

## 9ACC16a-5501C04 TIME

Transcript of Lecture by L. Ron Hubbard 9ACC16A - 5501C04 Renumbered 18 for "The Solution To Entrapment" cassettes

### TIME

A lecture given on 4 January 1955

You process a preclear up, you get him into a certain level of speed, and you know very well that he's going to drift back somewhat from this level; somewhat. He might go halfway back to what he was before, so on, unless you bail him all the way up and out with your processing. Just a handy little tip here: Process a preclear rapidly, get him up as high as you can get him in the short space of time that you can get him and then knock it off and arrange to process him again in three to six months. You got the formula, hm?

Now, this is definitely a formula. Your preclear is going to go out into the society. He's going to get himself slowed down. He's going to be running at a high rate of speed, going to be in pretty good shape when he gets through with your processing. He's going to be perfectly willing to fly at a jet plane speed in the society, and he goes out and he finds out this society has not yet got up to burro back. Speed's slow, real slow. And he will average out fairly well the difference.

We're talking now about speed, you understand? Speed is a factor in processing. If you were to process a preclear and you were to say, "Um-well, um-well, give me another one of those."

"Okay." "All right. Uh - can you find another place?"

You're going to be amazed at the fact that the fellow is not going to make much gain, you know? That's the speed factor. In the first place, time in its most basic condition is instantaneous for the preclear. And you start processing him, you say, "All right. Give me another one of those. Yep, all right. Another one. Okay. All right. Another one. All right. Another one. All right. Another one. All right. Another one." You're still up a little higher than his tolerance, but he will come up to you. Always lead him a little bit in speed, always.

And you can count on the fact that after he gets out of the processing, the intensive, after he's left you as an auditor, he's going to move back into an area where the speed of auditing which I've just demonstrated would be a high-pitched screaming chatter. See, I mean, "Well, I don't know why you want to but uh ..." You know, high-pitched conversation, just terrific tension, dynamic pressure in this society is just wonderful. I was on the telephone the other day and while as a - while a salesman, who should certainly have known better, was trying to sell me a piece of machinery which I didn't think much of and told him so two or three times, and in the length of time that this individual was trying to sell me this piece of machinery, his comm lag, his delivery and my prediction of what he was saying were such that I actually dictated two letters while I was talking to him on the phone. I just kept one hand over the mouthpiece and kept dictating with my foot on the foot pedal. It didn't disturb me any, because he certainly was, at that slow rate of speed, was no obstacle. He was so predictable.

That's another thing you can't ever quite forgive this society for after you've gotten processed up along the line. It gets so damned predictable. You just know that when the guy walks down the street and stands there for a moment, he's going to remark - damn his soul - on the weather. This high, quivering, dynamic excitement is probably too much for the society to stand because it tries to slow even that down. All right.

So, you know your preclear's going to drip-ping-flop-drop-skid back toward this speed. But the actuality is he about halves it. You know, you bring him out brrrrrr and the society's going putt-putt, and he gets it about poppita-poppita poppita-poppita, see. Even though he went out of auditing brrrrrr; he'll still drop down to poppita-poppita poppita-poppita, see? The only trouble with a society of this character is that it imposes such a tremendous strain upon communication. There's just too little of it. The number of unit - the number of communication units per minute of time in this society's conversation is not enough to keep anybody Clear. You get how that would be?

All right. Let's say the society is talking this many communication units: "Hello-hello-hello." Do you see that there is a waiting time in there greater than the communication time? All right. Here would be another one: "Hello, hello, hello, hello, hello." Now, you see that there's communication units, you might say, for that same duration of time, overpasses those intervals of silence, see, intervals of silence.

Well, now, what slows people down isn't anything very esoteric. It is simply this interval of silence in relationship to the communication unit. The interval of silence in relationship to the communication unit.

How many unit - communication units - this is just a word just to communicate with you concerning it. Let's say that we have a rate of ten communication units per hour. Well, this would just be almost certain to spin somebody after a while, you see? It's just not enough communication.

Now, I'll give you some sort of an idea on dictation on a tape recently. Some of those tapes have five hundred communication units per minute, if we think of a communication unit as a word. Now, this is quite speedy. Well, therefore, there's a lot of communication per unit time. But let's not get all mixed up with this thing called "time." Time simply is the change of position of particles in space. All right. We could define time as the absence of communication because in the presence of communication you don't accumulate any. You accumulate nothing, get it, in the presence of communication.

Now, if you get a lot of communication, it's just going along boppity-boppity-boppity-boppity-boppity-boppity-bop, boy, time passes. See, it's zing-zing, you're not conscious of it. But when the too few communication units occur, why, then we get conscious of this thing called time. So you could say that time comes into being to the degree that the number of communication units drops. You got the idea? So, with no communication units, you'd get a forever. And that's MEST. See, that's no communication units.

