

EXPANDED DIANETICS AND WORD CLEARING

A lecture given on
7 April 1972.

All right. This is the 7th April '72 and have you got your misunderstood words cleaned up from the last lecture? Are you sure? All right, well that's fine. Then we can proceed with this one.

And this is a specialist Dianetics lecture which is the Graduate Dianetics Course, actually. The first thing I want to talk to you about a little bit is word clearing. It's obvious that a Dianetic specialist would really have to know his business on the subject of word clearing. And that's interesting because word clearing then also contains, if you're going to correct it, you have to know what rudiment actions in order to pick the ruds out bit by bit and run those with R3R. And so it's quite obvious that word clearing is a necessary action.

It's interesting that you and the team are doing very well, and that your word clearing is very good. If they don't have uniform success with word clearing, the auditor's TRs leave something to be desired or his metering or something. And they every once in a while, why, will have a catastrophe on the subject of word clearing which occurs in the middle of a rundown. And then they really have a catastrophe.

And the main difficulty with that is they don't clear the Word Clearing Correction List, and we already have taken this up on the folder line. But if you don't clear the Word Clearing Correction List at the time when there are no flubs in word clearing, then when you get a flub in word clearing you have lost your correction tool.

But this, "Clear the list first", can go a little bit too far. Let us get a situation where a pc is in a screaming ARC break and somebody clears the LIC before he handles the ARC break. Now that came up on the line the other day and I thought, "Well, if that pc had really been ARC broken," - it turned out that the pc had a withhold or something - "but if the pc had really had an ARC break, that would have been it." Because, of course, auditing over the top of an ARC break just pushes a person down and they get sadder and sadder and sadder and sadder. But in general - he got away with it. But if a pc has a serious ARC break in the last session, why, your best bet if you do not have a word cleared LIC, you best bet would be adrift if you had never cleared the word ARC break. So to protect the pc it is quite obvious that at the beginning of his auditing, we had better clear this word "ARC break" and we had better clear this word "present time problem" and we had better clear this word "withhold". Otherwise we'll find ourselves somewhere along the line adrift. And then we would have the proposition of having to spend two hours clearing a list while the pc was nattering about how bad the auditor was. I don't think it would be very easy to do.

So the rudiments would probably be the first thing you would clear. We can make a rule about that and so on. Not that he has one, it's just "Let's do it just in case" so that he suddenly recognizes when you say it what you are asking for.

So word clearing here is of considerable interest and it is, of course, just itself as a technology. And that can be studied in it's own frame of reference.

But where it comes in, in this particular field of specialist Dianetics, is you will find the bulk of the people who have had any difficulty whatsoever have been audited over misunderstood words. And there are two big things that give people a very bad start on auditing. If they don't know the meaning of "how do you do" and "is" and "what" and "did" and a few words like that. And then he's had it because Axiom 28 is violated. You don't have communication so you won't get duplication so therefore they can't do what you said and so on.

Now this is a considerable breakthrough in its own right because I never realized that auditors stopped clearing words in the commands. And I understand now that it dropped out to a marked degree where the auditor would read the command and ask the pc if he understood that, or not even ask the pc that - just read the command, take a word and sail off into the wide blue horizon. He would think he had a reading item when he didn't. He would have a reading misunderstood word. And that in itself would make a great deal of difficulty.

There's probably many a drug addict who does not know the meaning of the word "amphetamine" which is the commoner drug which, of course, they call speed. And somebody told me the other day that it was Benzedrine, which is one of the keep awake drugs of yesteryear, and that say that is an amphetamine. I don't believe that. But in any event you understand just with the words I was using these are just the names of drugs. Well, you can imagine this 10 year old kid - I think that's when they start on drugs now or is it 8? This 10 year old kid or 8 year old kid you ask him now, "When were you on amphetamines?" or "Were you on Benadryl or Benzedrine, now which were you on?" and you get a read and you say "Ah ha!". But he's never heard of this stuff. See, actually he was on LSD but he's never heard of it as LSD anyhow. That's acid.

And actually not even the news papers reporters know the name of the stuff because they keep calling it LSD and LSD isn't, isn't its name. It's LSD 25 if you want to be very purist about it.

So you can imagine taking this drug addict who's already all fogged up on drugs - should carry a little foghorn on his shoulder when he's walking down the street. And what do you find? You wouldn't know anything about it because he didn't know anything about it.

