

ALL POSSIBLE ABERRATIONS

A lecture given on
4 June 1951

During the writing and publication stages of Science of Survival, Ron continued his researches into new theory and techniques. On 4 June 1951, Ron released to the students on the Professional Course a new system of Straightwire involving the affinity, reality and communication interactions of the eight dynamics. This new system became the basis on which several other new techniques of processing were built. It provided, for an auditor versed in its use, a method of computing all the possible aberrations a person can have, as well as all possible pleasure moments. This lecture was transcribed in 1951 and published in a condensed form in the first Supplement to Science of Survival, and was later reissued in the Technical Bulletins of Dianetics and Scientology, Volume I, page 157.

A New Development of Straightwire

A graphic representation of what aberration is would be valuable, particularly if it could be seen to contain all possible aberrations. What I am going to give you here is a description and graphic representation of all possible combinations of aberration based on the eight dynamics. This is not a terribly technical subject, actually, or a very technical representation.

Let us begin with the fact that we can call the urge toward survival a dynamic. That is the central dynamic; that is the dynamic. That is the urge toward survival of the individual.

As that urge becomes enturbulated or influenced by outside forces it is either suppressed or it is alloyed with other people's purposes; that is to say, other people force their purposes on the individual. Either way, the dynamic itself becomes to some slight degree enturbulated.

As the survival dynamic is cut back or as it is entered or acted upon by other influences—other dynamics, suppressors, or other people and the regular suppressors of life, such as the absence of food, clothing and shelter and so on—this dynamic can become more and more enturbulated until it is headed toward succumb, exactly in the opposite direction. Now, as this dynamic (which means survive, the urge toward survival) becomes enturbulated, it can actually be impinged upon by other forces until it is pretty messy, and when it gets thoroughly and completely enturbulated it starts going down toward death. It succumbs.

This dynamic goes toward death, or succumb, in the exact ratio that it is enturbulated, and it goes toward survival in the exact ratio that it is clean and clear. The ratio of enturbulation of the urge toward survival can be graphed on the tone scale. The dynamic starts out clear and unalloyed, and then we could graph it as becoming enturbulated or interfered with. As some of that dynamic becomes enturbulated, it will actually start to force the rest of it down. It gets a lot more enturbulated as other forces enter in, and finally when the whole thing is enturbulated we have death.

This is very simple; if anything it can be overcomplicated. It is just a simple graphic representation of the urge of the individual or the urge of the group to survive—any living organism, a group being a living organism.

Now, that is regarding it just as one dynamic. But if we were to put a big magnifying glass on this dynamic, we would find that we had not one but eight of these dynamics. So this main dynamic is subdivided for our purposes into eight parts; it has actually eight dynamics.

This is all in the original book, by the way, and the rest of these dynamics have been known and numbered all this time, but they were not needed much for individual processing at the time they were brought out, so we only gave you four dynamics. There are actually eight of them. The first of these dynamics would be self, the individual.

Number two we call sex, and the product is children.

Number three is groups.

Number four is man—all men as a species. That is the urge toward survival of all men as a species.

And number five, which is life, would include any form of life or just the fact of life and its existence.

The sixth we can call MEST—the physical universe. We have matter, energy, space and time, and we take the first letter of each word and we call that MESS. That is the dynamic of the physical universe. Man's affinity for or urge toward the physical universe is the sixth dynamic.

The seventh one is Theta—you might say the Theta universe, the universe of thought, whatever thought is. That could also include man as a spiritual being.

We add the eighth on that because man has agreed for an awfully long time that something created this universe. This doesn't work out quite so well if you don't include the eighth dynamic, which would be the dynamic of the Creator. That would be God. There are many ways to consider this. You could consider that God created the physical universe and he created the Theta universe.

So we have the Theta part of the dynamic and we have the physical universe part of the dynamic, then all life, and so on. Those are the eight dynamics.

Now, just to review that rapidly, the first dynamic would be man's urge toward survival for himself as an organism. In the past, many therapies and philosophies were worked out on the basis that each man was a self-centered entity and everything was done by him out of a motivation of selfishness and so forth, and therefore there was only the first dynamic. This egocentric representation displayed the aberration of the philosopher who was dealing in it, because it doesn't work out well. You have to make a tremendous number of postulates and curves in order to get everything to fit so that man is rewarded for himself for permitting a group to survive and for permitting man to survive and so on. It is very clumsy to handle that way. Obviously there must be some other dynamic.

So there is the second dynamic: man's urge toward survival as a future generation. On the first dynamic he is an individual, but by sex—procreation—he creates other individuals and future generations. This is an urge toward survival through children.

People in the past have thought up a lot of therapies and a lot of philosophies that dealt exclusively with the second dynamic and said that everything and every motive man has of whatever kind, no matter how faint that motive is and so on, is attributable solely to sex!

There was a large group of therapists and philosophers who dealt with this, but with the changing times and the advance of science this group decayed. And because it said everything is attributable to sex and therefore sex must be evil somehow, those people did not procreate, so they are not with us anymore. That was Manichaeus, and I think that philosophy came up into the third and fourth centuries; it was seen spottily around Europe for the next seventeen hundred years. As a matter of fact, it still sits in the society in the guise of Freud's libido theory.

I wonder a little bit at the individual who says everything is attributable to sex—the second dynamic. This is certainly as strange as saying everything is attributable to the first dynamic.

Then there was a fellow by the name of Marx. Several other people like him came along and they said, "We are going to button this all up and put this in one big package and throw it down people's throats if possible, and this package says that the only thing important is the group!"

Second dynamic—no. First dynamic—to the devil with the first dynamic! Put them in concentration camps! Shoot them! Civil rights—ha! The third dynamic is what is important! The state! The group! Now we're going to have communism." This is the whole philosophy.

Today we have whole nations operating on this philosophy that says the only thing existing is a third dynamic. They do a beautiful job of working out everything in terms of the third dynamic, but I think it leads to a somewhat unbalanced society where the individual has no importance and where the future generation really has no importance: "It is all taken care of by Lysenkoism or something anyway, so you don't ever need to worry about that. Marriage is unimportant; the state should raise all the children; love should be free; divorce should be procurable on the afternoon of the day on which one got married." This all comes out of the fact that they are concentrating solely upon the third dynamic.

Now, I am sure there exists a philosophy and a therapy which says everything is attributable to man—the fourth dynamic—that nations and groups and subgroups should not exist, that only one group should exist and that is man. There is one group like this in California which says "It is all man," and that the only urge is to survive as a species, not as a subgroup.

On each one of these things, we are talking about the urge on the part of the individual to survive—as, one, self; two, future generations; three, a part of a group, with the individual himself furnishing this motivation; and four, a species, man.

Now we get up here to five, and we get the urge on the part of the individual to survive as life and to cause all life to survive. For instance, people make duck preserves—and some women even raise Pekinese dogs! This thing could go to the most extraordinary lengths.

You find a whole group in India which is sold on the idea that the fifth dynamic is the thing and that all there is, is the fifth dynamic. They wouldn't even step on a cockroach if it was walking across the sidewalk, because this cockroach is life. They are surviving as life, and the only thing that is fit to survive is a life form, and life forms should never at any time be subdivided into any lesser thing than just life. You don't subdivide it into men and dogs and sheep; it is just life—the fifth dynamic.