For instance, that wall doesn't have any communication units. You can come along and impress a form or an idea on it in some sort of shape or at all, but that, remember, is a wall. That is one communication unit, and that is going to last that wall - just as far as even impressing the idea on it, you see? It doesn't have any itself, but we're going to impress one on it. And let's say, "It is a wall. It is a wall at 401A East Roosevelt. It is a yellow wall at 401A East Roosevelt," and we've just about done it. We could trace the property classification down here in the zoning regulations and we could get the owner of the property and so forth, but this is a transient sort of a communication; it isn't intimately connected with that wall - not intimately. We've got its time and location. Well, what is its time? Its time is one communication unit: wall. Get the idea?

Now, it's a - it's a wall. You see, for - I don't know how long it'd last - twenty-five years. See? That one unit has got to last it, got to last it for twenty-five years. Get what comm lag is? Hm? One communication unit's got to last the wall for twenty-five years.

Now, don't be surprised when Joe Blitzkrieg out here gets awfully speeded up and is able to do all sorts of things, if Joe Blitzkrieg, being in contact with a wall which is one communication unit for

twenty-five years, slows down. No, don't be amazed that Joe Blitzkrieg, after he finishes getting processed by you, slows down a trifle from the level he attained while under processing. Also, don't be surprised if Joe Blitzkrieg does not speed up at all if you insist on processing at the rate of ten communication units per session. Get the idea?

Now, actually, time enters in as communication enters out. Get the idea? It's a sort of a silly thing. It's - it's the absence of something makes something and the more absence there is, the more it is made. You get that?

Well, it's a very, very amusing thing; it is tremendously amusing. Wherever we find a preclear who is having a hard time in life, we have a preclear who has not had enough communication units. Not per anything, that's the horrible part of this. He's just not had enough communication units. Well, what determines how many communication units he ought to have? His own expectancy. That's all that determines it.

Guy - he now - this'd be the test. If you were to get somebody and you were to say, "You know, you ought to be talked to more."

And the fellow says "Why?"

"Well, I don't know. Company, companionship, you're liable to get lonesome. You should be talked to more."

"Oh, I don't know. Why should I be talked to more?"

"Well, it's just the fact that you'll be lonely. In your old age you don't want to be lonely. You want to get married to some nice girl so that in your old age you will have somebody to talk to, see?"

"To have somebody - what do I want somebody to talk to for?"

"Well, because you've got to have somebody to talk to. That's all there is to that. Because people are lonely, you know," and so forth. And actually, he just needs a good talking to, that's what he needs. "And the people are awfully lonely, and - and they should have a lot of communication, you see. And if they don't have a lot more communication..." and so forth.

And the fellow says, "You mean this? You mean this? You know, I wonder if that isn't true. I wonder if I shouldn't be talked to more; I wonder if I shouldn't talk to people more. Let's see. Yeah. I ought to talk to people. I actually only talk to about one person a month. Maybe I ought to talk to a person every day, huh?" A big idea, see?

Well, now, he expects to talk to a person every day, so he misses a week. And he's created, by his own consideration, a starvation. You get the idea.

All right. Now, the liability and danger of teaching people about communication is that they have an expectancy increase. Then they expect people to be in good shape if they're talking all the time, or something like that. See, they misapprehend this. But you've got to have this factor in there, too; this factor's got to go right along with it. It's the expectancy of how much communication the fellow ought to have. Now, if he expects a lot of communication why - and he gets no communication, he's unhappy.

Now, let's take Joe Blitzkrieg, and he didn't expect a letter from anybody; let's make this even plainer. He didn't expect a letter from a soul. He didn't expect any letter. He went two months and he

didn't think anybody was going to write him. And then he - his girl goes off, you know, and she's gone down to Bide-a-Wee Summer Camp or something like that, to two-time him, and she's gone down to Bide-a-Wee Summer Camp and she doesn't write. See, she doesn't write. "I wonder what could be wrong. I wonder what is - what's this all about?" You see? Here he expects a communication and he doesn't get one.

Now, here again is an absence of communication leading to franticness. The first absence of communication led simply to tranquility. He didn't care whether anybody wrote him or not. But now he has a reason for somebody to write him and he knows that he ought to be written.

Well, people get this computation on wrongness. They think that if they don't hear from somebody, something is wrong. They get all sorts of odd things. But whatever it is, here we have expectancy. How many communication units do I expect to have? And it's just as though a fellow invented time and waitingness in order to force people to communicate. Waiting is so horrible, you see - and he can explain this thing to them, you see, that therefore they ought to communicate more. Follow me?

