HOW TO FIND A SERVICE FACSIMILE

A lecture given on
4 September 1963

Thank you.

I'm very, very glad to announce that there are some of you who are not in trouble. Thought we'd start the lecture on a happy note.

What's the date?

Audience: 4 September.

4 Sept. A.D. 13. Don't know what the month is named after, but probably something very barbaric.

Well, the shadow of your big toe has approached within several yards of a service facsimile. You remind me of a scout looking over a citadel which is bristling with guns and quite hostile, observing it from as far deep in the neighboring woods as you possibly can get. And I think maybe you've caught the tip of one turret or have seen a sign which says Citadel. And I'm going to ask you now to be brave and even get out to the edge of the woods and take a look at this thing, because it's well worth looking at.

And perhaps the fault that you have not seen it is resident with me. It appears to be quite lucid to me; it doesn't seem to be offering very much complication and so on.

But I know what this breed of cat is. I myself have taken a look at it and have audited it and have seen the results of it, and over a period of years have had an unhappy history of colliding with it. You know, you're going down M1 there and you're wide open, you know, and everything is fine and I'll be a son of a gun if somebody hasn't piled barrels across the road, don't you see? And well, that's the end of that one, you see?

PCs have always been full of surprises, and it's been of great interest to me to find out how they create these surprises. And so I'm very, very happy with what we've got here in the service facsimile, because it is how they create these surprises and what happens. Apparently there's a great deal to know about this thing. And I have not, to any great degree, relayed this information even in the bulletin of R3SC. Apparently this takes a lot of grasp, basically because it's terribly simple. And it's not that anybody is protecting their service facsimile—you can almost wipe that out.

You head a person's attention toward the service facsimile, and they go right on in, man. They go down the toboggan and over the falls—crash! They are no more able to keep out of the service facsimile than anything. And you needn't erect, now, a structure of philosophy to explain bad assessment by saying the PC will defend himself against his service fac being found. The PC will not. The PC gets to the middle of this whirlpool and just whirls. That's it, man. All you've got to do is swing him somewhere in the vicinity of the lake in which the whirlpool exists, and he dives right in and swims like mad and goes right to the whirlpool and says that's it—unless he's prevented from doing so.

My first plea, then, is don't prevent the PC from finding his service facsimile. That seems to be a rather obvious point to make, and I'm sorry that it sounds sardonic or sarcastic, but I'm afraid has to be made.

Because you could say, "Well, of course, if the PC counts on this for survival, he's not going to let it be found," you see? And you could go off on that line and make a lot of hard work for yourself, and actually it's not of that nature at all.

Now, there are so many ways of isolating a service facsimile that to cover the area of assessment at this particular stage of the game is merely to put in your hands a lot of rote this and that which will more assist you to miss the service facsimile than to find it. There is no substitute whatsoever for knowing what one is; there is no substitute at all.

Now, the service facsimile, first and foremost, is a tremendous solution which the PC believes, if disturbed, will end his survival. It is always an aberrated solution; it always exists in present time and is part of the environment of the PC. And it is something that everyone, unintentionally or otherwise, is telling the PC is wrong and causing him to assert that it is right.

Now, you get to understand a service facsimile a little bit better when you recognize that last point. That last point is very, very important. Otherwise, you're going to be running some of the silliest things and calling them service facsimiles, and you're not going to make the boat at all.

The environment, the mores, one or another dynamics, is insistently and constantly at work trying to tell the individual that the service facsimile is wrong, and the individual is constantly saying that it is right. And when you have that situation you have all unauditable PC, because he is getting audited only to prove that this is right and actually will constantly bring it up in auditing.

It is about as hard to find as a burning tar barrel in the middle of an empty field on a dark night, see?

The PC is always bringing this to the auditor's attention. This is so much the case that once you have found it you will consider that you have been very obtuse indeed. But sometimes it's being brought to the auditor's attention in different wordings, in different conduct, in different approaches that one doesn't find it easy to label. And it is probably labeling it that is harder than finding it.

Now, let us first look at the exact thing we are trying to do with a service facsimile—the exact thing we are trying to do with it; there is one thing we are trying to do with it—and then this will move out of your perimeter, as an auditor, any necessity of trying to use this principle to make an OT, because that is not what we're using it for.

I'll give you an idea now of this. Reg and I just had a discussion a moment ago, and he was saying, "Well, a human body would be a service facsimile." He's absolutely right. He's absolutely right. But this, of course, is being applied to going OT—not for the purpose we are applying it.

See, the remark is absolutely correct. It turns on mass. See? It is being asserted constantly, and so forth. Obviously it's a perfectly good service facsimile, you see? Well, all that's wrong with it is that it isn't the service facsimile we are trying to target. See? The wrong target. Because if you used that, you would be going to OT, don't you see? And we are not using the service facsimile for that. We're simply using it to get a person auditable this lifetime and get out of the road those constantly restimulated solutions that make it hard to audit this person. And that's its purpose. Its purpose is simply to clear this lifetime.

Now. I'll give you some beauties on the application of the service facsimile on the whole track. What do you suppose you have a bank for? It obviously must be some sort of a service facsimile. Obviously: it turns on mass, doesn't it? It follows all of the rules.

Obviously, "How would having a bank make you right and others wrong?" well, obviously—ha!—obviously would kill the PC. Why? Well, you'd just restimulate the whole early track and you'd throw him into countless GPMs and you'd overrestimulate him like mad. But obviously, according to the theory, it's a perfectly valid service facsimile. A reactive mind is a perfectly valid service facsimile, but not for the purposes that we are going to use this for.

It's well to remember the basic principles of the service facsimile when you are running somebody to OT, because sooner or later you're going to find this guy, and he just can't seem to get up to a point where he can tilt a planet. You're having trouble with this PC. He sits down there on one mountain top, and you sit there on the other mountain top and you're trying to audit him, see? And the E-Meter you use are the little glows that appear in the various parts of his vicinity. See, you say something; you see something glow, you say, "That read." Probably your auditing commands are all in telepathy or something like this, but we don't care much about that. That's a good thing to remember. This guy just keeps complaining, complaining— ARC breaking. Weather gets terrible on the planet, you know—keeps ARC breaking. Thunderstorms and other things occur. And he's got this PTP, you see? He just can't tilt a planet. Weak. And I bid you remember this point, you see, that undoubtedly you are now bucking a service facsimile, see, which would probably, after you've talked for a while, add up to something like "being incapable."