When we get out to the sixth dynamic, we have the capitalist. He believes all that is important is MEST: "Can I see it? Can I feel it? Can I measure it? If I can it exists!"

And this is not just the capitalist; you will find this idea, I am afraid, in every scientific laboratory today. They are sold on the idea of mud to man, that man is the physical universe: "Man exists solely by virtue of the fact that some mud got animated one day, and we are all part of this mud. There was an ammonia sea, and by some fortuitous circumstance certain chemical compounds all got together, and the first thing you know, there was life and then there was man. And we are just mud anyway, and what I believe in is the physical universe. And if you don't like it, you can lump it!"

They haven't gone anywhere in being able to handle or control the thought of man. They came up on the subject of the physical universe: they invented an atom bomb, they use Boyle's Law and they can make tractors and everything is just fine. They can control an atom bomb up to the point where when they push a button it will go off, but they can't control the thumb that pushes the button.

The mud-to-man theory has been applicable solely to mud! Here we have a whole world and a therapy and a cult and everything else. For instance (all due respect to medicine today), medicine is mostly based on the idea that everything is structure, and structure controls function.

One doctor in Kansas City, while I was lecturing up there, had a dreadful time with this. He finally came up to me after three days, looking awfully beaten, and said, "I've listened to you for three days and I've read quite a bit of your book. I was taught for about twenty-three years

that structure controlled function, but in the last three days I have seen that function must control structure; therefore I am on your side. I'll probably be executed tomorrow morning by the AMA, but that's all right!"

This is a complete reversal, the idea of function controlling structure.

Next we get the seventh dynamic. Now, that is labeled the seventh dynamic just because it happens to fall along the line as we go, but actually it is interesting that, coincidental with it, the number seven has a great many magical, spiritual and occult connotations. I was checking these dynamics off one day, one after the other, and when I found out which one was seven, I tried to reverse it in some way to get off this old saw. But it insisted on staying seven!

The seventh dynamic, then, we call Theta. That would be the urge to survive as thought, as Theta, whatever Theta is. Some day I hope to be able to put my finger on a button and start a flow of Theta from one point to another point and measure it as it goes.

Theta works out well as a theory. It postulates excellently, and furthermore it has the agreement of the last fifty thousand years of human thinking, whereas the mud-to-man theory has just the agreement of the last hundred years, if that, on the part of a very few people. So working out Theta as a dynamic and looking at it as a dynamic, the rest of these postulates work out to a point where we can control, regulate and deaberrate human beings rather rapidly.

We consider, then, that Theta plus MEST equals life. Theta, the energy of thought, which comes from the Theta universe (it doesn't matter whether you postulate it as coming from a divine creator or from a battery sitting up in the sky or anything else) is just an energy, but it is definitely not physical universe energy.

And then we get dynamic number eight, and we put number eight down there because as it goes up along the line it sort of looks like there ought to be a number eight. For a long time a lot of people have been talking about and fighting for and dying because of the eighth dynamic. As a matter of fact, every Sunday morning people go down to church to express their belief in the fact that the universe was created.

The Greek, three thousand years ago, was talking about the Prime Mover Unmoved. Every time you get into this problem you have to go someplace to find out where the physical universe was created. So we postulate a Prime Mover Unmoved; there is a Creator. I am not talking out of my own opinions now. It looks to me sometimes, the older I live and the more times that I have close shaves and so forth, as though there certainly must be a devil looking down the back of my neck. And sometimes I look up and find out I am beyond draft age and that the navy has accepted my resignation (as of about a year ago), and I then believe in the fact that there must be some divine being who oversees our destinies.

So there are your eight dynamics; they all come out of this single dynamic.

Now, the same thing that happens to the main dynamic can happen to any one of these subdivisions of the main dynamic. You could conceive of this main dynamic as being hit by suppressive forces, being told that it can't survive, being harshly used in various ways and becoming enturbulated, changing polarity and reducing down on the tone scale, having less strength toward survival and actually gathering strength toward death. If this can happen on the main one, then because these eight are the component parts of it, what would hit any of these dynamics individually would do exactly the same thing to it.

In most people we do not have a uniform suppression of all the dynamics as represented in this central one; we have them selectively aberrated. For instance, we can have somebody with his second dynamic pretty well out, his fourth dynamic practically nonexistent and the rest of them functioning all right, and he will get by. He could even have half of the first, half of the second, half of the third and all of the fourth completely gone and still pass for "normal."

So this is what happens in the aberration of an individual: He has the urge toward survival as an individual on each one of these lines. Life comes along and selectively suppresses them one after the other and we get a changed pattern of survival.

For instance, this fellow all of a sudden is afraid to own anything. This means that he is pretty well gone on the sixth dynamic. Another person does not believe that there is any divinity or that he has any power, or he thinks he isn't really part of any other form of life. He is pretty well gone on the seventh dynamic. In other words, a standard scientist of today, who is continually denying in himself anything but MEST and is considering himself MEST continually, is actually pretty well knocked out on the seventh dynamic. If you don't believe this, start talking to these people and start picking up the times they have been taught this, and you will see them get saner. That is the test.

Now, the suppression on any of these dynamics can happen in two ways. The first is something that simply inhibits the dynamic. It says "No," it just cuts the dynamic off.

For example, a person has been told continually since he was a little child that he is worth nothing, that he is no good, that he will never be able to do anything, so the first thing you know, he is way down on the first dynamic; he is badly enturbulated. You could carry this on with a constant bombast of him to a point where it would practically knock out the first dynamic. But it wouldn't be knocked out, it would have changed polarity and it starts heading for death. As an individual, then, this person is liable to commit suicide.

But if he is very strong on the third dynamic he will live for the group. He makes a pretty good private soldier: he is no good as himself; he lives for the group. He makes a pretty good communist: he is no good for himself; it's all for the group. He, unfortunately, is usually the fellow who will needlessly sacrifice his own life for the group; he is high on the third dynamic and low on the first.

So you have this suppressive type of influence. This person gets pretty well suppressed on the first dynamic, so he starts carrying along on other dynamics. People looking at this think that the first dynamic has gone over sideways and run into some other channel and they talk about "sublimation," but that doesn't hold up well as a theory. If you cut out one dynamic another one gets more visible.

There is another way that a dynamic can be foreshortened or enturbulated. That first one is inhibit: "You are no good. You will never amount to anything," and so forth. The other one is enforce: "You've got to be a good boy! You have got to amount to something. We expect you to be a credit to your family!" After a while you see, for instance, some poor girl who, all of her life, has been expected to be a great credit to her family and at the age of twenty-two or twenty-three is very sad and somehow or other just can't do anything. But she has always had encouragement; her family was always nice to her, she went to the very best schools, nobody was ever mean or tried to blunt her impulses. When she was in kindergarten she would get out a box of crayons and she would do some kind of a drawing that any kid in kindergarten could do, and Mama would say, "Aha! Undoubtedly you will be a great painter. Now you must work hard at that and you will be a great painter someday. You are going to be a great painter, aren't you, dear? You want to be a credit to your family."

This is interference. Mama is entering her own dynamics into that child with the resultant blunting of the child's dynamic. You could call that enforce.