You see, he invents waiting to make them communicate more. He says, "You see, this is so horrible, you being down there at Bide-a-Wee Summer Camp for all three months, and you didn't write me a letter? Those three long months you didn't write me a letter." See, he's invented the horribleness of waiting, and at that moment he has invented noncommunicational track. He has invented time interval by saying it would - had no communication in it, but it existed. And this is your first and primary lie on the track, and it leads to walls and things like this. See how it is?

Well, he invents at once the communication and the time interval. He invents the fact that she's going to write him. Maybe she can't write. Maybe she went to Vassar and she can't write, and so on. He doesn't take any of these things into consideration at all. He's invented this letter, hasn't he? Has he? He's expecting a letter which isn't ever going to exist, so he must've invented it. She isn't going to invent it. It isn't what is expected of her or anything else. He has invented a letter. And then he invented the waiting period. And so we get the interval, this silly looking picture of communication units per unit of time. But the time itself is being expressed on a clock which is an invented waitingness. And we get this total lie: mechanical time. And we get time as being the action of particles, the action of masses, an action which takes place in spaces; and none of these things can exist unless one expects a communication that isn't there.

It's not real hard to unravel this. If you look over it real carerully, you'll see at once that both of these things are an invention: The communication unit is an invention, which we agree upon and so it exists; the interval when there is no communication is invented by the expectancy of the communication which is not answered. Get this very clearly, that the next moment, by agreement amongst us, is invented way back somewhere - there is no way back, you see - but it's invented by the fact that we agree it can occur.

Okay. I'm going to say something to you in exactly five seconds - .

Now, what did you suppose, that something was wrong with my watch?

Audience: No.

Here, I was merely giving you a demonstration. But did you get that? Get the fact that there's some oppression starts to enter in there. You got that? Well, that oppression is put there by the fact that you were expecting a communication five seconds from there which didn't occur. But here's the trick: The trick is that blank period - the blankness and the period is an invented thing on which we have agreed. It's total invention. And it only exists anyhow because of an expectancy.

We've invented an interval when there is no communication, and boy, that is - that's an invention. That's a terrific invention. It leads to a whole universe, an interval in which there's going to be no communication. First you would've had to invent the idea that there was such a thing as a communication, you see? And then you'd had to invent the idea that there'd be an interval when there would be no communication. And when you've got these two things nicely boiling on the back burner, why, you're all set, then, to consider an existence and time span.

And then for the measure of this time, there being no communication, you've got to juggle some particles around to say, "Now, look. These two particles move from here to here all during this time. And we get motion. Motion takes place in the absence of communication; motion does not take place in the presence of communication."

Let's look at it on a higher theoretical echelon. ARC, total ARC, gives you no triangle. You see the affinity, that affinity sitting there? We've got everything coincident with everything, haven't we. It's all sitting on the same spot. So we have no triangle, which is all triangle. You see that? So, we're all sitting on the same spot very neatly, and believe me, there's no universe.

Now, the proof of this is an entirely different process. We ask somebody, "What things wouldn't you mind occupying the same space you're occupying?" And boy, we start to boot him right on up-scale on the affinity corner of the triangle, of course. Now, it is lack of affinity, it is lack of communication; get the idea, see? Any thing we say about one corner of this triangle, we've said about any other corner of the triangle. So when we have lack of affinity for the environment, what do we have? We have a triangle there, anyhow, don't we? We've at least got two things occupying different spaces, so there must be some lack of affinity. So communication itself, in word form, must express some - to some slight degree, coming way down scale from the - from the terrifically high theoretical. Just communication, just talking to somebody, no matter in what friendly voice, is really a lack of affinity, and demonstrates a lack of affinity. Do you see?

Now, this is so marked with some people at certain portions on the Tone Scale, this is so very marked that they can talk together, two people can talk together for a very short time and they wind up in an argument. You would say, "Well, now, here, wait a minute. This is a violation of this triangle." Here you have, you say, "This communication - the more communication there is, the greater affinity there is." Not necessarily true, because you can invert on this darn thing, and you can actually get two people talking together in the friendliest way and have them wind up in a screaming fight. You see how you could do this?

Well, that would be when the individual's expectancy of communication was "No communication expected, thank you. I'm happy with these here particles and all of this waiting time. This waiting time is fine. Wonderful stuff, this waiting time. It's just what we need, more waiting time," you know? Well, you don't - you don't quite click unless I say "What we need is more havingness." Havingness, waiting time; same difference. Same thing. Mass, waiting time; same thing. You'll understand it much better if I say space, waiting time; same thing. And don't tell me that space isn't waiting time. You ever had to drive across the United States? Well, that's waiting time; that's waiting for it to - for an arrival to take place.

See, waiting time. Space equals - is waiting time. Particles, motion of, may move in some uniform rate, but we don't care what uniform rate they move in, it's waiting time, you see? Pyramid, waiting time. Packard car, waiting time. Buckingham Palace, waiting time. When you get around a large amount of mass like Buckingham Palace, I'm sure that you would be made to wait, too. Get the idea?