And you ask him, "All right. How would being incapable make you right and how would it make others wrong?" and so forth. And you run it on up with just the same steps of R3SC. You undoubtedly got this boy flying again, you see, into some new zone or area.

So you're never really rid of the principles of the service facsimile. He's got some tremendous solution, and that solution is "being incapable." How does he survive? By being incapable. At what level? At some very upstage level of some kind or another, you see? All right. So that's perfectly valid.

So it'd be valid almost at any point of a case, but that isn't what we are using it for and that is not the design and style of R3SC. It's the same breed of cat—the same breed of cat. But we are attacking here a solution which, just like any other solution, is a barrier to the discharge of the confusion.

What's made this possible is a new evaluation and a new road found through the bank on guess what? You've had a new communication level in auditing, and so forth, and that clarified a lot of things. But, of course, the service facsimile is borne out of a reevaluation and a readjustment of the confusion and the stable datum—that basic: confusion and the stable datum.

The confusion can only stay in place as long as it has a stable datum to hang it up. Now, that is so light and so easily changed by a thetan or a being that this does not much get in anybody's road. It's only when it becomes an aberrated solution, the loss of which threatens survival, that the individual fails to be able to discharge the mass associated with it.

So if you could see confusion as a stable datum (you know those principles; they're old HCA principles), you should realize that you can actually pluck,, out of the center of the confusion, the stable datum, and at that point get a discharge of the energy held in place. It's a new discovery, you see? What holds the confusion in place? A stable datum. That's a new thought, do you see, because you handle life all the time on the reverse line. You've got too much confusion: put a stable datum in and the confusion lines up on the stable datum. That's how you've been using it before.

All right, let's take a reverse look: How is the confusion held in place? The confusion is held in place by a stable datum. So the removal of the stable datum then discharges the confusion. And a confusion is a very good description of "what is charge?" Charge is an electrical confusion.

Now, as long as a stable datum is held in place by the person, the confusion will not discharge. Do you see this? So here's a new piece of advanced technology—rather remarkable piece of technology—that we have had around for a very long time and it's simply a reverse look at the thing, and we know now how to hold a confusion in place.

Now, fortunately for us—fortunately for us—confusion's are tolerable and not always aberrative. In fact, the biggest part of the confusion's of life are not at all aberrative; they could go on for a long time without hurting any thetan or incapacitating him for a moment.

You're playing a card game; you're playing a card game and you're having an awful time playing this card game. You just never seem to really get anyplace playing this card game. And you discover a little booklet and it says "How You Play Canasta," see? And you read over this booklet and it gives you some hot dope on the thing, and after that you can play canasta. This is just about as aberrative as eating blueberry pie. You understand?

Nevertheless, the confusion's of canasta are held in abeyance by these little rules you have learned about canasta.

Now, of course the confusion's concerning canasta, as I say, have no aberrative value whatsoever. Zero. Life, you see, as I've told you several times in recent lectures, is not in itself an aberrative activity. Aberration has to be rather extraordinary. It has to be worked at; it has to be kept in restimulation all the time

Now, this rather innocent action of the switchboard girl solving the confusion of her job on the principle "If I have twelve calls simultaneously appearing on the board, I handle one and then handle two and then handle three," don't you see? In other words, she's got a confusion of calls, all you have to do is teach her to handle one call. Each confusion she has from that point thereon is handled by that. Well, that actually is not at all aberrative to her. Nothing going to drive her mad because she has twelve calls simultaneously, don't you see? That's nonsense.

So now, we pull off the case—we say, "All right, what system or solution have you had to answering calls when they were too many or a confusion of calls?"

And she says, "Well, I answer one at a time," and so forth. We get the motion of the tone arm here could not be detected with a micromilli-vernier UNIVAC. See, it actually doesn't back up any charge. You get the idea?

No, there's got to be force and violence mixed up with these things. There's got to be something fabulous. Now, she could add this up and you could add this up as part of the confusion of trying to survive by having a job—and this could be part of it. And you might touch on it and it might appear to move some mass, but actually she's got something else she is worried about. Her survival is threatened by the fact that she could not handle her job and she's liable to be dismissed, don't you see? Ah, but look, solving how she handles a switchboard does not solve what she is worried about. She is worried about the fact that if she does not handle her job she will not have a job and her survival will thereby be threatened.

Ah, there's a much bigger tower on which this little piece of confusion was leaning, don't you see? All right, so we address this. How does she hold her job? By being a competent switchboard operator. Well, I'm afraid that this is not very aberrative either.

Why is she worried about holding her job? You say, "What solutions do you have for holding your job?" And you get a little TA action, see? Get a little bit of TA action.

She says, "So-and-so, and be nice to the boss" and so forth, and so forth, and you get a little TA action, see. Because this threatens her survival, don't you see, much more intimately.

But the case is still relatively unauditable. There must be something on this case if we're auditing this case and we're having trouble with the case; there must be something else that we are bucking into here. What are we running into? Something else. Something else.

And we look around and we find out, "Well now, what makes you upset, particularly, about losing a job?" or something like that. "What would be upsetting about this?"

And you hear, marvel of marvel and wonder of wonders, you hear—you expect to hear, you know, "My aged mother would then starve to death," you see, or something like that. And she says, "Well, actually, it's my dog." You can't add this up. Actually, she can't either. Actually, it's unaddable.

And you say, "Well, what about the dog? What's this got to do with the job?"

"Well, you see, uh . . . they'd put the dog to sleep if I couldn't feed the dog, you see?"

Now, you might be getting here close someplace and that even looks a little bit sensible, don't you see? That doesn't look quite completely dippy. But you've got the idea of a human being working like mad and terribly worried about their job and so forth, and we've traced it back to a dog. Now, ordinarily human beings do not work to support dogs. But this one is; this one is. And my golly, we work this around for a little while and we suddenly find out that she has lots of trouble all the time and lots of upsets about keeping the dog in an apartment. And we may have a service facsimile that is simply described as keeping a dog.