Actually, that word is not too good because enforce sounds like it would make the dynamic stronger—an enforced dynamic. But people try to force this dynamic into some channel or force it to be something and the dynamic enturbulates. Or they inhibit it from doing something and it enturbulates. Either way, what we are really dealing with, then, is a spectrum: when inhibited it is off, and when enforced it is on too thoroughly. Where we want this dynamic to be riding is on the middle band. We want it neither chopped off nor forced into doing something it wouldn't ordinarily have done.

That is the primary principle of self-determinism: The individual must be able to determine his own destiny in his environment to its utmost; he has to be able to do this. Of course, nobody can be one hundred percent self-determined because the environment modifies it. For instance, if a person is being one hundred percent self-determined and he says, "I am going to eat eight quarts of strawberries every day," that is disagreeing with his environment, and I am sure it would disagree with his stomach. An environment, then, very definitely has a limitation on one's self-determinism, but one should be able to live up to that self-determinism.

In Europe they talk a lot about liberty, but the environment in which they are living has been so consistently suppressive for so long on both the third dynamic and the first dynamic that they wouldn't quite know how far they could go as self-determined individuals—particularly politically—and as a result, their level of self-determinism or their concept of what self-determinism should be would fall short of ours. We have been permitted to go quite a bit further as self-determined individuals. So self-determinism is a relative state of being. But the individual who is rationally facing his environment must be permitted to be as self-determined as possible along all of his dynamics.

You find out that people who are rational are very easy to live with, they are easy to have in a group, they are very productive, they get along well in their environment, they handle their MEST well and so on. This is self-determinism adjudicated against the environment.

The first thing, then, that gets destroyed or aberrated is self-determinism. Self-determinism and the urge toward survival are almost the same thing, and anything that aberrates this urge toward survival is going to aberrate the individual's self-determinism.

That is the first form of aberration. But how many manifestations does that have?

To answer that, we have to go into the component parts of Theta. Theta is not electrical energy. It may be that Theta will respond along a parallel of electromagnetic waves; in other words, you might be able to measure a Theta flow by electromagnetic instruments. But it does something and it has something that electricity and other types of physical universe energy don't.

Theta is composed of three parts; there are three things in Theta. One of them is affinity, one of them is reality and one is communication.

Theta has to stay in affinity with Theta. It identifies itself with other Theta. As for reality, it has to have some agreement with other Theta in its vicinity as to what reality is, and it has to be in agreement with itself. Furthermore, it has to be able to communicate.

In the physical universe we have laws of matter which are somewhat comparable to this; matter is cohesive, and the material universe matter sort of agrees with itself one way or the other. But these laws are not at all the same as those of Theta.

Life force has these three factors of affinity, reality and communication. Those things run sort of parallel. All three of them make understanding, or comprehension. Comprehension, understanding, thought, computation, education—all of these depend on affinity, reality and communication.

You can take affinity, reality and communication and actually derive mathematics with them. At no point are you left adrift. And a mathematics which doesn't fit into all three of them is no good at all.

Now, an individual with a full urge toward survival is in full affinity, he has a full agreement with the reality of the physical universe and he is in good communication.

By the way, the basic communications are sight, sound, smell—the communication of the individual with the physical universe.

ARC is a very handy thing to know about. For instance, a person has no sonic, but you can't find out who used to tell him to shut up or that he couldn't hear or something. You are wasting your time going on worrying about phrases that shut off this person's sonic. The chances are his affinity is off, and if one goes off the other two will go down. You turn on a person's sonic by raising his affinity, or you turn on his affinity and communication by raising his reality. In other words, you have three interdependent factors; you cannot suppress one without suppressing the other two, and you cannot lift one without lifting the other two.

For example, some fellows wife leaves him and his sonic goes off. Or somebody disagrees with him or he finds out that his theories of how he was living his life are in violent disagreement with what suddenly turns out to be actual, and his sense of reality will go off. The first thing you know, he won't like people quite as well. These three things are apparently entirely foreign to each other, but they aren't. If you suppress reality, affinity and communication will go down.

If you tell a person continually "I didn't hear you. What did you say?" "Nobody understands what you're talking about. You should phrase things differently," and so on, the first thing you know, he doesn't like you. That is a direct application. But the horrible part of it is that he isn't in as close an affinity with the rest of the universe either. As far as his reality is concerned, if you start telling him things like that he will start disagreeing with you.

It is odd, but he starts disagreeing with you on the subject of, for instance, trout fishing. You keep telling him that his hearing isn't so good or that he didn't understand what you said, and that he should speak up or express himself a little more clearly or differently, and then when you get into a talk with him about trout fishing you will find out he will wildly disagree. He will even disagree to the point where he will betray some of his own actual beliefs about trout fishing in order to argue with you. You say, "I like to trout-fish and I generally use a rod."

So he says, "A rod is no good. A string and a bent pin and a worm are much better." He doesn't believe this at all; he sees that he has to argue with you. In other words, you have cut down his reality, so his reality comes back that way; furthermore, his affinity is cut down and he won't like you.

But just as life begins to suppress the communication of this individual, so does the ability of the individual to express or feel affinity and to agree or recognize the reality of existence go off.

So this thing is a triangle of A, R and C. (It doesn't matter what order you put them in.) And if you were drawing a tone scale the way the tone scale ought to look, then you would draw it as a stack of these triangles representing the tones from 0 to 4.

That is actually what the big vector—the big dynamic that says "Survive!"—looks like. It expands out into a tone scale.

Now, if you cut down an individual on reality he will go down the tone scale; his affinity will drop too, and so will his communication.

If you want to turn on a person's sonic, start picking up affinity breaks or affinity enforcement's. These are the two sides to this: "You don't love anybody" and "You've got to love people." Both of them are enturbulating to the dynamic because they push it out of its natural shape and enturbulate it—in other words, interrupt or interfere with the self-determinism or the rationality of the individual. "You must love people," "You have to love your mother. If you don't I'll beat your darned little ears off!" and so on—these things are thoroughly aberrative. He is being forced out of his line of self determinism. When we pick up those breaks we find out that this person all of a sudden starts to have a better concept of reality, and furthermore, his communication will pick up.

It is actually true that after you have broken a lot of locks—enforced and inhibited locks on affinity—the world looks and sounds brighter to the individual; it actually does. If you could measure how many quantum's of light or something he was recording, you would find out he would be recording more after you had picked up affinity breaks. Furthermore, pick up all of those times when the individual was forced to agree with things he would not have agreed with and pick up all the times when he was made to disagree or kept from agreeing, and the first thing you know, his affinity will come up. Strangely enough, he will be more fond of his children, for instance, or something of the sort.

In other words, affinity, reality and communication are the three component parts of this big dynamic I just told you about.

Now, that big dynamic breaks down into eight dynamics, and each one of those is three-cornered. The first dynamic is an urge toward survival for the self, and this urge is in terms of ARC. There is the affinity one feels for oneself. How many people do you know who go around invalidating themselves to themselves?

Robert Louis Stevenson wrote a very sweet line; it is on a statue of him in San Francisco. It says, in effect, that one of the first things a man must learn is how to be a good friend to himself. Very few people have ever learned that, because we are taught, particularly in this culture, that we really ought to despise ourselves a little bit. We are continually making mock of ourselves actually in public. For instance, a fellow knows he is the best golfer that has ever stepped on the local golf links. There are two ways that he could handle it that would be aberrated: He could go around and pound himself on the chest, shake his clubs and say, "I am the best golfer, and anybody who challenges this . . ." or he could say, "Oh, I'm not so good." Both of them are lies.

