And you say, "All right, get the idea of not liking cats. Thank you." And, "Get the idea of not liking cats. Thank you," and so forth and you do this for three hours and nothing happens. Cat walks in the room: he gets a black eye in the other eye.

Well, what exactly has happened? His ability to influence his own mind is so low that no matter how many auditing commands you run on the guy, of course it doesn't wind up with any result. It's his ineffectiveness is what you're Sealing with and when you're going in straight on a games condition, you'll get this ineffectiveness considerably magnified. And of course, it must be a games condition with cats, if all a cat has to do is walk in the room and he gets a black eye, man, you're way down the scale. I knew such a fellow once. His name was L Sprague de Camp, one of the great science-fiction writers.

Anyway, this person, when he registers on the E-Meter needle, when the E-Meter needle registers and when you can get tone arm reaction, your command is affecting his mind and then therefore changing his electrical potential, so this tells you if you're in a zone or area where he is being effective. That's what it tells you most intimately and directly.

All right. Now over here on the needle, if it dips, this tells you that you have a chance of affecting it. See, he can affect that area, because it dips. So therefore, you can run it. Now, if you saw that the cat walked in the room and he got a black eye and you just made it up out of your own mind that this was what you should attack on this case and cure up this black eye situation, don't be amazed if he has never noticed it.

He just somehow or another has never noticed the fact that he got a black eye every time a cat walked in the room. Everybody else knows it, but he doesn't. Yeah, he's even been told a lot of times and he'll occasionally say, 'Yes, when a cat walks in the room I get a black eye,' see. Daaaaa! He'll say it, but it's not real to him. He really thinks it's the chandelier.

And if you doubt that, take somebody who has a wild allergy to some known object that has been isolated for him by the medicos and ask him, "Is it really Persian rugs? Is it really? Have you ever thought it wasn't Persian rugs?" And you'll get the first reality that you got on the situation.

He'll say, "Well, I . . . no, I know it isn't Persian rugs."

"Well, what . . . what do you suppose it is?"

"Well, I don't suppose it's anything, as a matter of fact."

"Well, do you think it's Persian rugs?"

"No, it is not Persian rugs." Then you get an action.

"Well, what is it?" No action. Got the idea?

So you might ask this fellow, "Do you get a black eye when a cat walks in the room because of Persian rugs?"

He'd say, "It's likely." Seems reasonable to him. He'll buy any wild explanation you ever heard of on the subject because he can't think, can't reach or can't rationalize on this particular subject.

Most Dale Carnegie salesmanship is directed toward these individuals. You see? That's if you can just give them a bunch of specious reasons why they should buy and you're sufficiently 1.1 about the situation and so forth and they're in a games condition, of course, they can't do anything but do what you tell them to do or something like that, with regard to an object.

All right. That's being tough on poor, old, late departed Dale Carnegie. Anyway, what you read here is: Can the individual influence his mind? That's what you read and that's what this thing adds up to. And therefore, when you run a command that you have not assessed on an E-Meter, you're doing something very adventurous.

See, you run a command that possibly, quite possibly, he has no influence on. you can be very sure what the command should be, but when you test it out, does it produce any needle action? Let's say these words to the pc in the command and let's say these commands. And do they produce needle action?

Well, if they don't produce any needle action, you'd better not bother running it, because you've got an area where the pc either doesn't have to be audited or where he is totally ineffective. And if he's working in an area that's totally ineffective, of course, you get no needle reaction.

Hence, you should assess something like a games condition process on such things as problems, confusions, thoughts, facts, motion, almost anything that you could assess. And then you finally got one of these that produces a reaction . . . not that this is real to the pc, don't you see. That phrase is what we've been using previously and it is not very explanatory.

The mechanism is, can the pc be even faintly effective in this particular sphere or area? Well yes, he can be, because you see a needle reaction. So you assessed it out so that the word he goes along on is "motion." Ah, voila! Very good.

But now all we know is that he has an effectiveness where motion is concerned. This we have, that we have. We don't have the gen on the rest of the command. Does the pc have any reality of, whatsoever, on the "whenness" of things? And we test out "whenness." We test out "whatness" and "howness." And we all of a sudden find out that "when," if we ask him "When did you?" or something like that, we're not

going to get any reaction on the E-Meter. That's not real to him, he's not effective in the field of time. We say "How could you?" Ha-ha, and we get a reaction, see. "How?" That "howness" is real to him.

All right. So we'd add together and we'd say, "How could you?" and all right, we got that and we've got motion, but we haven't got "deny," "prevent," "not let," you see and a whole bunch of intermediate verbs and we check those out on the E-Meter and we get "not let." Ah-ha-ha. This is nice, now, we've got: "How could you not let another have motion?" Doesn't make much sense to you, but it seems to make good sense to the pc. He falls all over the place on this auditing command, don't you see.