Mass, space, energy: communication lag. Communication lag: waiting time. So I've been talking all this time about communication lag, which is simply absence of communication. Well, when I'm

talking about absence of communication, I'm talking about space. When I'm talking about absence of communication, I'm talking about particles. When I'm talking about absence of communication, I'm talking about mass. When I'm talking about absence of communication, I am talking about clock faces, which of course are just particles moving in space. Clock faces are particles moving at a uniform rate in space.

And in the absence of communication, and in the absence of affinity, in the absence of coincidence, you get the goddamnedest universes all out of these two inventions: I expect a communication; I'll invent a wait to enforce its arrival. You made me wait for this communication, see, so therefore you're a dog. So we have space, time, universes and so forth.

If you can break down this ARC triangle you will see that it becomes no triangle, whatever, as soon as affinity becomes total because no space exists with total affinity, total reality, and total communication. See, we don't have a triangle; we don't have a universe either. We don't have particles. We don't have masses. We don't have waiting time either. In fact, we don't have any time at all.

But there's an inversion of this. Individuals trying to dramatize the truth of this get down to the bottom triangle, which is an enforcement of the communication of the reality or an inhibition of all, or some thing of the sort, and nothing is quite coincidence with anything else, but boy, are they held tightly together. You see, you've got everything compressed. Everything is gorgeously compressed. The distance is still there under terrific duress. And there's the bottom of the triangle. Now, this sounds very odd, but there is no silence at the top. See, there is no silence at the top. Silence is an invented thing, see? Silence is an invented thing. You have to invent an absence of something to prove that the something exists. So there is no silence in a totality of triangle, but boy, is there silence at the bottom. You see, we go down scale, we run into silence.

Now, silence would be this communication unit per moment of wait in a tremendous ratio. One fellow in one billion years has uttered one word in this space. Begins to look awfully permanent, doesn't it, huh?

All right. Well, the tests of these things are: "Give me two things that could occupy the same space, or "Something that you wouldn't mind occupying your space," or anything like this. You could go on processing in that direction and you'd get somewhere. There's actually a faster way to get there. Faster way to get there; it's just on communication itself. Let's increase the number of communication units per the expectancy of the boy's bank. Well, we'll just take the expectancy of his wait - you know, the wait - for granted. There's a lot of wait there, and we'll see him dramatizing this. We say to him, "All right. Now, give me some things you wouldn't mind having touch somebody you didn't know." You know, some mild process.

And he says - "What was the question?"

Now, what this boy's dramatizing is the waiting period. So, it means that his expectancy of communication has been violated. Just doesn't mean any more than that. It doesn't mean that he has a lot of time in his bank or it doesn't mean anything else. It doesn't even mean that he has any real masses around. But it does mean that his waiting time, his expectancy of communication, has many times been violated.

He went in and he said, "How are you, Mama?"

See, he expects this communication to occur, and it doesn't occur. In order to get Mama to answer, he might even explain to her, "Do you realize that you're making me suffer by standing there."

Now, what he's done is a very simple thing. He's given over some of his responsibility for communication, exactly 50 percent. He is only willing to occupy one end of the communication line so he is less pan-determined by 50 percent the moment he says, "How are you, Mama?" and gets no answer. So his expectancy is that some other-determinism will enter into conversation. This is an expectancy which creates masses and actually creates time itself. Expecting somebody else to take part in his communication is 50 percent less determined than taking part in both sides of the communication.

Could give you an example of that. It's an old Unit 1 demonstration. You have a fellow sit in a chair and say "Hello," and then go over and sit in the other chair and say "Hello." And then in the other chair, he says, "How are you?" and goes over to the first chair and sits down and says, "I'm fine."

And the - a fast way to run this would be to simply have the individual stand there and say, "How are you?" then have him go over and face the position where he was standing and say, "I'm fine. How are you?" And then go back to the first position and say, "I'm okay. How's tricks?" And have him go back to the first position - the second position again and say, "Well, they're fine. How are your tricks?" You know, just any kind of verbiage that you could throw in making him change these two positions, one against the other.

It has a considerable efficacy, but it does not bail out the preclear. See? I mean, he's tremendously amused; he gets very relieved; it has undoubtedly great therapeutic value. But it's slow freight because you're making him bust in, while he's at the lower part of waiting time you see, into lots of communication and both sides of it. And he gets pretty confused because he has a tremendous number of considerations he has to undo before he can do that.

A much faster method would be to have somebody sit down for ten hours of processing and simply have him tell - tell you things he wouldn't mind occupying the space he's occupying. And he goes on and does this. Now, you see, you have worked there the R corner of the triangle, spaces you wouldn't mind occupying. But both of these methods - one because R, reality, contrary to the expectancy of everybody in 1950, reality was not the key. More people have come up to me and have said to me, "Ron, do you realize that the reality is the most important corner of this triangle? You know, the way I look at it is that reality is the most important corner, and the other two corners are, you know, just there to supplement reality. And reality's really the important thing."