Now how you would get over that point is you would have to clear up with him what drugs he was on. You couldn't take a canned list of drugs and expect very much action because he would require some sort of an education on the subject of chemistry. So what did they call these things? You can probably identify them from such things as acid. "I was on acid, kid, you know. I was on acid, you know." They don't even know what the hell, you talk about the stupidity of things. It's absolutely marvelous, you know.

I was tracing this back intelligence wise and it is the perfect intelligence drug—very very simple to make, a few kitchen utensils. And probably originated in Germany. And it is probably an intelligence drug of some type or other. Terribly cheap and then drives a person stark staring mad. And these dumb yips are actually taking this stuff.

A girl was, gruesome tales occur on that drug, very gruesome. A girl got a scratch on the back of her hand, wasn't bleeding very much, took it to a doctor. Ah, it was all right, he let her go. And it, hand got to swelling up but it was just a little scratch. And all of a sudden her hand swelled up and she got gangrene, which is just rotting flesh, and they had to amputate her hand and arm. She was on LSD which basically is a drug called ergo or ergot which is used to constrict the blood vessels so that blood won't circulate. And if anybody gets any kind of a whee out of LSD, that would be quite remarkable because it is simply they don't get any blood in their brain and that must be the whole kick. It's pretty marvelous, see.

So now you're busy auditing somebody who doesn't really know he has been on this, and you ask him if he's ever been on that. You might get a read on it. But he's liable to run something else or not know what you're talking about.

I probably should clarify something here a little bit. The reason why the scratch infected is all the time when she scratched her hand. And all the time she was on LSD which contains ergot, which is the constriction lysergic acid. It constricts all the blood vessels and the arteries and so on. So there couldn't be any blood get to it and it wouldn't circulate, no blood circulate and it wouldn't heal. So the doctor took his finger off his number on that one.

So this would make quite an interesting engram of some kind or another if you were to run it on somebody. She wouldn't know the word ergot, she wouldn't know the word LSD 25, she

wouldn't know LSD, she wouldn't know lysergic acid. And maybe they called it something locally. Maybe they didn't even call it acid.

So it is the pc's nomenclature. Now the pc isn't really likely to use words he doesn't know the meaning of when he's giving you some kind of an item. He isn't likely to. It would be possible but not necessarily true. So you don't have to clear the item list.

I noticed there was somebody clearing an item list and this, useless. Why clear the item list?

Now it would work the same way with a drug list so that you wouldn't really want a canned list. Or you need to know what I mean by a canned list—one that has been pre-prepared and issued. You really wouldn't want that. But he might not know the meaning of the word drug and I notice that people occasionally will have been on some awful medicine of some kind or another. You know, like there is a medicine puts people to sleep called bromine. And this doctor was simply giving her these tranquilizers and it was just bromine, and they don't give it to you as a drug. And then people who have epilepsy, which is a type of disease which gives them seizures, are almost always found on some minor drug that prevents them from getting these—they call them petit mal seizures. That's epilepsy. I don't care how they call it. Sometimes they really seize and sometimes it's just slight.

One of those, if an epileptic ever took you by the hand and so forth, he's liable to break every bone in your hand, if he suddenly had a seizure. But the doctors keep them on something to prevent this. It's just a tranquilizer and they keep them on that one year, year in and year out. And then you come along as an auditor and you try to audit the pc and you tell the pc that he'll have to go off that drug. And then all of a sudden, why something will happen from someplace or another that the pc will tell the doctor that they have been taken off the drug by the auditor. And the doctor will call up plaintively asking you to please put her back on the drug because she needs this. And you get into a collision between medical treatment and so on.

Now I've been using a lot of medical words here or chemical words really. Just don't pay any attention to them because they're mostly gobbledygook, and there's an awful lot of gobbledygook words. Gobbledygook just means nonsense chatter, you see. There's an awful lot of them.

I remember in ancient Greece trying to disentangle Latin names for diseases into the Greek and Greek's names for the same diseases. And then the Greeks telling you they had certain diseases when they were speaking a dialect nobody else spoke and it gets pretty gobbledygook.

So actually then, what do you clear? Do you see? You could find yourself starting to give somebody a total college education in chemistry or medicine.

Now Mary Sue's brother, who is a radiologist, an X-ray doctor. He actually was in the Navy and he specialized in this field and he came out and he's down in Texas or someplace now. He was talking to Mary Sue not too long ago when she was over in the States, and he said, "But you can't get",—he's very disgusted with the patients. He's done his internship and all that but he's very disgusted with patients because they can't tell you what's wrong. And you ask them and you ask them and you ask them and they can't tell you what's wrong and they come in and they can't tell you what's wrong. And they tell you some of the, they just don't talk to you see and so on. And I've been on the verge of sending him one of these little put-together dolls which is plastic, you know. They're about 11" tall, something like that, and they have all the organs inside of them so that his patients could point to them and say, "This is where I hurt," you know, and he would get someplace with it.