See, that's probably too mild a look at it, and I haven't given it to you as rough as you would actually find it or as incredible, because I want you to understand it, not sit there with your jaw dropped, see? But keeping a dog— keeping a dog, or keeping a dog in an apartment, some such action as this, or keeping a dog.. . "And how would keeping a dog make you right? And how would keeping a dog make others wrong?"

We find out that this girl has one computation in existence which makes her right and makes others wrong, and it has to do with keeping a barking dog in an apartment where it'll annoy people. And that makes her right and makes others wrong, and she feels if she were deprived of that solution her survival would be shattered. And this is what's causing her to worry about her job. Don't you see?

So she always carefully gets these little, sharp-bark terriers, you see, that scraffle and raffle when they walk around on the floors, you see, and that yip and yap endlessly, particularly in the middle of the night. Sooner or later as you're running this thing, she'll all of a sudden cognite, "You know, I always seem to get very noisy dogs. Wonder why that is?" Well, of course, naturally. It bothers people more.

And you run this thing down and you will get some kind of an incident, early-life incident and that sort of thing, where somebody insisted that a dog be put to sleep or something like this because it was getting old and scrawny. And she had to drive it down to the pound, and everybody was busy making her wrong and, he [she] was trying to make everybody else wrong, don't you see? And this thing is all wound up in a ball. And wonder of wonders, we get this thing audited out—it's all about dogs, you see? And suddenly, because keeping a job and handling a switchboard was attached to an aberrated service facsimile, you see, to this degree, then, her worries and anxieties all have a big lie in them, you see? And they're all twisted around wrong way to, and all of a sudden she can operate a switchboard much better— doesn't even have to have a stable datum to operate one, she just operates a switchboard, don't you see? And she can keep a job, she doesn't worry about the job, and so forth. She's released on this line. You get this action?

Now, I've given you a very, very simple, understandable solution here— very simple, very understandable. And they're not quite that simple when found in real life; they are more aberrated. I gave you a more intelligible one because I wanted you to understand there was some connection. Now, as you walk across this in real life they jump, usually, a wider gap than from job to keeping a dog, see? Probably be more involved than this.

They arc across a larger spark gap. You may find out that it is "breaking dishes." So you may have some more steps in it, you see? Breaking dishes. And t this doesn't make any sense at all about keeping dogs or holding jobs, but nothing makes any sense anyway. She's breaking dishes to be right, you see, and breaking dishes to make others wrong, and this is the service

facsimile on which everything else is piling up. And oddly enough, if she's not permitted to break dishes, she knows she cannot survive.

She may not know what the barometer reads; she may not know how wide the street is; she may not know a lot of other things in life. But this she does know: that if she ceases to keep the dog or break the dishes or something like that, why, that's the end of her—total tertiary line of defense.

Now, you may not discover this at once on a case. You may not discover this promptly, immediately and at once on a case. You may audit off one, two or three apparent service facsimiles that all answer up to the complete description of a service facsimile, but are actually only leaning on the central service facsimile that is restimulated in present time, don't you see? But as you take these things off, why, the central one comes to view.

Now, you see now why, when you say or imply to me, "Now Ron, you should give me some kind of a rote procedure by which to isolate this every time," you're asking me, of course, to apply a logical system to an illogical action. I probably could do it and we probably will do it and all of that sort of thing, but I actually would much rather you understood what you are doing. See, I'd much rather. Because, frankly, you can hunt and punch around on a case. You can take old case assessment sheets and folders and 2-12 and something, you know, on the case, or the case reports or auditors' reports or case histories or something; and you could get a whole list of things—anything that's been found on the case. And you can have a discussion over these various things and points, and you can assess them in various ways and get one or another of them to read. And you'll find out the PC's interest will hang up someplace on this list. He'll be very interested in it. Far from leaving it, they dive right in on it, see? And here's the PC's interest; it'll hang up with a somatic, so forth.

And now, in fooling around with this, it is sometimes necessary to reword it. You don't have to worry about rewording the command. You'll get results on cases by running different commands, but you'll only be running oddball, flank material on the service facsimile itself, don't you see?

Now, the command is always "How would it"—whichever you have found, makes the PC right and makes others wrong. It's always that command, see? It's not "How would opposing it . . ." " . . . stepping on it . . ." " . . . throwing it away . . ." or something like that, or " . . . fighting it make you right?" see? Because you haven't got the idea of what the service facsimile is, see? Because the condition, the final identification is that the service facsimile solution is the PC. That solution is the PC, so it is something be has. It's "How would it make him right and make others wrong?" Now, you can vary it: "How has it made you right?" and "How has it made others wrong?" You could even say "What would be made wrong by it?"

Now we're going afield, but the PC sometimes springs over, and when they're operating in an aberrated area of this particular character, their ability to follow an auditing command deteriorates markedly and they slop. That's all right.

The way you handle that, and so forth: All of a sudden PC is answering what and not answering how, see? You say, "All right. Well, just give me the rest of the what's and we'll get back to the how," you know? I mean, they're not very tough. You know, don't make them wrong and stop them and all this sort of thing. Let them go because you may be standing in the road of an avalanche at an automaticity, see? They'll slop on that auditing command, do you understand?

But the auditing command is not ever "How has it made you wrong?" Never. Never. Never. Oddly enough, it' I run, but it'll run the PC down scale. "How would doing things to it make you right?" see? Oh, oh, oh, no, no, no. You'll get some tone arm action. See, this is what'll fool you. You'll get a little tone arm action. It'll look okay.

Well, let me take the case in point. We assess Father, and some "genius" has just read the rest of the 2-12 bulletin and found out that it was always "oppose"—you were supposed to oppose what you found on that. So he ran 2-12 plus R3SC, which is pretty good. I suppose you can run several other processes in conjunction with it, too. You could probably have the PC feeling the walls at the same time you ran the process. I mean, you could do a lot of things. But anyhow . . . I'm sorry, but that actually happened. And the command was "How would opposing Father"—this is not quite the right one, but don't want to cast too many bricks— "How would opposing Father make you right?"