So we put that in its various brackets and we run it and it produces a result. We don't assess it. In the first place, we haven't found the areas where the pc can be effective. In the old law of taking something the person could do and make him do it better is not then present in auditing. You see, the basic thing you're doing in auditing is find out something he can do and then make him improve the ability.

All right. So that is the way you sort out a command. Those are the basic laws. That's why you should check a command out on an E-Meter. That's quite a good thing, to check a command out first on an E-Meter. Because if you get no reaction on this command, you had better start banging the brain cells together and sparking long and blue and getting smart enough to take the same thing you want run on him, just take the same thing, only let's get it into some gradient and some phraseology that does produce reaction on the E-Meter. And you'll find out that the command is answerable, the pc has good reaction on it and so forth.

Now, most pcs will react on one of the three: "problems," "confusions," "motions." They usually react on one of the three. They'll react on one of these three: "thought," "fact," "idea." Those are three that go together, and they're gradients to most people. You've got to sort out what you're doing so that it's real and what we mean by real is: can the pc be effective in that particular sphere?

Now if you can get the idea of some pc having just backed out of life and then started backing out of his head . . . you know, "withhold" and "can't reach" and "withhold" and "can't reach" you'll finally find somebody with a body over there and he's compulsively exterior in some fashion. And this is simply R graphic and a factual example of what occurs. And this is the "detached Vase" of Mr. Sigmund Freud that he found out he could never help. He could never help this person. The person was detached. This is what he called the Case. (The end of the twenty-eighth lecture, if you want to look it up, of Freud's.)

That applies to most homos and so forth. They're detached or it applies to an awful lot of people, not to use any dirty words. They have gotten detached and sometimes somebody will tell you they feel detached in life. Oh yeah, I'm sure they do. In any area where they're in a games condition, they feel detached.

I think the unrealest activity that a soldier . . . in a games condition about soldiering . . . the unrealest activity he could possibly engage in would be fighting. Everything would get very unreal to him the second he approached this particular field, don't you see? And he's got to do it, he must do it, he's not going to get anything out of it. He's not going to be effective either. If you let him near a gun, he'll land one on his own command post. It's this kind of thing, you see, but he'll get very unreal. Everything goes very unreal and very foggy and very drifty when he starts moving in toward that area because it's the area where he is the least effective. Life can effect him the most and he can effect life the least and yet he'll always volunteer. See, these are the odd explanations.

So apparently, we feel this man can do soldiering as an effective in the field of soldiering, simply because he does volunteer in the field of soldiering, don't you see. Well, he is not effective in the field of soldiering. But he has to volunteer, that's . . . that's the way that is.

Now, how do you do as a Scientologist? How do you reverse this condition? Just find it on the E-Meter. What's real to this person means what will react to this person, which also means what will this person be able to affect? And having found it on the E-Meter, then you can, on a gradient scale, bring him up, get his withholds off, get his "can't-haves" and game conditions out of the road and of course, he will walk up to a total effectiveness. Get how you're doing that now?

You take off the withhold . . well, that permits him to reach . . and you take off the games condition and of course that permits him to reach. And he just reaches further and further and further and further and of course the further he can reach and the less he's withholding, the more effective he is and that is all there is to it. It's as simple as that. It's actually idiotically simple. You can get terribly complicated about it, but that is precisely what you were doing. Now, when you violate that doingness, you don't get any results in auditing.

Now, let's take the cure of psychosomatics. If you want to go in for the cure of psychosomatics . . nobody says you ought to or should, but this is kind of a nonsensical thing to do, but that's all right. I want to give you this as a graphic example. Psychosomatic illness.

Now, if you can actually enter a certain field and find patients who are so much the effect of some psychosomatic difficulty that you can alter it but they can't and so you tell them to get well in some fashion or another and they do. Only they don't find out about it and so they never thank you and more auditors have run into this one. Now that's a queer one you know. That's a goofy one, but that's the explanation of it. you found an area where they were totally ineffective and actually you simply mauled the bank around and straightened them out and told them that was the way it was and that they had it. Got the idea?

So of course, you effected a cure. And it advisedly could be called a cure because you certainly did it. you didn't effect an eradication of the difficulty.

All right. Here would be the right way to go about it so you wouldn't run into this sort of thing. You would assess all the things the person thought were difficult with him until you got a fall. And you got your major fall of the thing he has the greatest communication with as a difficulty and then you work on that by getting the withholds off of it and getting the games condition cured about it and it will right itself just like that. Bang! But you've got to do it by an E-Meter assessment.

Now doing it that way, you actually could eradicate an enormous amount of illness or upsets with people, but you would have to assess them.

Now that a pc keeps complaining all the time about some difficulty means nothing, because the complaint might simply be a piece of machinery firing off or the mechanism that the pc is complaining about is a mechanism that has to do with another games condition which has nothing whatsoever to do with the difficulty they're talking about. This is how they can accomplish a games condition.

But of course, you're not going to get rid of that difficulty. The difficulty would be totally unreal to the pc on the meter. But the pc may be saying all the time, "Oh, I'd just give anything, anything at all if you could cure my migraine headaches. That's what really disturbs me. Oh yes, it's my migraine headaches."