But you cannot expect somebody to say to you, "Well, I have been taking 2cc of morphine, I've been using a dirty needle, and originally I was being given an injection in the "gluteus maximus"—meaning his butt. "But now it is all in the biceps." He comes in and he says, "I got a concrete arm," see. It means he's injected himself so much in the arm that the arm has gone solid to the touch or something like that. You might expect him to say something like that but

the chances are he won't. And the chances are he will just simply sit there and expect you to do something magical without his volunteering a thing. But what he will volunteer he has tremendous interest on. And that is a technical datum.

Now what blows down is what is really real to him. And what he volunteers will usually read and blow down. So that although you have to word clear correction lists, clearing the pc's own list is not necessary. But that isn't the real problem. The real problem is getting him to make one. There is a person on these lines who has had murder, rape, death, who has been audited for years and has never mentioned these; death of people around her, perversion in the family, the wildest family background you ever heard of. The pc's not been intensively on my lines. In other words, I haven't been C/Sing this pc or I would have. But this person was sort of going downhill and so I got interested in this folder, and I took a look at it. And the information isn't there. The information is on a rumor line. I started getting it into the folder. But that information came in on a rumor line.

This pc as far as I know, it could be wrong, maybe, that I didn't check the folder. I haven't gone exhaustively through the folder—but just looking at the pc's condition. This hair-raising existence she led is not part of any list, not part of any white form, not part of any record. And 1/100th of it would be enough to send somebody around the bend.

Now hold your hat—she was also a psychiatric nurse. Suffering god, and you've been trying to audit that with all kinds of upper level processes and everything else but nobody ever got to the nitty-gritty, meaning the important core of the case.

So therefore your success will enormously depend upon your ability to sniff out the real hot dope. If the medical doctor thinks he has trouble on this, think of trying to pull a withhold on somebody who was cheating on her husband for 39 years and keeping him from ever knowing anything about it—with his best friend.

Now, I've mentioned the case before, is the dear little old lady that would never give up any withholds and had never done anything until we suddenly started going at it this way; "Did you murder somebody?", "Did you poison people?", "Have you robbed banks?" She's sitting there with a little flower in her hat, dear little person with mittens on, don't you see and . . . That's really taking the long way around. And of course it came up, "Oh, I didn't do any of those things. All I did was . . ." and there it was and that was that.

Now you're not necessarily going to be running much in the way of ruds. But I'm giving you the basis of why people don't talk. So therefore chains of things they have withheld, that is to say, times of withholding and so forth, will get you quite a bit of information. But it will also pull out from underneath the case one of the basic, the basic chains that are keeping them very pinned down.

So the case that doesn't talk to you is, normally speaking, the normal case. I mean, the case that you bring on off the street, why, he has all kinds of ideas, like certain people shouldn't inquire into certain privacies. And nobody should know anything about anybody. In fact, here is a book that was just put out, and one of our people just sent it in to me, and it's just been published by the University of Michigan press. And the name of it is—it's a pocketbook, probably all over the US newsstands right now—and it's the Assault on Privacy, computers, data banks and dossiers. Quote, "What misuse of computers is doing and can do to individual freedoms—a warning of a new form of human slavery", unquote. Now that's by Ralph Nader, by the way.

So if a smart guy like that can propagandize against the exchange of information, why then there must be something wrong with giving up information. Now to run consequences in Dianetics would find you doing what? Running the back end of the engram, you would never get the beginning of the engram. If you can't get to the beginning of the engram, you won't get to the beginning of the chain and the TA will go up like mad.

So let's have an item—"being scared after battles". Now that's pretty obvious that every one of those you ran, see, that's pretty obvious, isn't it, every one of those you ran, of course, has got a battle as the beginning of it. There he is, he's got, he says, "I have this somatic in my shoulder," and so on. And you say, "What is the item?" "Well, it's being scared after a battle." You're going to grind a long, long time and you're not going to get that somatic in his shoulder or anything else because it didn't occur. There was such an item run a year or so ago and it was "running away from a battle". That's marvelous when you come right down to it, see. Now that is an invitation to run the back end of the engram, and I must warn you about this because it will give you sudden and then weird high TAs.