I never bought it. I never made up my mind which corner was really the most important corner. I might have skidded once in a while and said that possibly one was or one wasn't, but the fact is that communication is the important corner.

Well, all of these processes have the liability that they don't hand out enough communication per unit of waiting time, see? Now, the processes I was giving at the congress will tell you rather rapidly - with the amount of masses that moved around and so forth - will tell you rather rapidly that having something out there which chatters at you - and - you know, you've got something that is talking almost incessantly, you know: "Hello, hello, hello, hello, hello, hello, hello," is violating this mass-waiting time ratio, you see. And boy, the masses start flying in all directions, and the person's idea of what he can do per unit time changes. I haven't taken any survey of the congress; I don't need to. But I know that everybody who was there, and did run the process, had at least a small and mostly a fairly large change in the number of projects or activities in which they were willing to engage. Had a change in this, you see?

Well, what changed there? The R changed like mad, didn't it? Reality did change. Well, now, what would happen if you had a process that changed the R and the C at the same time, and which

gorgeously violated the A at the same time by giving people their proper acceptance level of A? What is - what is the acceptance level of your preclear on affinity? Real bum.

If you were to walk up to a preclear and tell him that you were very, very fond of him and that you had a great deal of affection for him and so forth, he'd probably get upset. You'd say, "You know, I really am very fond of you and I like you very much and..." and so forth. He'd think something was wrong here, see? He'd assume this. He'd get embarrassed. This is one of the first reactions he would have - just an emotional reaction.

All right. Now, we take over - we take a look at this - at this A and let's find the proper level for A in this process, and then let's get an agreement going of one kind or another, see, to get the R. And then let's throw lots of C to it. And if we did all these three things at once we would theoretically have quite a process, wouldn't we? Theoretically. And there is such a process. This process I gave you yesterday leads right straight to it.

Now, I told you to run it; I told you to run it in a particular way. Just have the preclear invent some wrongnesses. I told you to run that in a particular way, didn't I? Well, actually, that is a good test flight. Did you use that process on anybody? Hmm? You did. All right.

Now, that takes all three corners of the triangle and includes in it acceptance level, but it has a difficulty when run in that fashion, is it can get hard on the preclear.

Female voice: I certainly did find that out.

Did you find that out? Well good.

Trying to give you some subjective reality. All right. Now, you understand that "Invent some wrongnesses ..." Let's get - let's get real factual here. This would go up, straight on up scale, just "Invent some wrongnesses," because you've got some A, you've got your A identified, but it'd be rough on the preclear because A, as distance enters into it, drops. See, as distance enters into it there's less and less A, right? All right.

Absence does not make the heart grow fonder; it simply permits her to find another guy. This is not - not a workable maxim.

All right. We get a faster entrance. Now, did you get subjective reality on that process? You did. All right. We get a faster entrance into this process with "Make somebody else, have somebody else or create somebody else invent some wrongnesses, right there." It's a faster entrance. And then you will swing, of course, into the other one. Wrongnesses become fun after a while.

Well, now, did anybody have an automatic machine go brrrr and start inventing wrongnesses like mad? Did you?

Female voice in audience: No, but I had a preclear and she said, "My God, this is the first time in my life I've had the privilege of making a mistake!"

Oh, yeah, yeah. That's right.

All right. Now, for a case that is having any rough time or difficulty at all I mean, with processes, if you would just start it in - "Have somebody else invent some wrongnesses," you'll find out that you get a much smoother run at it. Why? Because you've detached the A's.



Here, let me see some hands here. Who did run this process on a preclear yesterday? And who had it run on him - same way to?

Now, I want you to get a subjective reality on this because you'll see the modus operandi of existence - very clearly. And the process, the indicated process for an entrance - you've always got to do it the hard way, you understand - but the indicated process for an entrance on a case that is having any real difficulty at all is "Have somebody else invent some wrongnesses." And you will occasionally run into a machine - it's more than occasionally - you'll run into a machine that is inventing more wrongnesses with the preclear than you could shake a stick at.

Now, why has he got to have wrongnesses? That's so he won't close terminals with the whole universe; so he'll have something to fight. Only he's gotten too good at it. A constant flow of wrongnesses has been hammering and pounding him, lo, all these years. And he's fought them all, and by resisting these wrongnesses, he has accepted them. That which ye resists, ye shalt accept, indubitably, inevitably and horribly.