The fact is that man cannot live without accurate data or unless he is supplying accurate data. But everybody is sort of trained in this society to be very upset about anybody who properly evaluates himself. This is highly aberrative on the first dynamic. And there is the first ARC break: Don't evaluate yourself properly; go around and eat humble pie. Go around and tell people that you can't do the things you can do, and the first thing you know, you will wind up by telling people that you can do things you can't do. It will reverse itself on you.

Have you ever heard a fellow going around disagreeing with himself? For instance, he feels tired; he knows he ought to go to sleep but he says, "I ought to be strong today" and he goes out and plays eighteen holes of golf, which he shouldn't do. He is "mastering himself." He has to be inuictus or something. He is in disagreement with himself continually.

However, when a man who is living fairly well in harmony with himself is tired, he goes to sleep. Some people would hardly be able to understand how this could be.

You have heard of people talking to themselves. That is an aberration of communication—a bad one. There is something there on the first dynamic which enforces communication with oneself. A person shouldn't have to communicate with himself, because he is himself.

Then there is the person who never even thinks pleasant thoughts or thinks up pleasant futures or anything; this fellow is just cut off on communication with himself.

Dub-in could be a manifestation of enforced communication with oneself, and shut-off sonic could be simply being out of communication with oneself, just to that degree. That is how those two things work.

I hope this has all been very simple so far because now I am going to give you something a little more complex. This is the plot of the set of all possible aberrations for all eight dynamics.

We have here the combinations of affinity, reality and communication for each dynamic. Up at the top are the ARC vectors for each dynamic, and at the bottom is a series of triangles forming the tone scale for any one dynamic.

An auditor who has this can plot any kind of an aberration that anybody might possibly have. As far as I know, there are no aberrations which are not included in this system.

Out of this system can be practiced something which we call Dynamic Straightwire. Dynamic Straightwire is the next advance above Hurdy-Gurdy Straightwire. Hurdy-Gurdy is the process in Science of Survival whereby you apply the ARC triangle to every individual in the preclear's life, to find where ARC has been enforced and inhibited. This is a very handy little system by which you check up on affinity, communication and reality breaks on the part of various people—where these people have enforced ARC upon the individual or inhibited ARC for the individual—and it is a fine way of picking up hordes of locks that you might otherwise miss. But this Dynamic Straightwire is about ten times as good.

There are eight dynamics. Each dynamic is an ARC triangle, as I have just described to you. Any seven may suppress or aberratively enforce the remaining one in any person. That is the central law we are going on here. Any one of these dynamics or any of the subjects of these dynamics may suppress or aberratively enforce any other dynamic in any person.

We also have the fact that both suppression and enforcement shorten the dynamic on the tone scale. In other words, either too much, or none, or too little (inhibitive) will send the individual down the tone scale slightly.

In addition to this, affinity, reality and communication, all together, form comprehension—understanding. So we have enforced reason and understanding and inhibited reason and understanding as forces which suppress all three at once. Probably the most aberrative thing that you can say is “You’ve got to understand this!” or “You can’t understand it!” That grabs A, R and C, all three parts, at the same time. You get affinity, reality and communication simultaneously when you start talking about “You’re dumb!” or “You have got to be bright, dear.” When you start talking in these terms, you actually do things to each one of the three. That has to do with a person’s ability to compute and so on.

I would say that you could measure the aberration of a society very easily by finding out how much the individuals in that society talk to other individuals about how dumb the other individuals are or how bright they have to be. One of our prime slang expressions is the hurling of the epithet of stupid, stupidity, and so forth. But I know other societies that do it much worse and much more artistically, and those societies are far more aberrated than this one. This would be the master aberration, then.

Now, the way this system works is you take one of these dynamics and put it down in the lower section. We are going to measure how many suppressions there are in the individual on, for instance, the second dynamic. You have the preclear sitting in the chair or lying on the couch. You have started to review this preclear and you have gotten up to this point of the second dynamic.

You take it one dynamic at a time and find the suppressions and enforcement’s of the other dynamics and other people upon it. So, the A—the affinity line—of the first dynamic enforces or inhibits the affinity of the second dynamic; the R—reality enforces or inhibits R. and so on. Now, you are not interested in measuring too much; if you were dealing in evaluation of the tone scale you would just be measuring this so you could spot him on the tone scale. But we are interested in picking up his aberrations.

Let’s take the second dynamic just on the subject of children, the affinity one feels toward his own children. You start out Straightwire like this: “Has anybody ever told you that you didn’t like your own children?” Chances are he will say yes. That is an inhibitor. “Has anyone ever told you that you had to like your own children?” That is an enforcer.

Let's go to reality: "You have to agree with the people around you." Have you ever heard anybody tell you that? "You have to agree with the people around you" might be a leader for reality, but that wouldn't be on the second dynamic, so you say: "Have you ever heard that you have to have children?" That is an enforcer, a forced reality. "Children are absolutely necessary to your happiness and continued existence and you know it" is an enforcer. "Children aren't necessary to your continued existence" is an inhibitor, and "You don't have to have children yourself. You can live in the hearts of other children," or something like that, is a shut-off to some degree.

And as far as communication is concerned we could ask, "Do the noises children make annoy you?" If he says yes, that is interesting but somebody has said so someplace; there is a whole flock of locks: "These children are making too much noise, they are driving me crazy." You can ask, "Has anyone ever said to you when you were a child 'You are making so much noise, you are bothering me terribly'?" There are also things like "It's my little boy and he can make all the noise he wants to!" That is an enforcer. You ask about both sides and get the attitude of the individual toward his children or toward other children.

What is his general attitude toward children? Is his affinity toward children enforced or inhibited? How about his reality—his agreement about and with children? Is it enforced or inhibited? "You have to do whatever little Tommy says," for instance, is an enforced agreement. As far as communication is concerned, "You should talk to your children," "You have to talk to children," "You have to listen to children," are all enforcement's. And then there is the classic inhibitor in this society, "Children should be seen and not heard."

We are still talking about the same individual; this was just as an individual. Now let's see how the third dynamic is influencing the individual's second dynamic. Let's take this one rather bluntly on the subject of sex and find out what one group with which the individual is associated thinks about sex.

The first group that comes to mind is the family. If he is living around people who are badly inhibited sexually, he is probably living around people who also treat children rather badly.

But here is ARC on the third dynamic. Look at what the community you live in thinks about sex in general. Affinity, when it is measured up sexually according to the basic aberration that plagues this society at the present time, is just not quite nice. You just can't mix affinity and sex. As far as communication on the subject of sex is concerned, forget it. And as far as agreeing on the subject goes—what the reality of the act is and so on—there is more confusion about this one subject than you could name. But you have all possible aberration on it right there; it is A, R and C in the vicinity of the person hitting his second dynamic.

You can start by asking him, "Have you ever been a member of a church?" Maybe he was a member of a very decent church, but it might have been one that was really down on the subject of sex. As a member of that church, raised in the vicinity of that church, he was part of an organization which itself was a suppressor to the second dynamic. So let's find out with the preclear what the people of that group or what that group had to say about the second dynamic—his second dynamic—both those things which enforced it and those which inhibited it.