Brother, that is not a service facsimile: opposing Father is not a service facsimile that's an action. See, that's just an action. Now, if you assessed it out, you've got to try it. You got to try it on for size and you got to find out if there's anything to this, because it would be if you assessed Father—it just simply—I mean, it's too idiotically simple: Father must be a solution. See, it must be a huge solution. So we say, "How would Father make you right?" And "How would," you know, "Father make others wrong?" you see?

Now, you can drag this over into the cow pasture and say, well, hating Father is probably the service facsimile and so forth, but actually you're just looking at a secondary or tertiary condition of a service facsimile. You're not looking at a service facsimile, because this is no action. See? This'd be something which was the result of a service facsimile.

And the first rule is—what I first gave you in this lecture—if the PC doesn't immediately jump into the lake and swim right straight to the whirlpool, but tells you "Oh, well, Father . . . make me right . . . Father . . . Uh . . . —make any sense," I call to your attention the PC is still standing on the bank—not service facsimile. Got the idea? PC has not swum madly in and got all embroiled in this thing. Because that's the first thing they want to do: Hit the service facsimile—drown. Why? Because to drown is to survive. Obviously—that's the characteristic of a service facsimile.

The PC says, "Um . . . I don't think . .-. um . . . I don't know. It's . . . I'll have to . . . right . . . I don't know whether that's right or not. I'll just . . . make me right? And . . . don't . . . I don't know if that would make me right or not. Let's see, would it make me right? Would it make anybody else wrong? I don't know. I can answer the question. There doesn't seem to be very much wrong " Wake up there in the auditing chair and take a look at what's going on. PC is standing on the bank, feet not wet, whirlpool not approached—equals service facsimile not been found.

So go on and do something else clever. Say, "Well, that's fine. I'm glad we covered that," cheerily, cheerily, cheerily, cheerily, cheerily, and you gather up your papers and get the hell out of there, see?

PC won't be able to keep out of it—that I guarantee you, man. Won't be able to stay out of it.

You say the service facsimile is "burning cats." See, something weird like this comes up, see? Or "being a cat," you know? Something like that. "Being catlike." "How would being catlike make you right?"

"Oh, well, that's so-and-so and so-and-so, and so-and-so and so-and-so and so-and-so, and then, of course, so-and-so and so-and-so, you understand. There's quite a suite a—that's quite a thing when you start really thinking about it like that. You see, catlike is so-and-so and so-and-so and so on, you understand? And so on, and a lot of times been catlike because, you see, it—it uh . . . it's catlike, you know, and—and so forth, and uh . . . that's the way it is and so on." And when you can't get in an auditing question to get the session properly started, know that you have hit one.

Now, the reason it turns on automaticities is, of course, that it is automatic, unanalyzed solutions, and they simply just pour off in a Niagara. When you got a real one and you're running one, always note in your auditor's report "automaticity." It merely means, more

answers than the PC can articulate are arriving from the bank—conveyor belt stacking up. Just note down when you find one of those automaticities. It's a guarantee you've hit on a service facsimile.

Now, this gives us the way it has to be run. Because it is susceptible to avalanches, you can't then run it with the old TR 0, 1, 2, 3, 4, see? You've got to throw the question into the arena and let the lions fight over it for a while, you understand? And just don't stop it with a new question; don't stop it with acknowledgments; let it sort of run out. After a while, the PC has given you fifteen, twenty answers and so forth, and seems to look rather blank—doesn't seem to have one now, and that sort of thing. Well, you can either give him another question or you can change the thing over to the other side, and it does the same thing then. So it's actually not one auditing question for one auditing answer. You're not running it that way. You're running it one auditing question for one waterfall.

But sometimes the PC swaps ends in the middle of it. Well, this is no time to stop him either. He's busy making others wrong with this "being catlike," you see, and others wrong, others wrong, others wrong, others wrong, " . . . and it'd make me right to so-and-so and so-and-so." And he's just reached the end of the flow and he's turned around and he's on the back flow. You can also overrun these things and put the PC into a stuck-flow sort of a drifting anaten. You're insisting that more answers must exist, you see? Well, he's already at the end of his rope, and you're making him run too long on that side. So it's run very permissively.

What you're trying to do is get rid of this avalanche and automaticity and get some tone arm action. That's your main purpose. So how you do that as an auditor is give only enough questions to get the PC going and only enough acknowledgments to acknowledge the fact that you had a lot of answers. And turn it around whenever it comes toward the end of the rope; and turn it around the other way. It's very simple stuff.

Now, trying to keep the PC answering the auditing question is sometimes difficult, as I just told you because the PC will skid around on this and disassociate because he's in disassociated area. And don't you ever tell me that you're very shocked because this PC has given you a whole bunch of answers that weren't answers to the auditing question. Now, that's expected. That's expected, see? Because what?

This solution—now, let's talk on the theory of the thing. This solution, you see, is holding back a tremendous amount of aberration, none of which makes sense, so it doesn't as-is. So there sits this solution, see, "keeping a dog," you see?

All right. All this stuff is back of it and nothing is going to flow, because as long as this person is able to keep a dog, life is handled: Jobs are taken care of; everything is protected; all is right in the world except, of course, for the painful stomach, a hatred of dogs and some little marginal fringe worries, you know, of one kind or another. And being broke all the time and not being able to have a job or hold a job.

It's like trying to solve a problem with a whopping lie, don't you see? And boy, would you have to get busy to keep this problem solved with this whopping lie. So it has to be continuously asserted—continuously asserted. And that solution, then, is just a solution. That's all it is. And the PC doesn't even have to work on it consciously because the PC has got it all triggered to be worked on all the time anyhow. It's the immediate answer to anything.

So life just continues to stack up on this solution, and it accumulates mass on this solution, and the solution accumulates mass.

Now, because the solution . . . Now, let me give you the condition of what kind of a solution it's got to be: It's got to be a below-2.0-on-the-Tone-Scale solution—always below 2.0, nothing above 2.0, see? It's a below-2.0 solution, because it, perforce, is a substitute for an itsa line. It's a substitute for an itsa line.