Now, something else that you will run into in running this process - I'm going to point it out to you, because I don't want you to miss it - when a person is no longer permitted to invent wrongnesses to hand out to his fellow man so as to keep space stretched apart and the universe in action, he begins to represent them in solid masses, forms and actions. When he drops from the permission to invent wrongnesses, he keeps insisting on it and wears them, acts them and wears them. Get the idea?

A little boy, little boy walks up to his mommy - . By the way, I was at a swimming pool one day at a very swank country club and there were a couple of gay, gay, gay matron-class couples there, you know. I mean the - not quite grown up enough to be older folks, you know, and not young enough to be considered juvenile delinquents; just hanging in between. And they had some kids and so forth, and they were in the gay, gay social whirl. I think you know the kind: tremendously shallow people that go on doing everything because they're supposed to do it, but it's the gay thing to do, you know. You know, they never have any fun.

Anyway, they were at this country club and they were having a little bit of sport with me. One of them had accidentally found a copy of Dianetics and had probably picked it up upside down and had tried to read it and had noticed something in it about prenatal. And was saying, "This is the most nonsensical - we've disproved this years ago, you know," and so on. And this little three-year-old kid, little three-year-old kid was standing there looking very serious about this and listening to this conversation, and started to frown a little bit. And Mama ran on and on the subject. "Why, you know that a child can't remember anything at all. Now, Johnny, could you remember - you couldn't even remember yesterday, could you, Johnny?"

"I don't know, Mommy. I remember when I was in-inside you, Mommy, and you screamed at somebody and you hurt me, Mommy." Eek! Kid was able to recall at that early age a prenatal. Horrible violation of reality.

All right. Let's say this little kid got this hammer and pound of "You can't remember that, you can't remember yesterday, and you..." Of course, now, I imagine he got it for the next year or two "Now, Johnny, it's just a hallucination, you really can't remember that, can you, Johnny?" this sort of thing.

You know what he'd do to communicate? He would wear the prenatal. You got that? You got that? In other words, he's not permitted to say, "Mommy, when I was inside of you, you knocked hell out of me," see? He can't tell her a wrongness, so he wears it; and that's a deterioration. That is the entrance of the waiting moment in the absence of the communication, you see? So that we start to

communicate in masses what we cannot communicate straight as communication, see, so, that a mass becomes a covert communication.

I imagine the fellow who invented and builds cars, let's assume he's one fellow just for the fun of it, this fellow who invents and builds cars could be said - we could describe this this way - is not permitted to tell people about automobiles. Got the idea? So he expresses it in mass. When restrained from communication, you get mass. That's the mechanic of it, you see? When expectancy of communication is there and then you can't communicate, you will still communicate in mass. And if you're restrained from communicating too much, you're liable to go mad and start communicating with bullets or something, you see what I mean? You start communicating in masses. You get the idea?

So what is - what is this engram in restimulation? What is this advancing age factor that people have? I mean, they grow older; this is nonsense, they shouldn't grow older. It's just an insistence on the fact that they're old enough. Not "to what," but they've had the first twenty-one years of not being old enough, and they finally get so they insist on being old enough. And this factor is so constant in society that they - you get a constancy of aging. Do you follow me? You can - you can remember immediately insisting that you were old enough or that you were grown up enough; you can remember this instantly, I'm sure, if you think it over.

And what is this but representing in mass what you're not permitted to communicate. So that we have a law - and I do mean it's a law - operating, is anyone who is representing something in mass forms - has been prohibited from communicating it in any higher verbal or thought level. So that anyone who is talking - such as I am talking to you, or you think I am - actually has been restrained from communicating as a thetan to a point where he puts words into MEST form. You follow this?

Any time you see a mass, you know that you have a restrained - of a communication; somewhere there's been a restraint of communication. There's a chair: therefore, there's been a restraint of communication somewhere. Get the idea?

All right. So this preclear has a goiter, so we know there's been a restraint of communication. You get the idea? You come along as a thetan and pick up a body and push this body around, we know very well that you have been restrained as a thetan from creating a body. But we know that you would have created a body only if you had been restrained in communicating as a thetan. You get the idea? In other words, the body would be a protest against being restrained in communicating. You see how this works out?

You could just take this as a law, see, that any time you see a space or mass, it must have been preceded by a restraint of communication; just like that. Follow me? And the only way people can keep spaces really stretched apart is by inventing wrongnesses so as to cut down the affinity enough so that they can be separate from somebody.

The only way you could get an individuality would be to explain to somebody how bad he was. Get the idea? You'd have to explain to somebody how he couldn't communicate in some fashion or another in order to get him back there eight or nine feet away from you. Otherwise you'd be occupying, to some marked degree, the same space he's occupying. But in view of the fact that an individual can control his postulates when he's in pretty good shape, he of course could occupy the other fellow's space with the greatest of ease, just like that, and unoccupy it again with the greatest of ease. So is - therefore, you see why we want people to exteriorize easily and not be afraid of interiorizing after they've exteriorized, so they'd be able to go in and out of bodies with the greatest of ease?