Now, on a person who has been raised around a communist cell, I can guarantee you that sex is enforced. It is completely opposite; Christianity and communism are far apart, and one of the main places where they are really far apart is on the second dynamic. The concepts are totally different. There is a sort of enforced nymphomania about communism, and unfortunately in the much stricter churches of the country there is a sort of enforced sexual deprivation—two opposite ends of the spectrum.

So how these groups influenced this person's second dynamic interests you as an auditor, because you now can ask him a lot of questions about this or that. Remember that his family is a group: "What did your family think on the subject of children?"

Just the general opinions that were expressed around this person can aberrate this dynamic. So you get the conceptions of various groups with which he has been associated. For instance, this person has been part of the army. Now, you as an auditor would not normally go into his army career on a broad shot like "What did the army think about the second dynamic?" However, I cracked a case wide open one time on that same type of thing.

This person had been raised in the Episcopal Church by a very hidebound minister. This minister was evidently a pretty good guy, but he sure called hellfire and damnation down on the head of anybody who practiced anything outside the rules on sex. This boy went into the army and he started to hear words and phrases being used, and the general opinion in the army was so far in reverse of what he had been brought up with that he nearly spun in. He had run into first an inhibition and then an enforcement on the second dynamic, between group one and group two, and it had practically looped him. It was that severe.

I got up all this stuff on Straightwire, and all of a sudden the fellow felt fine. That was a mysterious one.

But just by normally going over this system of all possible aberration you would hit that; you wouldn't leave this one uncovered.

Now, the next thing you would hit is the fourth dynamic, man, against the second dynamic. Naturally, this is what man as a whole considers about sex. There would be teachings about man as a species. You will find stuff in biology classes and so forth which have made aberrative locks on this line—what people have been taught man is, and so on. Furthermore, you will get the general agreements and disagreements, such things as anthropological studies on the subject of sex, children and so on. What does man think of children? But now we are getting up into more ethereal lines as far as this second dynamic is concerned. Communication on this line is possibly unimportant, but there may be aberration on it.

Now we get up to the fifth dynamic, which is life in general. It is very interesting that as soon as we start addressing the line of the fifth and the second dynamics on somebody off the farm, we run into the whole subject of animal husbandry. One would not normally think of this as suppressive to the second dynamic or enforcing the second dynamic, but it is.

One time I uncovered, in a little girl who was raised on the farm, a lock that had to do with animal husbandry. It was all being described at great length, and the little child's mother suddenly heard Papa talking about this and realized the little girl was there; Mama blew up and scolded Papa and scolded the little girl, and the little girl was completely bewildered. She didn't know what this was all about. Why should she be scolded and suddenly sent to bed and Mama and Papa have a fight? She worried about this for a long time. She was practically scared of animals too. She must have been very groggy that night or a little bit sick or something of the sort, because this incident went in and sat right on top of every engram on the subject in the bank and charged them up. She blew grief on it—animal husbandry. So that is ARC addressed to the second dynamic in an individual, on the fifth dynamic.

Now we go on to the sixth dynamic—MEST. Any time we get into MEST we start to get into heavy stuff—engrams. An engram is a break between dynamics seven and six—Theta hitting MEST too hard—or it is a separation of seven and six, which gives us grief of loss, and that is the central loss aberration. That is Theta unable to contact the MEST or the organism, so you get grief, or you get an engram when the MEST is contacted too hard.

If the organism stumbles into a rock, this is the seventh dynamic hitting too much of dynamic six. Actually, it is also dynamic five hitting too much MEST, because that is a life organism, but it is really Theta and MEST. Whatever perceptics are included in that moment, that becomes

the most severely aberrated thing there is, because below all this we are basically dealing with the urge of Theta, first, to survive through its conquest of MEST, and second, to conquer or change MEST. When that gets interrupted we get severe aberration.

Now, how do we make aberration out of the sixth and second dynamics? How does MEST influence the second dynamic? Believe me, it does! For instance, some of these fat fellows smoking great big cigars have got an awful lot of MEST, and when you see some of the pretty girls going around with them you sure know it has an effect on the second dynamic.

Or some fellow has a very fine automobile, and he goes around and takes beautiful girls for rides and life is wonderful—but all of a sudden he loses it; it gets stolen. You will actually get grief on this. This break is between the sixth and second dynamics.

Maybe a man wants children very badly, but he has lost his property and his home. Naturally he can't have children if he doesn't have any MEST; he would not be able to support them. That is a break on the second dynamic. We are working out all possible combinations here.

Also, injury of various types can come in there—Theta and MEST coming together in the vicinity of the second dynamic. And remember that when we are dealing with communication anywhere along this line we are dealing with sensory perception. That is a communication and it has a very definite effect upon the second dynamic.

Now, on the seventh dynamic, how many times have you heard religions try to cut down the second dynamic? The second dynamic is the most certain immortality which we have. We are going along from generation to generation rapidly and that is an immortality. It might have been that somebody figured out that the way you could really sell immortality was to make a man take off and go to heaven as a soul at the end of his life, but he couldn't guarantee it very well and he couldn't show any facts in the matter, so the second dynamic became a foe. And you will find that large numbers of religions suppress the second dynamic—not just the Christian religion; many others suppress it much more horribly. In Rome, for instance, emasculation was practiced as a religion. This really made sure that the soul went to heaven!

There is, then, all of this inhibition on the second dynamic: the inhibition of affinity, and the inhibition of agreement—reality. What is the reality of this? Does the soul go to heaven, or does one continue to his immortality through his genetic line? We have a turbulence there; nobody has quite decided this, so there is a confusion between those two points.

Furthermore, as far as communication is concerned, we just don't talk along the Theta line and the second dynamic. In this society particularly that is a complete inhibition. Any person who doesn't talk about it naturally has been inhibited, and if you go back with Dynamic Straightwire on this line and run into this one, and you ask how many times he was cautioned not to speak of this and not to speak of that in relationship to the second dynamic, you are going to find an enormous number of suppressions which will act as suppressions of ARC right across the board. They are just ordinary suppressions like anything else.

You can run this for any dynamic, and the way you figure it out is, first, you put the first dynamic down on the bottom (and you could actually have the first dynamic inhibiting the first dynamic). Then you put the second dynamic down, then the third dynamic, then the fourth dynamic, and you run the A, R and C lines from each of the other dynamics down to the one at the bottom and figure out how many aberrations there are on each line. It is very complex and it goes up to a very high number of combinations, but you don't have to think very hard to get what they are.

Let's run this for the moment on the third dynamic; we start with the line from dynamic one. How is the third dynamic inhibited by the first dynamic? Why isn't this fellow willing to be a member of a group? Why won't he get married and form his own family? We take the third dynamic just as a family right now. In the family, obviously, a child could not contribute as much as he would like to have contributed.

All around you, you can see people who are self-conscious in company. That is the most limited description of a blocked third dynamic I know of. Call it a blocked or enturbulated third and you have got it; there is something wrong between this person and other people. So let's find out how many times this fellow's third dynamic has been inhibited or enforced by the first, the second, the third itself, the fourth, the fifth, the sixth and the seventh. You can ask him first about being told he had to be a member of a group—for example, "Before you can go around with women you have to be married to them." That is the second dynamic blocking the third; this fellow has to form a group before he can even look at a woman. Something is wrong with this and he can't quite figure it out. On the third dynamic itself, it may be just other baseball teams that kept beating his baseball team. But every time he has been whipped in his life when he was a group, his third dynamic has been suppressed by some other third dynamic.