The PC started out by feeling he or she could not itsa the object that he or she was trying to make wrong and so dreamed up this solution—dreamed up this solution as a final solution. And that, then, is a substitute for an itsa line, believe it or not.

Well, there's a girl sitting there and Mother has not spoken to her since noon because the fender of the car has been dented. And she has this solution: "Well, families are no good," you see? Makes it unnecessary to observe Mother; makes it unnecessary to observe the environment; makes it unnecessary to participate; makes. . . No necessity at all to do anything about it because it's all done—it's all contained there in the solution. And then because, you see, there is no isness occurring on the environment, you get an accumulation of mass. See, mass only accumulates in the absence of itsa. So there goes the old shell game. So it's actually a substitute itsa line.

Now, because of this, of course, it then is referred to every time one refers to anything. And when it is a below-2.0-on-the-Tone-Scale solution, it of course is propounding this—it's propounding this very clearly, as aberrated as this sounds: To survive it is necessary to succumb. And that solution always propounds that, one way or the other, in some oblique, aberrated way.

Survival is made up of a numerous number of succumbs. How to survive: "Not to have any fun"—that's a good way, see? "To cry all the time." "To appear to be destitute." See, obviously, see, I mean, to... These are all manifestations of nonsurvival, don't you see? It's necessary to manifest nonsurvival in order to survive. It's always this kind of an oddball solution, see? You'll get something like "not eat," see? That's a quite common, by the way, service facsimile; refusing to eat, not eating—common service facsimile. Little children will play this an awful lot of the time, and when it gets out of that realm and range and moves into adult life, why, you have diets. They usually don't amount to a service facsimile, but when they do, you've really got a mess on your hands. It's really a nice, big mess. And this must be terribly common because one of the major problems they have in insane asylums is making people eat. Not eating is one of the final protests—hunger strikes. Throw guys in jail, one of the first things they think of is go on a hunger strike—if they want to make a big protest, they go on a hunger strike. So there's a very common service facsimile.

Some version of no sex—no second dynamic. I don't care how you have it or how you phrase it. It's got to be some no-second-dynamic one way or the other, see? It's an incapacity on it; it's an aberrated practice of it. It can go worse than that. How to survive, you see, is to murder children. How does that add up? Well, it adds up to the guy all right, you see?

And on the first dynamic, how to survive? Well, commit suicide, you see? In innumerable ways, you can commit suicide on many gradients, you see? "Be ugly," you see? "Be overweight." "Be too thin." Be this, be that, be disabled, be something, be something. Doesn't much matter what it is, you see? You might collide with that on the first dynamic.

On the third dynamic, "to be antisocial." See, these are all sure methods of nonsurvival, don't you see? And yet they are added up as a survival computation. "Shoot policemen." Third-dynamic solution: how to survive shoot policemen. Simple, effective. And you say, "Yesh. But that couldn't be a service facsimile in this lifetime, because this PC has never shot a policeman in this lifetime"—ha-ha-ha-ha-ha. Don't make me laugh. This PC has always shot a policeman; every time they see a policeman they shoot a policeman.

"Robbing houses." You say, "Well, robbing houses—this individual . . . This couldn't be a service facsimile, because this person has never robbed a house." Oh, well now, don't be too sure. Never passes one but he doesn't rob it—thinks about it and so forth.

Well, how does he use this service facsimile? Oh, he uses it via the newspapers. He always clips out robberies and shows people about robberies and that sort of thing. Figures out robberies; reads nothing but detective stories, see, and—robbery—robbing houses. That's a

good service facsimile. So, you see, it doesn't even fit in with the guy's environment. Therefore, it sometimes is rather hard to trace.

You get somebody who is in a death cell, you see, having already shot up innumerable policemen and so forth. Well, you know what his service facsimile is—you think. You say it's obviously "shooting policemen." You know, I'll point something out to you: He's shot policemen. Probably wasn't his service facsimile at all. His service facsimile is probably "never loading guns" or—you know? Service facsimile is "being kind to everyone."

See, the exact circumstance of the person doesn't always guarantee you that you have your hands on the service facsimile. That's what I'm trying to point out here. Because this thing goes underground. It's not very visible, and they very often . . . The most effective service facsimiles are those which are totally hidden—until you've come anywhere in their vicinity and then they're laid in your lap, see?

You don't find service facsimiles above 2.0 on the Tone Scale. Now, it'd be completely silly, then, to add up the ARC of the lower Tone Scale, like "not communicated" or something like this, and say "Well, his service facsimile is 'not communicated.'" "How would not communicated make you right?" or " . . . not having communicated make you right?" or " . . . not communicating make you right?" and so forth,

Well, this is, I'm afraid, a little bit too general, see? You don't use these buttons by their isolated selves because they are insufficiently directional, and the PC answers them too broadly. And all you do in such a case is restimulate the service facsimile without labeling it. Well let me give you—just dream one up here; don't say it's terribly workable: "Who or what would make themselves right by not communicating?" Something like this. Or "Tell me a means of not communicating," and make a list and assess the list. Don't you see? Some odd action of this particular character. Such a button, then, is useful for the location of a service facsimile, but is not in itself a service facsimile.

You eventually get, on this list, "hiding pencils." And you say, "Well, this can't be very damaging, but we will run it anyway." Well, it's not maybe very damaging; but you find out that the reason the PC has always looked so bulky is because they're always carrying fifteen or twenty gross of pencils; can't get into their room at night because of the crates of pencils, you know? Everybody in their vicinity misses pencils all the time. Never spotted him. This is loopy conduct of one kind or another. But sometimes it can look so ordinary to you—because this is this planet—that you sometimes don't put your finger on an obvious service facsimile.

Let's say it isn't "being sick" but it's "having chills." "How would that make you right and make somebody else wrong?" or something like that, you see? Or "having a cold," or something like this. That still could separate out into a service facsimile, don't you see? But it might not be on and it might be on: it doesn't matter.

See, I've given you a bunch of stuff that you may think, by this time, the service facsimile, again, is very hard to locate. No, it isn't. I'm just giving you she idea that you've got to look for it. You've got to prowl around. After this character has given you something that might be it, make a "represent" on it. Be quite frank with the PC. Don't pussyfoot on this thing. There's been too much pussyfooting about already.