Well, how would we accomplish this, to put them into a position where they didn't have to push forward a mass every time they turned around? We would accomplish it simply by reestablishing the number of communication units per waiting time, according to the expectancy of the preclear. And therefore you audit fast; therefore you audit in terms of communication. And because the individual's basic effort is to be separate and distinct, to some degree or another, you could very well have this process, "Invent some wrongnesses," "Make somebody else invent some wrongnesses" solve all these purposes simultaneously.

Okay. I want you to examine this, because by examining it I am sure that you'll come into a possession of - by auditing it, by getting it audited on yourself - you will come into possession of more data about life and human behavior than you ever thought possible. But more importantly, you will come into data as to how to regulate, control and live life than you ever have before. Yes?

Female voice: Ron, would that fit in with the with the attempt to communicate with God - no return of communication to the masses?

Sure. You're going to show him there's a mass there. You're going to show him there's some space there, is the first thing you're going to show him. For instance, there's a restraint on communication on the subject of religion, very definite restraint; I - you mustn't blaspheme is the first, most obvious restraint. You mustn't say, "God's a bum" and you mustn't build this and that. Furthermore, it restrains people from building images, which is - they needn't have put that law in there at all. They couldn't possibly have gotten the law obeyed. It never has been obeyed. People build images in religion constantly and continuously, because they are restraining communication. If you just said, "You must approach this God reverently" so forth and so on, you've just restrained communication to the degree that sooner or later you're going to impose a lot of waiting time there.

Then in the absence of a direct communication from God, why, you're really in trouble. Now, now we're really in trouble because he obviously doesn't think you're important enough to talk to. If you believed somebody was there, ready to talk to you, and then didn't talk to you, he must therefore be ignoring you. So your expectancy of a communication is terrific, isn't it? So you get a mass. And so all churches, sooner or later, go into tremendous masses.

Our idea, for instance, of a center for the HASI has to do with quite a bit of space and very little in the way of very solid buildings. Enough to air condition, is about the extent of the buildings. The idea behind its structure is that you have lots of space and darn few walls. You get the idea?

Yes, Peggy.

Female voice: Ron, there is - there's a story written by one of the leading writers about a woman who went out of communication with her lover; and she got fat and fat, and she got to be 350 pounds.

Say, I have an interesting example of that; I have an interesting example of that. I know of that happening, and never thought about it before. I wondered why this girl pushed herself on up to almost 400 pounds. She did, though. She was a fairly slender girl, and in the space of two and a half years of absence and no communication - which, by the way, she had broken off - she had gotten up to this terrific weight and was trying frantically to reassert these communication lines. Fabulous.

Yeah, that's right. That - that -

Female voice: One of Faulkner's stories. It's one of the big stories in the... She kept getting fatter and fatter. She was a belle. She was slender and charming and beautiful. Then she just got well up to 350 pounds in the story. He doesn't tell you why, but I mean, he starts out by saying...

Well, we've gotten - we've gotten a tremendous insight into Freudian work. If a man were to work on the sensation particle of sex, as a therapy, we would get nowhere. We'd just get nowhere.

Therefore, we start to push around flows as such, you see? And a man can just - . I know this. We've set up a couple of little tests on this. But a guy can just push around flows just endlessly. It's about the most fabulous thing you ever heard of. And they solve rather rapidly in the presence of communication.

Well, all of these things are very very explanatory, very illuminative of exactly what is going on. You - wait'll you run across one of these automatic "It's wrong" machines, though, on some preclear. You might not have any present. If none have triggered so far, probably none will.

Female voice: That seemed to work two ways. In one case, there would be a resounding repetition of resentments, inverted. And then the other way would be a complete prevention of something that was in existence. Mm-hmm.

No, you'll watch these various shifts in tones, and the old communication - pardon me, the old Tone Scale of Dianetics never behaved more reliably. There are some very interestingly pat ways in which you can exactly reverse this process, that is to say, making somebody else invent some wrongnesses and have the preclear invent some wrongnesses. It's not terribly - it's not terribly vital that you follow this by rote, as I told you yesterday. They get stuck and various peculiar things occur. It becomes too arduous. You get a - you've actually run into a stuck flow. The easy way to get out of a stuck flow is simply reverse the line.

Now, we take boil-off. Boil-off starts to occur, the actuality is all boil-off is, is a flow going too long in one direction. That's all boil-off is. Here this fellow has been outputting his mock-up around the society all day long. Naturally he's going to go to sleep for hours.