Now we get over to the fourth dynamic, and there is a whole race. There are many minorities in the world today who consider themselves suppressed by man. They consider themselves minorities. Somebody told them they were minorities—somebody who had something to gain by it, probably. So the fourth dynamic was inhibiting the third dynamic. But in what way?

Let's take a very obvious one; we know a lot about this. Back in ancient times the Hebrew got kicked around in Egypt, and he collected a good, solid break on affinity between the fourth dynamic and his third. He invented a religion which was among the first to introduce into the world an exclusiveness of a religion for one race. Up to that time any religion would admit any other race, but the Hebrew admitted only his own race. This action was forced upon him by the clannish Egyptian, who had cut him out. Introduced on top of this at the same time was the fact that he had to love.

The Hebrew then got in an awful mess with the Roman Empire. The Roman Empire didn't know what to do about Jerusalem. Here was a race that wouldn't admit other races into its own religion and professed to dislike these other races. This was too strange and the Roman courts didn't know what to do with it. According to Gibbon, this was the first point of break, evidently, between the Hebrew and the Roman Empire. Affinity had broken down. It broke one way (the Romans with the Hebrew), and one day the Romans turned around and wiped out Jerusalem. They shoved the Hebrew out of his own city, after all of his centuries of travail in order to secure that city, and that really broke it. This was an affinity break the other way, and it was a huge break on the sixth dynamic. And then Rome went even further and said, "The dickens with this god Yahweh! We are suppressing him," and there went dynamic seven. So four, five, six, seven—these things started going out, and that nation really split up; the members of that nation went all around the world. They finally drew back together again very recently.

But that is the most graphic example of the fourth dynamic breaking a third dynamic that I know of, as far as a whole group is concerned; it is at least the one which we know best. It certainly makes a very interesting story, but more than that, it is a very good example of what we are looking at.

The Hebrews finally went down the tone scale with regard to others, and then people started to make capital out of this fact and suppressed them further and increased the breaks. This is typical of what happens.

I processed a young Hebrew friend of mine, and I started in on the rehabilitation of dynamics three, four and five by Straightwire. The material with which his early life had been filled on these dynamics was just fantastic.

This man as an individual came up the tone scale very markedly just on that little bit of Straightwire. It was straightening out things for him. I actually had to run secondaries on this subject from when he was in school and all of a sudden somebody would turn around and look at him very hard and say, "Oh, I can lick you."
"No, you can't."

“Well, you are a Jew and Jews can’t fight, and you don’t belong to this club anyhow,” and this sort of thing.

Here was a man who felt sore; he felt pretty bad about life and he was quite badly off. He had gone practically to the bottom of the tone scale. This person was very close to psychotic. As a matter of fact, he was so psychotic that he was within an ace of being a communist. The rehabilitation for this person was all on the third, fourth, fifth and sixth dynamics acting on the third. His mother, for instance, had taught him that he must get along with the rest of the human race. He must learn to be nice to them, he must do this and he must do that, but they were kicking him all over the place. He lived in a very bad area and these guys would kick him in the teeth and then his mother would say, “Now, you have to be nice to them.” This man was so confused; he was up to a point where he wouldn’t belong to anything.

Now, let’s take the fourth dynamic and put it down on the bottom of the diagram and work it, and find out how this individual feels about the fourth dynamic on the various lines. You will sometimes start talking to a girl on the fourth dynamic and have her tell you, “How nice these dear, little pussycats are, but men and women are awful nasty. And if men and women were only as considerate and as friendly as little dogs, it would be all right, but they aren’t.” There are a lot of breaks between all of the other dynamics and the fourth. Somebody has been talking about people, how bad people are, or how you have to do this or that to people, or how you have to agree with people all the time. It is just all these sets of ARC against the ARC of the fourth dynamic, and when you start straight wiring it on this basis she starts turning up with quarts and gallons of material.

This system will guide you, then, into almost anything. I may be drawing a little bit too long a bow,’ but it looks to me, as I have examined this, as if this diagram includes every possible aberration that a human being can have. It is this series of dynamics aberrating each one selectively. I suppose you could even get up to the point where combinations of them were aberrating other things, but I don’t think it is that complex

How has the individual aberrated himself? He doesn’t think well of himself, he has compared himself to his studies, he has done this and done that. How is the individual aberrated as an individual on the second dynamic? How does the individual think of himself on the third dynamic? What has the third dynamic done to the first dynamic?

So take that diagram and study it over, and one of these days you will be talking along to a preclear and you will suddenly find yourself confronting a problem that this fellow has obviously had for a long time; for instance, every time you mention God, he just kind of goes rigid and grits his teeth. What do you do about it? Don’t just be tolerant. An auditor’s business is not to be intolerant, but an auditor’s business is also not his own study of how to be a human being around preclears. It is the auditor’s business to know the anatomy of aberration. If he knows the anatomy of aberration, then he can get in there and straighten it out rapidly.

So what do you do about this fellow who is gnashing his teeth about God? How does this preclear feel on the eighth dynamic? What you do is put the eighth dynamic down at the bottom of the diagram, and then begin by finding out, what is the affinity enforcement between dynamics one and eight? What is the reality enforcement between one and eight? What is the communication enforcement between one and eight? What is the affinity inhibition between one and eight? What is the reality inhibition between one and eight? What is the communication inhibition between one and eight?

People have been talking around him, people have been making statements around him or to him which formed inhibited or enforced locks on the subject of one and eight.
“What is God going to do to you?”

You normally take people back and find out it is something like this: “Now I lay me down to sleep, I pray the Lord my soul to keep. If I should die before—eel!”

What is God going to do to him?

“You gotta love God!”

“I love him.”

“God’s going to knock you flat if you don’t!”

Or you could take this business of talking to angels. The little child’s mother says, “Well, you know, dear, an angel will come to you in your sleep, and the angel will say to you so-and-so “

“He will? I don’t know whether I like this or not. What is this angel going to do?”

“Oh, nothing, dear. All angels are good. If you die when you are asleep, or if something bad happens to you . . . And of course, the bad angels are the ones that give you the bad dreams.”

“What do you mean, the bad angels? I thought you said angels were good?”

“Well, some of them are bad, but angels are good.” This is enough to really confuse the poor child.

Or you get things like “You know God really exists.”

“But Tommy across the street says he doesn’t exist, and Agnes down the street says God is everywhere. But old Grandpapa Dooley says he ain’t no place.” This person really gets confused after a while between dynamics one and eight!

Now let’s find out what eight is supposed to do to the second dynamic. Evidently dynamic eight doesn’t have anything against two sub-B, which is children, but does have something against two as sex, and there is a lot of confusion there. So here you have the ARC on the second dynamic against the ARC of the eighth dynamic: “Obviously, to carry out God’s will you should go on and procreate and get and beget many generations of people. Obviously this is something that God wants, but sex is evil. Why?” I am not quoting my own opinions now; I am just saying how I have heard people talk about these things.

The person starts to worry about this, and somebody tells him that this is so, and he is cautioned from another quarter that this is so, but then he is told by the priest that he must have children. And any time you get an enforcement or an inhibition on any one of these dynamics as they interact (remember what I said the ARC added up to, and that you can resolve all mathematics with ARC), it makes unfinished or confused computation. When you get right down to it, actually all aberration is, is inability to compute.