Say, "We's looking fo' you' service facsimile. What is it, boy?" You know, subtle.

"What do you think your service facsimile is?" Do a list. Pull the missed withholds and null that list—good reliable method. PC [will] withhold it perhaps, and then just the fact that you put it down on pulling the missed withhold—and all of a sudden he dives into the water, swims right over to the middle of the lake, dives right into the middle of the whirlpool and says "There we are. Uhhhhhh! What am I doing here?" Interest! Attraction! So forth.

Because, of course, it's not a volitional solution. That is to say, he doesn't think up this solution all the time. It's a sub-awareness solution which goes into automatic action. It's that buried. He's right on the verge of it all the time, he's in direct connection with it all the time, so you just lay down the faintest link to it and he can't help but travel that link, don't you see?

That's one of the reasons, you say, that neurosis and psychosis are very, very difficult to maintain. All you practically have to do is spot them and they start blowing up. It's very hard to dramatize the exact reason for them.

Why anybody would go through heroic actions to explode a psychosis or neurosis, or electric-shock people or go into brain treatment, just because the person is jumping about the floor and screaming or refusing to eat or doing something like this, and so on—that's not a good enough reason. That doesn't mean that the psychosis or neurosis is violent, you see? That only means that it produces violent reactions. See, it doesn't mean that it is violent at all. Maybe this girl, insane, is jumping about the floor because she doesn't like cockroaches. And that's the logical explanation of the thing, and people fail to note that this is true because there are no cockroaches there. But she's seeing cockroaches, you see?

So you might have something on this order (this becomes very elementary): You say, "What really might be worrying you all the time?" You make a little list. And she jumps about the floor and hangs from the chandelier and rolls up in a ball and so forth, but she'll talk to you and she gives you, finally, a list. And you assess this list out according to interest: Which one is she really most interested in? And you'll find out that it's cockroaches. She's very interested in these cockroaches that are all over the floor. And you'd say, "Well, how would seeing cockroaches make you right?" And that's probably the end of her insanity. Why, she probably couldn't maintain it from that point on. She wouldn't be well; she wouldn't be calmed down or anything like that. But she's now going to have a hard time maintaining it because she's got a connection to it. And the thing will discharge. See, it's hard to do now. Now you got to get volitional about jumping around in the middle of the floor; now you got to mock up the cockroaches to put them on the floor, don't you see? And she just can't make it. And that charge, just that much charge, and it's gone.

That, by the way, was practically the totality—the accidental fact there, is probably the totality of the Freudian recoveries—is contained right in that. It's just that they would evaluate in some fashion or another, like you do with an ARC break, you see? And they'd happen every now and then to strike something that was a service fac, and the individual would think about it, and it would be impossible then to dramatize it. But not knowing the mechanics of it, it nevertheless would slightly discharge, don't you see? And it's all those false assignments that made their people sick, see? It was the assignments that weren't service facs, and that sort of thing.

So you can learn from that just in passing. And don't give a guy a bunch of phony service facs, see? Let him decide what it is, you see? Don't ever foist one off on anybody. You'll find that's always a good part of the rules. If he says it isn't it, it isn't it, man. That's it. That's the rules. Customer is always right. Because frankly, if you've got it, he can't stay out of it, see? Man, if you keep that little fact up your sleeve, why, you can afford to reject any quantity of them. You say, "All right, 'beating dogs' and so forth. You don't think that is it. I had it on the list here. It read a little bit."

"No, I don't think that is . . Beating dogs, beating dogs, beating dog, beating dogs, beating dogs, and so on.... Beating dogs ..."

"Would it make you right in any way?"

"Nah. Would beating dogs make me right? Hm. Heh. No. No. No. Wouldn't do much. Well, actually, could add it up—it could make me right to object to bad behavior on the conduct of dogs and make dogs wrong to indulge in bad behavior." End of computation, see?

You'll find every once in a while a PC will give you something like that. And then they'll say, "Oh yes. Let's see. How would it make me wrong? Now, let's see. How would bad auditing make me right or bad auditing wouldn't make me right—it'd make me wrong." Of course, that's the end of that. You pursue that no further, see?

But, "How would getting stuck in an engram make you right and make others wrong?"

"Wouldn't do it."

"Well, how would auditing make you right and make others wrong? you see? How would auditing make you right?"

"Well, it'd make me right if I got better and it'd make the auditor wrong if 1 didn't." End of computation.

Of course, that's no service fac. Perfectly logical answer. There are no further answers behind it. No vast blast of the TA as it falls down; there's nothing going on here particularly. So you don't want to hang people with these things, because it's too easy to find the right ones. And they abound, man.

This is one of the most interesting little treasure hunts you ever engaged upon, see? And you might as well get used to what it is and figure out what it is and put your own itsa line in on it, and so forth, because you'll sure know what it is, then, see? You say, "Here it is, man. This guy has got this thing which is some kind of a horrendous solution of some kind or another, and it's got all this charge backed up. And whenever I audit him with a Prepcheck, why, very little TA action or mass turns on with a Prepcheck—must be a service fac. This case not very easy to audit; has a fragile tone arm; tone arm gets stuck hard— another condition, you see?— must be a service fac, and so on. Can't get this thing. Why?" Well, look-it—obviously, if all the discharge you're going to get is a confusion running off in the form of charge—if the charge won't run off, there must be a solution there which p events the charge from running off. And that's all there is to it. He's got it solved. He doesn't have to look around: Back's bad and his head's bad and his ribs are bad and he can't sleep at night and he's got ulcers and so forth; but he doesn't have to inspect this. See?

Say, "Well . . ." You start running this down, you'll find out, well—do this little list or something like that, or however you're going to run it into, or do past data, moving in toward this thing—you find out he sleeps on the floor. Doesn't sleep in bed—has a bed but he sleeps on the floor.

Well, I'd try that on for size and just say, "Well, is there any possibility you do that because it would make you right?"