So you actually shouldn't run a withhold as a chain. Why? It's after the incident. But you could run all the overts you wanted to and all the motivators you wanted to because you would get the withhold. But he isn't going to tell you the overt because he's withholding it. Do you see what goes on here?

So you can get an "out of communication-ness" with the pc. And there'd be certain chains will remain seized up in the bank which nobody has touched. So this person has gone on for a long time and he has all these chains that have never been touched and never been run, and by preference he runs other chains. And that is just a case of the pc who won't talk.

You have such a pc, you're auditing him right now. He's on the lines. He's run the same thing seven times he said, I mean. Well, he's an engram specialist, do you follow? He specializes in one chain. You got it.

Why? Because there's something very wrong with the way he's been audited and the way he's been talking to auditors, and there's something very wrong with his track, and there's something very wrong in all directions. And whenever you see this kind of thing you say, "There is something VERY wrong." And the first thing you can select out is there may be something wrong with his PT environment. And the next thing you can select out is maybe there was something wrong with his auditing. And the next thing you can select out is maybe he has just been avoiding running. Because when a fellow tells you he's run the same thing seven times and it isn't gone yet, well, he's certainly avoiding something.

Now you could say right away, "Well, you could run 'avoiding', you know." Now I do want to call to your attention—that's not the right answer. I do want to call to your, I'll give it to you in a minute, but I do want to call to your attention, just to close off this other subject—watch these after the fact things. Because you'll be sitting there, "Help, the TA has now gone to 6.5." And then all of a sudden the wrong time to realize that is you're running "finished". Seemed like a good item at the time, "a time you were finished." That was pretty good.

It comes under the same rules as interiorization and you should have a familiarity with interiorization processing. And the thing which cracks the back of interiorization is when the fellow goes out of something he must have gone into it. So you have to run going into it. Now the Interiorization Rundown has been under overhaul and I should give you this one too because you're doing word clearing.

Interiorization Rundown, you'll find yourself being called upon to do an Int/Ext Correction List every time you see interiorization read on a Word Clearing Correction form. Now it's there for a purpose. But it worries people because it reads. Now it can go out from day to day and some people, particularly C/Ses, become frantic and they handle it and handle it and handle it and handle it and they worry and worry and worry.

Now there was something wrong with the original Interiorization Rundown. Flow 1 was what you call "permissive" or "general". It permitted the pc to go in any direction. So Flow 1 was often some other kind of a flow. So the flow situation is "put in". Flow 0 is "went in". So you can run the flows wrong. And if you're correcting one of these things the fastest thing to do is just to, if the guy's in a heck of a lot of mass and all that sort of thing and you're trying to

straighten it out is this wrong flow situation. Because there was a missing flow “put in” a time you were “put in”.

And that’s what they’re all afraid of—going to jail. Do you see it? Now you can even figure out they were put in this universe. So there’s a missing flow. That is actually the flow 1. So the original issues on the thing was perfectly valid and it works but sometimes when it has to be corrected and corrected and corrected and corrected nobody really asks this burning question. This really can be a missing chain called “put in” and it will probably be corrected and the Int pack will be corrected and so forth on this. We usually don’t correct things unless we’re having a lot of trouble with them. They’re having a little trouble with this in the field but that isn’t the trouble with it. The trouble is they just don’t run 1 to 9. A to D and they say . . . Now here’s the main trouble with it is they’ve never got the word defined. It’s a brain cracking word.

So if the word has never been well cleared on a Word Clearing Correction List it will continue to read. Now you just had one come through where it did read and you were going to do an Int/Ext. Well now the test is simply this: TA was not misbehaving. Only do an Int Ext correction list when you’ve got a TA misbehavior—too high or really too low. You see that?

Now you call separate out a tremendous amount if you just recognize and remember; don’t go panic on Interiorization read. Don’t panic on it the hell with it. TA wasn’t high. Now Interiorization is only run to cure a high TA. It is not run to exteriorize somebody. So therefore if the TA wasn’t high you have a no situation. So Int read, two way comm, so forth, “How do you feel about interiorization?” “Do you understand what the word means?”. You don’t ask them one after the other “How do you feel about interiorization?” Yap yap yap yap yap yap yap yap yap yap F/N. So that’s it. That takes a weight off of your shoulders.

And the other one is if just “waffle, waffle...(etc.)” “Give me a definition for it”. And he’ll say, “Well, I just never knew that”. And get him to define it and it’ll stop reading.

So those, those, that point is something you should know something about. Thank you very much.

END OF TAPE