So if you can’t get the ARC of the second dynamic to settle with the ARC of the eighth, then there is a confusion of computation and the person can’t settle his mind on the subject. This ties up quite a bit of Theta.

Take someone who evidently isn’t worrying about this anymore back to when he was ten years of age and try to get him to reconcile God and the second dynamic. The amount of stuff which will turn up is very interesting.

By the way, I am not talking about whether one should believe God or shouldn’t believe God; I am just talking about whether or not ministers and priests in the past have been very expert on communicating this picture for what it is, whatever it is. It has not been very expertly done in all cases. A lot of people are perfectly calm about this, but you will find an awful lot of people who are completely squirrely on the subject. You find some other people who have a lot of blasphemy in the bank, like “Goddamn you, go to hell.” The little child goes to church and hears “God will damn you and is liable to send you to hell if you aren’t nice to your mama,

Johnny.” This goes into the reactive mind, hits him right square there on the middle of that engram, and that engram charges up. This person starts to get aberrated on the subject. He can’t compute so well on it, and the next thing you know, it hits him from another quarter, and it hits him from another quarter and the engram charges up more and more and more. This is on blasphemy, but it is all based as far as he knows on just the simple question, is God or isn’t he? He is not thinking about the fact that there are underlying computations that can’t resolve because this first one is the serious one that does not resolve. Theta either conquers MEST or it doesn’t. It is completely uncompromising. All of this makes a deeply buried engram, and that will sit way down in the bank and other stuff will come up along the line on it.

So you resolve this person that you are dealing with. You notice that he is very hot on this subject; he is an atheist or something like that. What is there between God and the church? What did the groups to which this person belonged have to do with God? You may find out that he has been associating with some highly blasphemous or otherwise depraved groups of one sort or another that enforced their beliefs upon him. So it is with dynamics four, five and six. Then, what is God going to do to this fellow’s soul?

At the present time there is more evidence that a human soul exists than there is evidence that it doesn’t exist, as far as Dianetics is concerned. As far as I am concerned, we have moved in pretty close to the *fait accompli* of demonstrating that the human soul exists, and evidently it goes along the generations. It is evidently a much more important line than the genetic line as far as personality is concerned.

This fellow may be very atheistic, and he may be snorting and snarling and fuming about “these confounded churches, and if I had a preacher here right now, I would really tell him a thing or two! “ and so on, and you find out that he is completely cut out between the seventh and eighth dynamics. He won’t admit he has got a soul, he won’t admit there is anything divine about him and he won’t admit that anything about him is going to survive. The whole thing gets very aberrative.

The way someone could close a person out with pain-drug-hypnosis would be to knock into him the fact that he hasn’t any human soul and he won’t live after death. Even if he is an atheist he is liable to spin on it. In other words, it is an entity. This doesn’t have to do with how much other aberration there is on the case; it is just another thing that can be closed off on a case.

You can go back and pick up all of a person’s conversations with his little brothers and sisters. I have processed children just by Straightwire on the subject of God and have got up more relief and more tears and resolved more conclusions than you would believe. People evidently don’t communicate very well on this subject; they don’t explain it to children at all.

This system is not something that you would soak up all in a moment. But if you think it over a little bit, you can see that it is a lot of help. If you are looking for Straightwire that will resolve computations that have been in the individual’s mind—miscomputations, irrationalities—if you are going to unburden a case so that you can run engrams or get handily to secondaries and so on, follow out this system. Find out how each dynamic is suppressed, what has suppressed these dynamics in the person’s past, and you will go beyond the rather narrow field which I have seen is now in use.

I have seen individuals working exclusively on the first dynamic and the first dynamic, or the first dynamic and the third dynamic in combination, and I point out that this is a very small fraction of the amount of aberration that a person could have. It is what Papa and Mama have said around Baby that you find yourselves working on mostly, or what Papa and Mama have said to the child, or what Papa and Mama have said to the young man. Sometimes you even get big-hearted and let Brother in on the picture. But this is a small segment of a person’s life.

A little boy, for instance, goes to school. He belongs to groups: he has belonged to the Boy Scouts and maybe to the DeMolays and he has belonged to the army, and he has been a member of a young Christian endeavor association or something, and at one time he went to a

big summer camp and had a terrifically bad time of it while he was there. These are all groups. That is dynamic three operating on one.

Or he has been a member of a minority group of some sort or other; he has been a member of a small group which was constantly getting trounced or kicked around, and that is dynamic three working on three. Maybe he has been pounded to pieces by some cynical, atheistic fellow who was trying to convince him that his early beliefs in religion were all wrong, and that is the eighth dynamic operating on one.

The reason I am going over this is that I have noticed the tendency to handle just one on one, or three on one at best. That use of Straightwire is far too limited; you can ask questions on a lot broader field than you are now asking. There is a lot more that can aberrate a human being than you have been using as a basis for your Straightwire.

And if you use this graph and start asking yourself these questions, you will find out that maybe in a couple of days of pondering around about it yourself, you will have delivered more deaberration than any quantity of this highly limited three-on-one Straightwire would have done.

If you sit down now and try to derive this thing as I have given it to you, and figure yourself out as a member of a Dianetics group and what has happened to you as a member of a Dianetics group—because that all has an effect on you too—you may get an enormous amount of charge off your own case, just by figuring it out.

This is, then, a system of communicating all possible aberration that, as far as I know now, can exist in a human being: the interruption of self determinism and computation; the interruption of affinity, reality and communication on each one of the dynamics, each one suppressible by any other dynamic.

I hope this hasn't been too overbearing. I have just worked that out so that I could communicate it to you, and I was rather amazed when I was working it out to find that there were about three brands of aberration in this that I had been completely blind to until I actually put it down and graphed it. I was driving along in the car afterwards and I suddenly remembered these three, because I had just worked it out, and I got off a line charge that almost ran me over the curb and into the front of the police station! So I wouldn't do it while I was driving if I were you.

Now I will handle some questions that have come up. This is an unresolved end of the spectrum as far as I am concerned right now. I don't know yet whether the seventh dynamic is eight or whether eight itself stands alone. There is something up at that end of the spectrum I haven't got my fingers on. I would love to have answers to everything in the universe, but sometimes I fall down.

It is a fact that the eighth dynamic could normally be considered seven, unless you consider that there is both a Theta universe and a physical universe and that these things were each created on the eighth. The eighth could have created both of them.

You could ask whether, if both universes exist, they would both come under dynamic seven. They would not, because seven is completely different than the physical universe. The seventh dynamic is not the physical universe; it doesn't include any portion of the physical universe. You have to regard it as a separate entity.

You can regard a formed idea as matter of Theta. A whole culture would be quite a big piece of matter of Theta. Theta evidently also has its own space and time.

It is very interesting. You can start going up into Einsteinian imponderables on this stuff very rapidly. But you will find that the problem resolves better if you consider a Theta universe and a MEST universe. Then you get better derivation.

But what created the Theta universe and what created the MEST universe? I would just as soon leave that as the eighth dynamic and use the same handy dodge people have been using for the last three thousand years that I know of, and say, "The reason it all got here was God created it," and then walk rapidly away!

"Would all these aberrations that you have been talking about be aberrations in parts of the engram?"