Now, you're going to get one of two reactions: "Pprffff. Well, it would make the landlady wrong, because she doesn't change the sheets very often, and so I sleep on the floor, see?" Or, the other reaction, which is the one you're looking for, see, is "Well, sleeping on the floor make you right? Oh, yes, yes. As a matter of fact, it would, so on. And a long time ago when I was in—when I was in . . . in boarding school, you know, we used to have these bed—big high beds and so forth, and could pull you out on the floor and ma ---. But that isn't the real reason why this thing was. You see, I kept sleeping on the floor. Actually, you get more fresh air, and so forth, and uh . . ."

Well now, look, don't be a complete knuckle head as an auditor and try to go through some more action, see? You're just using auditing actions to cut the itsa line. You got one running, man. Just sit back and let it run. Now, do the easy thing, see? All you got to do is sit back and let it run.

The only trouble you'll get into is sometimes the PC starts running backtrack on it in a hurry, and then you should start getting nervous. So if you can get in an auditing question on the

thing, why, slide "in this lifetime" or something like that on the front of the auditing question, providing you have asked an auditing question. If you haven't, why, try to get it in at the next question—if you get a chance to ask the nest question. Got the idea? You might not get a chance to ask the question at all. It may run all the way out and he's now ready for the other side, see?

Now, the main thing that you gain from all this and the main thing you gather from all this is tone arm action. You've got the mass flowing that kept the PC from getting tone arm action. And that's your interest in it. You're not interested in his social conduct. You're interested in his auditing conduct. Where old medical psychiatry went adrift, we needn't go adrift. They become so fixated on the subject of "r-r-r-right conduct," without even being able to define what it is (except maybe a slaver when the bell rings), that these birds are always adjudicating everything on the subject of conduct. Insanity is a brand of conduct. Neurosis is a brand of conduct—conduct, conduct.

Well, the unfortunate part of it is—the unfortunate part of it is—that it doesn't catalog, it doesn't classify. You can't do that, see? Because it just renders everybody open to the charge of being neurotic or psychotic. just everybody, wide open—which is one of the more interesting factors, and then they can use this politically, don't you see? And then anybody they don't want around, they merely say some of his conduct is aberrated and they can throw him in the local spin bin and chop his brains up for hamburger. I don't know what they eat.

The point I'm making here is that's highly dangerous—highly dangerous—saying a person is insane or sane when your sole basis of adjudication, you see, is conduct.

So this doesn't always meet the eye. Some of the most roaring insanity's on this planet are classified as sane behavior, see?

Now, in actual fact, you're measuring up not a person who is in agreement with this planet but you're measuring up a person who has lived a very long time. So whatever is the service fac is the service fac, don't you see? It's not because he does something peculiar, or not because he does something this, or . . . We have a list of things. I can tell you what it's more likely to be than something else. But action that is peculiar is only peculiar, not compared to the mores of the society in which you find yourself but just compared to the datum of survival. See, just compare it directly to the datum of survival. And it's always a contrasurvival action which is posing as a survival action.

Revolt. I don't even know why you'd revolt against an earth government; they're all convicts, see? You're living in an area where there are no wardens, see'? Actually kind of silly to do anything particular in this particular direction because they're nuttier than anybody else, don't you see? They probably need their hands held twice as hard as anybody in the spin bin, you know? They don't know what they're doing.

So what is considered normal on this planet might at any one point be completely batty. So the service facsimile comes down to the comparison with the datum of actual survival and the fact that the PC is interested in it and that it releases tone arm action because it must be a fixed solution.

So actually, what you're studying are fixed solutions uninspected by the person, which are contrasurvival. Now, when you hit all of those, man, you've hit the jackpot.

In any case which has a fragile tone arm which is liable to stick at the drop of an E-Meter cord, see—bang! like that—you're looking at a service facsimile. You must be. There must be a fixed solution. Why? Because there's no charge runs by it. So if no charge runs by it, it must be a fixed solution, and it gets in the road of auditing, so it must be contrasurvival. Actually, it could be a fixed survival solution which really was a survival solution, and you'd find it wouldn't even vaguely influence auditing.

See, you'd go out and audit the guy and you get tone arm action, and he'd go on flying and he's got these fixed solutions all over the place. He's practically nothing but a bundle of fixed solutions. You're trying to find the black spot in the middle of the ball of yarn, see? The black spot in the middle of a mountain of white spots. The mountain comes down if you find that spot. Fortunately for you, there are several gray spots in its immediate vicinity, any one of which can be hit and do the case some good. So it's a constant prowl on this route. You handle one. All right. Fine. Is this case going to remain stable? Well, that's very doubtful so let's find two. Let's find three. Let's make sure we got it, see?

Now, your tone arm is flying around and your needle, by this time—the thing can't stick. You find you find one, the case will tentatively resume its stuck-needle condition, momentarily resume it. Interesting. Can't hold it, but it's a drop, you know?

You haven't got all of these now; you haven't got all of them you want, and it'll still be a little this way. And the next one you find—pshew-sss-sss-ssss-ssssew. It's coming down. Needle, is getting so it can't stand upright, because there's nothing to hold it. Just the weight of the needle causes it to bang against the sides, you see" You actually have trouble reading your tone arm, as you're winning on these, when you are really hitting center. You're having trouble with that tone arm because you can't find out where to center it.

Your needle is not as nice as it was before. It's too floppy. You're having a trouble centering it. And you just about get it centered and it moves, see? And you just about get it centered, it flops over the other way. Your tone arm reading gets very, very inaccurate as this really starts to bite. You can't quite keep it properly centered. It's moving too fast, too. PC just thinks a thought, see, and it goes clank! It's gone. But, gee, how much charge went off there? Well, we don't know. It's because you're bleeding, you see, a central reservoir of charge and it's flowing in a Niagara.

Now, the other thing it does for you and the reason why this is very beneficial to the case completely aside from unblocking this—is a service facsimile is always protruded into present time, always protruded into present time. So any constant PTP that your PC has had will of course produce the service facsimile. And that is very good news for you. You can produce the service facsimile out of any PTP that has been constant and continual with the PC.

"What did you come into Scientology to resolve?" And he'll give you a long series of this and that.