Why, you . . you poor auditor you . . you fall for this every once in a while and you say, "Well, it means so much for Scientology . . I cure this guy's migraine headaches." Well, it sure would. It sure would. There would be no doubt about that, providing you did eradicate the difficulty and the games condition that was associated with it and everything else connected with it, so that the person found out about it. Because you're liable to go ahead and cure his migraine headache and he never finds out about it and goes around and tells everybody what a bum you are. you get how this is?

Well, the way to avoid that situation . . the way to handle this situation, not to avoid it . . is to just take lists of difficulties the person has until you get one that continues to fall good and hard. Yeah, continues to fall good and hard. All right, audit it. Get the withholds off of it. Make up some little pat series of questions that has to do with this particular item and then get the "can't-haves" off of it, in a bracket of some kind or another.

Well, let's say you actually did find out you could do something for this fellow's arm and the arm did fall. Well, that's dandy. All right. Now, we actually could do something for this arm and we would do it on the basis of: "When have you denied somebody an arm?" "When has somebody denied you an arm?" "When has another denied somebody else an arm?" You get the idea? "What problem or confusion about arms isn't present now?" In addition to that, you would say, "What haven't you ever told anybody about

an arm?" You got the idea? You would get the withholds off . . . just a little Security Check about arms, you see, and you work those two against each other. Get rid of the games condition with the brackets and get the withholds off with a Security Check and you'll just about have it made. And all of a sudden their arm will do a miraculous recovery.

But the condition is . . . that it has to obtain before you start all this is: does the pc have any effectiveness in the zone called an arm? Or are you being the only one effective? You see, you can hypnotize people and tell them to get well and they do. Only they don't. Their body or bank obeys you, not them.

All right, so much for that. This is the gradient scale of "state of case." You also have a "state of difficulty," the gradient difficulties. The pc has ten thousand difficulties. All right. There may be only one of them would ever find him effective in the zone of, see? In that zone, only one of these things would be. He'd be effective on just one difficulty. He can list ten thousand, but he's only effective on one.

That's an interesting viewpoint. That is actually the barriered line on healing and the barriered line on all therapy of all kinds and is actually the barriered line on "help." Of course you can run any level of the Prehav Scale, any level of the Prehav Scale, in a games condition form.

But I wouldn't advise you to use "no motion" in a games condition form unless you use it with this type of a version: Stillnesses should be used so that they are meaningful of motion. You don't ever run a stillness, you only appear to run a stillness. You say, "What stillness have you denied somebody else?" You get the idea? That's a good command. "What stillness has another denied you?" This was what you assessed on the Primary and Secondary Scale. You got "stillness."

Now, you could also run this on the pc's terminals. After they've been assessed on SOP Goals, you can run a Games Condition Process with assessment and so forth. You can apply all this to Routine 3.

You got their terminal? You got their terminal? All right. Use their terminal, fit it in as a games condition-type process. Work it out one way or the other on the E-Meter. Assess him on the Prehav level. Work it out so that you get a fall and you'll get something on the idea of . . . let's say it was stillness. "What stillness have you denied an aviator?" and "What stillness has an aviator denied you?" and "What stillness has an aviator denied another?" and "What stillness has another denied an aviator?" You got the idea? And "What stillness has an aviator denied himself?" And if you're going to run a Games Condition Process though, for God's sakes, let's get a direct look at problems. I don't care what command is used or what version is used, let's get him to do a direct confront around here someplace. Every time we do a direct Games Condition Process on problems. Otherwise, you won't get that as-is-ed.

So after you've got these . . . five-way bracket all worked out, then you add another hooker on it like, well, "What problem about an aviator could you confront?" or something like this. Or ". . . have you confronted?" or ". . . would you confront?" or . . . I don't care how you do that one, but throw that one in too. you see how that would work out?

Now, if you did a terrific assessment on somebody and you got his goal and you got his terminal and you got it all taped and piped and it was going in all directions, you did him on the Prehav Scale, you could run him simply directly or you could run him on a games condition situation with regard to this. There's a number of routes. It's all which is the most effective, which is the most rapid. Okay?

The day you run a command though, that doesn't register on an E-Meter, is the day you start auditing areas where the pc cannot be effective and therefore you plus the pc, versus the pc's bank, simply adds up to you versus the pc's bank. you see how that is? Because he isn't there. He has withdrawn in that particular area to such a degree that his effectiveness never assists you, so therefore he ARC breaks, he gets present time problems, he gets very upset all the time, he's hard to hold into session and so forth, because you are actually auditing a bank. you see, you're auditing a bank without any assistance whatsoever from the pc. So if you want the pc to help too, then you better assess it first on the E-Meter and get it taped. Okay?

Audience: Okay.

Well, I hope that'll assist you a little bit. When I come back, I want to see half a dozen of you Clear.

Thank you.