I tried to make this point clear; this also includes the engram—the cross-up of dynamics six and seven. The reason these other dynamics come in along the line is that these interactions are also in engrams as perceptics. Man learned how to talk, so he could get anything into an engram. All of these things go into the engrams themselves as perceptics, and you will find them as component parts of engrams.

More importantly though, this is a method of discovering locks, and locks aren't locks unless there are engrams underlying them. In order for there to be any aberration there has to be physical pain at the bottom of it; otherwise it is just bad computation, and the second the fellow gets the data he figures it out.

"Would you say that the chief operation of dynamic one aberrating dynamic one would be 'Control yourself'?"

Yes. That is the first dynamic trying to become an outside dynamic one.

"After the state is reached where engrams can be contacted and are rapidly reducing and erasing, is there a need for continuing this particular system of Straightwire? In other words, as the engrams resolve will these locks automatically discharge?"

If you get any case up to a point where engrams start erasing, and then all of a sudden you run into a charged area, you have to discharge that area. It is a continuing cyclic process rather than just clearing up all the overburden and then erasing all the engrams.

I am even betting at this time that if you thoroughly enough straight wired or lock-scanned an individual you would suddenly come up with straight wiring out engrams. That is one of these theoretical near impossibilities, but it is theoretically possible.

"Have you had any experience in the system of running ARC breaks, of straight wiring an engram before going to the incident and running it?"

Yes. With a fellow who has just been hurt, the engram is so close to present time that he is really straight wiring; he isn't running through it himself because he is so close to it. This engram doesn't have any locks yet, and he can go through it and he doesn't reexperience too much of its pain, and yet it pretty well erases.

More important than this is that with a case that has gotten way up there on the tone scale, well off of the entheta, when he suddenly starts hitting these engrams they start going whoosh!—blowing right out. You are running him on the track all right, but you really don't even get a good grip on these things. They go out that quickly!

There is theoretically a point you can reach in a case when the case has had a lot of Straightwire—and this has been reached in a very few cases of which I know—where the case is so high on the tone scale and where the engrams are not much charged up, that when you take him back to the first engrams, instead of locks coming off after you have run the engram, the rest of the engrams of the chain collapse. In other words, the guy is way up on the tone scale, there is no real charge on the case and the secondaries are off and so forth, and that is the

point at 3.5 where you can theoretically chain-scan engrams. That is the way they would behave.

“What is your new concept of the clear?”

I wouldn't say it was any new concept particularly. Clear is a concept that has been mangled and mauled around. If you take a Zulu who has lived in a 1.1 society all of his life, so that all of his data is 1.1 and his manners are 1.1, and you clear him of all of his engrams, you still have a 1.1. But you have an awfully good 1.1!

Now if you addressed his education and reeducated him you could bring him on up the tone scale, but I am afraid that would be necessary before you got a tone 4.

Technically, all clear means is he has had all his engrams erased. Now anything can happen. It is a fact that when a man's engrams are all erased he has sonic and visio and everything else, but he still has his educational bank and he still has his training and he still has a lot of things. Unless you do something about those, you are not going to make a tone 4.

Tone 4 would be a much more flexible concept, I think, than clear, and I believe people would understand it better because almost anybody sometime during practically any half-year of his life has been a tone 4. Tone 4 is something that a person experiences. A person can remember experiencing tone 4 and if he could get himself to a point where he could much more often experience tone 4 than before, I think he would be a very happy person. He would be more than just tone 4 happy, and I think he would settle for the idea that he could be happy, cheerful and carefree and capable of taking care of things and not getting so upset as he had in the past. I think it would agree with him perfectly. It isn't some absolute thing that he is trying to reach.

I have been talking about tone 4s lately. Remember when you were a little kid and you got up in the morning and the sun was shining and there was a little dew on the grass, and your legs felt so good that you could just get up and run? That is a good high tone 4.

A fellow who pitches a no-hit, no-run game—believe me—walks off that pitcher's mound tone 4. Nothing will touch him for a while; he is really up the tone scale.

Now, you can make a person tone 4 without running out his engrams. You can actually run Straightwire and run secondaries on a person and build him way up the tone scale and he will stay there pretty stably, and he will never thereafter go as low as he went before unless some terrific new blow hits him. He would not go down the tone scale, then, quite as far as before.

You could bring a person up to tone 4 and he might stay there for hours, he might stay there for days, he might stay there for weeks. But it is a state which can be measured, and a person will do certain things at tone 4. He can do these things predictably.

If all of his engrams were gone, then he could only be shoved up and down the tone scale by tremendous shocks in present time. But his behavior might be resultant of an educated behavior—for instance, an educated 1.5. A boy raised in Nazi Germany with no engrams at all would be a fine 1.5. Fortunately, with Lock Scanning and so on, you could take this fellow and take the charge or any force there was on his education off, and you could bring him up the line. Then you could teach him some democratic principles and some other things, and his education would then match where he should be on the tone scale and he would be a pretty stable person.

So I think it is a much better concept to talk of a tone 4 than it is to talk of a clear.

There is one clear who was in the Foundation, and a lot of the people worried about her. As a matter of fact, her auditing partner, with whom she audited other people, was pretty enturbulative. He is a nice guy but he gets excited about things and gets pretty upset about

them. She was very simpatico with him and she would get enturbulated too. This girl had had poliomyelitis when she was two and had been on crutches all of her life.

Her auditor had run out all the engrams that he could possibly find in her, and a check of her demonstrated that her sonic, visio and other things were all right. They were a little bit off and sometimes she had a tendency to not pick up all the data, but that was all right.

I have looked for engrams in her and I couldn't find any. Nobody else could find any.

The only trouble with a clear is we have no way of establishing whether a person's engrams are all gone. If we could put them on a meter or something and measure it, it would be all right; but you can run them up and down the track and see that they have sonic and visio, and there might be a whole chain of engrams there that is going to charge up one of these fine days and you don't even know they are there. We have no absolute way of measuring. It may be an absolute state for all I know, but there has never been a way of measuring it. You wait six months and test them again, and if you don't find any engrams that time, you say, "I guess so." This person is feeling well and acting well, usually.

Anyway, this girl demonstrated that she no longer had certain aberrations she had before. When I first saw her come into the Foundation, by the way, you could not talk to her or say three words to her without some tears leaking out of her eyes. She was running on this terrible mind tension that she had to take care of other people if it killed her, and somehow or other everything she did for them did practically kill her. She had terrific nervous tension, and she had been working in the field of psychiatry as a psychiatric assistant. She was really something.

All of her engrams were knocked out; all of those aspects went away and she became a pretty calm person and became a lot more able than before. But people said she couldn't possibly be a clear because she was still on crutches.

I often thought that, after all, this person from the age of two to the age of thirty, or something like that, had never walked a step by herself; she was on nothing but crutches. Yet people were saying, "She couldn't possibly be a clear," and "This couldn't be a clear because she is still on those crutches." I think this is being arbitrary.

But she fooled everybody. A note came in here a couple of days ago; she is no longer on crutches. This is incredible. This has never happened before; a person who for twenty-eight years walks on crutches from poliomyelitis all of a sudden throws them away. She has grown about an inch and three quarters and she no longer walks on crutches. This person is adjusting, evidently, physiologically to these changes in her being—functional changes.

So that concept of clear is considered an absolute concept and has not helped us too much in Dianetics. It has hurt us if anything.