Now, it's very, very dangerous to list too many problems on a PC. You list too many problems on a PC and you're going to wind him up in a . . . bang. That's dangerous. Call that to your attention. Listing problems—not so good, see, not so good. Bad show. Doing an incomplete list of problems will ARC break the PC. A complete list of problems is very often too long and is a bit dangerous to the PC's needle and case condition.

So how do you find out the problems? Well, you have to take a step backwards before you take a step forwards. See, locating the problem that you're trying to solve—you can't let that run forever because that's the exact opposite of an itsa line. It's a whatsit line. See, a problem line is a whatsit line. And you can freeze your tone arm gorgeously with a whatsit line. So a whatsit list will freeze your tone arm, and so forth. So it had better be on the basis of a friendly discussion which you can leave in an awful hurry. And you recognize that you're taking a step backwards with this case, making him whatsit, which is basically what's bum with these assessments, and so forth.

"What was your chronic present time problems when you got into Scientology, and so forth? What were these things? What are these things you were trying to solve at that particular time?"

Now, if you hang up this case too badly, you can take that little list and ask for a solution for each one of the problems he's given you—if you've made a list—ask for some solutions for those problems, and you will take the tension off the tone arm. So there is a cure for this

situation, but it's rather a lengthy and involved cure. But you may have, sitting right there . . . The solution, you see, is not a problem; the solution is not a problem, but a few of these problems can be looked at as pointers to a possible solution.

He's having trouble in a certain area. Now, your problem, once you've got any idea of his problems, is to put your finger on some solution with regard to that problem. Ant that solution will be the fixed solution which gives you the service facsimile.

Now, notice that R1C and R2C are designed to strip away solutions, decisions and stable data off the case—so-called stable data. Therefore, they are very, very easy to run and they produce tone arm action and are the least likely to hang up the tone arm. You start asking for whatsits, however, in R1C: "Well, you say you have had a . . . you—you've had the idea that all snakes were lived in the tops of houses, and so forth. Now what problem would that solve?"

Man, cut your throat! You've asked the reverse side of R1C and the tone arm is going to go up and stick. But notice that your R1C and R2C, these itsa-line questions and run, are designed to strip away charge from the service facsimile area.

Therefore, it is a very good thing to find out if the PC has been run on R1C and R2C. Of course, they won't have discharged the service facsimile, but they may have some data there that they uncovered in looking at all this, which you might then sort out and get an idea, don't you see? So you say, "While you were being run in the co-audit down there, what did you run into that you found very interesting while you were running your case? What did you really run into?"

"Well, I ran into this and that and the other thing and the other thing and the other thing," and you make your little bit of list of these types of solutions and zones and areas and you've got yourself an assessment, see? Then run this thing down, and—with a little further discussion with the PC—and you're liable to hit right on it just like that.

Funny part of it is that R3R is almost a dead-center pitch on a service facsimile, providing it winds up in a statable solution.

Now, "failing not to communicate with eating figs in Smyrna," I don't think you would find a good service facsimile. I call that to your attention. If it doesn't make sense to you, it's not likely to make sense to the PC So don't go astray on this, because, after all, the preliminary step of R3R was designed to do an entirely different thing and it may be only a fragment of that and it won't be the tone level you found, see? It won't be that. It'll be some fragment of it or a rewording of it.

Now, I funnily enough have found one on an incomplete R3R assessment that two stayed in on. The list had to be extended, don't you see? And one of those was the service facsimile. I find that quite interesting. In other words, if we had completed the list to the final run, we wouldn't have found the service facsimile, see, because it would have been buried back on the line a little bit, don't you see?

Well, this tells you that it doesn't really have to be a terribly good assessment—any kind of an assessment. You've run something like "failed to shoot" — "What have you failed to shoot?" or something like this, or "failed to have been with?" or something. And you get a list, get a list of this; go on down the line; assess the thing out. Well, even if your "failed to shoot" is kind of a lousy level, as long as it's in, not because it's been protested or was a mistake on your part, see'? PC has protested it, so it's in, you know? That's the corny way those assessments go astray.

PC didn't understand it, didn't know what it was. So it keeps reading, you know? If you don't clear anything with the PC while you're assessing the PC, you can expect that problem to come up on auditors that are green in your supervising sometimes.

That can be sort of corny and it'll still produce something. And you're doing yourself a list over alongside of this thing, and you didn't even really get a chance to complete your list very well, and so on, but it went out, and you finally had a level stay in. It's much more likely to be that level if the PC is interested in it. You get the idea. It's the item—pardon me—it's much more likely to be the item, you see, than it is the level, because the level is too broad. And just running it sets up the bank enough so that you can then do one with greater accuracy, because everything on that—as long as you just got something to stay in for fifteen strikes or something like that—you know, one of these arduous lists where everything is alive on the whole list. Everything is knocked out at one fell swoop because restimulation by reason of present time is always about 50 percent of the restimulation present on any case at any given moment, that has service facs, you see? It's about 50 percent of the charge on the case.

You've only got, then, 50 percent, you see, that you can restimulate with safety because the tolerance for restimulation, you see, is lessened by 50 percent. All of a sudden this character will run like a startled gazelle if you can get this service facsimile out of the road, because your environmental restimulation has nothing to kick back on.

Now, we used to try to solve this by processing him faster than the environment can kick him in. Remember? You know? Process him twenty-five hours during the week, keep him away from home, and his wife won't kick his head off, and when he goes back home he'll stay stable. You know? That kind of thing. But we were just hoping we'd get the service facsimile before he went back home. You understand? So if you could reduce that factor out of the case, then all the gains the case made in session would stay. So there's another bonus. See, the cases wouldn't drop between sessions, see?

Now, the amount of attention which the PC has turned in on this service facsimile and the disabilities which accompany it, and so forth—the attention that he has on that—also keep him from looking at his bank. I could say that an expert handling of service facsimiles—this is just a wild guess—would probably raise the runability of the case about a hundred to one. You don't actually know how easy a case would be to audit. See, if every case has some of this and it only becomes visible when some cases make it impossible to audit, see, well, how easy is a case to run? Well, we probably don't know the answer to that question.

See, but we know some cases are impossible to run, and those are the ones we have attention on right now. So, you take care of those for me just now, will you please?

Thank you. Thank you.