You know what you can do to conquer sleep? Just reverse the flows in which he was engaged that day, with communications. And all of a sudden he'll be bright and wide-awake. This sleep is your automatic process of so much outflow, sticks, sleep. And then it kind of has a tendency to rebalance itself, and the guy gets up the next morning, too much outflow or there's, for that matter, too much inflow and then, see, he would - . But we know that the person is asleep or is tired because he has engaged in too much directional flow. He has outflowed too long or inflowed too long, and so he is sleepy.

Well, there's one of the most fascinating examples of this in my own life. When I used to pound a typewriter at tremendous rates of speed, with great quantities of work, I finally got on a stuck mechanical flow at this damn typewriter. And I was at a point one time, back about 36, I was at a point where actually, I could only write for about an hour before I had to lie down. That was all there was to it; I would just knock myself out, just literally and actually, write for about an hour and knock myself straight into a boil-off, see? I'd write for another hour and knock myself into a boil-off, and write for another hour and knock myself into a boil-off. I didn't know what the hell was wrong with me.

The number of communication units which I was putting out, actually, were terrific, but these things were being put out in mass form. I was advancing masses, and I was shoving masses out. You know, words, pieces of paper, symbols and so on, and of course, this made a stuck flow to end all stuck flows.

I finally skipped it and went on a trip. And it's got rebalanced and so forth, and I didn't pay too much attention to it. Started doing a lot of dictating after that, and that's much easier, much easier.

But here's-here's an example of a stuck flow. Sleep and that sort of thing is from this. Now, as far as the invention of wrongness, you possibly need a word on the mechanics of running a technique. If your preclear is doing anything that you consider off-beat from what you've said, you make him tell you what he has been doing. You will - this is understood, you see. But to make him tell you every wrongness that he has invented or had something invent out there in front of him is simply to cut down the actual amount of communication time and make him verbalize it. You see that? In other words, you've cut down the amount of processing you do by having him tell you everything of which he has thought. You follow me?

But if you have the least, faintest suspicion that this boy was not quite tracking, you would immediately bring him up standing by asking him, "Oh, all right" just conversationally, you know, "What did you invent that time? Now, what did the person invent that time?" and anything of this character, you see, which would make him then tell you what had taken place. And if he hasn't been doing what you told him to do, you will run into the fact that he has said - . Here's the infallible sign: you've said, "All right. Have somebody else invent some wrongnesses."

All right. "What did the person invent?" And at this moment you get a comm lag. He wasn't doing the process. You get where that - where the - the comm lag is there. Now, he possibly is doing the process. You say, "Now, have somebody else - make somebody else invent some wrongnesses."

"Yeah."

"Now, what did you have that person invent?"

"Oh, he in - " see, "he invented some shoes that people wore on their heads."

See? You see where the comm lag goes. The comm lag was in the actual invention, not in the relay of it.

When you ask somebody to relay you a communication and he's been slow about it, why, bat your ears as an auditor, because the possibility is this person is wool-gathering, wandering, doing other things. Very often a preclear will get into energy chewing. Stenographers chew gum, preclears chew energy. You know? He isn't going to get anywhere chewing this energy. And he's got himself a fabulous, fabulous amount of off-track. You know, he's not doing what you said.

And when this sort of thing occurs with a preclear, it's quite often that it's not been malicious or willful on his part. He's just simply had a machine flip 'em, you know, or he's just gotten too involved or he's - so on.

Now, on this boil-off, if your preclear started to boil off you've just had him invent - let's go back to Self Analysis in Scientology, some of the remarks in there - you've simply had the preclear invent - you've had him make somebody else invent some wrongnesses from in front too long. You know, he just starts going nyah. There's no sense in wasting any time on boil-off at all; it's just simply the wrong - the flow has continued too long in that direction.

Now, it is so thoroughly mechanical, the boil-off is so thoroughly mechanical, all you'd have to do is have him make somebody invent some wrongnesses behind him. It's just as simple as that. See, he - you had him have a person out here - it wasn't a mock-up or anything; but just the idea of a person or a thetan or whatever you wanted to fancy up out here, but it's better not to get too fancy. Just some idea coming in from here and inventing some wrongnesses that - he's going to convince you that you had two left feet. That was what he invented, you see. And so - and then all of a sudden your preclear

starts to look just a little dopey and he's getting slow. It's another manifestation than direct comm lag; it's boil-off.

So, if we were to then say, "All right. Now, have a person behind you invent some wrongnesses," why, you'd find your preclear pick right up and become alert and bright. For that reason, when I lecture to you, why, at the - . It doesn't occur, by the way, if you're not creating masses to amount to anything. When I lecture you for a short time and I feel myself not particularly alert, I simply turn myself around as a thetan and use another face, and it works exactly the same way. I'm actually flowing in exactly the opposite direction, but as far as you're concerned, I'd be flowing the same direction. You see? I just turn around, and what I've been using for a face faces the wall back there, you see. But then I start talking out, you might say, through the back of my head.

Thank you.

(end of lecture)