

AXIOMS AND EFFORT PROCESSING

A lecture given on
8 October 1951

Handling One's Own Efforts

There really is no great trick to Effort Processing; it is fairly easy. The main trouble is going too far with it: the preclear goes up in a puff of smoke, and this is embarrassing! We haven't seen this happen yet, but we expect to at any moment.

Completely aside from Effort Processing, we now have something which is a mathematical science. The test of a science is in whether it needs phenomena which do not exist in fact in order to prove itself, whether it explains existing phenomena and whether it predicts phenomena which, when looked for, will be found to exist in fact.

The Axioms do that with an insidiousness which has two or three of our people sighing because "there is no randomness left, there isn't any variability; it's going to be dull from here on."

But those who have been in Dianetics these last eighteen months or less are fortunate to this degree: You will never see anything like this again. But you will have knowledge and you will have examined phenomena which it is very, very doubtful will ever be examined again to amount to anything.

Anywhere along the line we have had something in Dianetics which was better than anything that existed, but we have not had a complete codification of it. It took quite a little while to find out what codification was needful and necessary in order to deliver it into the hands of individuals who could use it effectively and invariably.

There were some wild variables in the way I processed. I used to use a technique of trying to give the preclear back to himself, which I don't think is codified anywhere. Those who have seen me audit with the earlier techniques probably will have recognized it, though: "You know what you're doing; what are you asking me for?"—that type of validation of self-determinism, and a continual hammer and pound on that subject.

It was not recognized by me that this was a considerable variable, and yet it was, since auditors who perhaps did not have this wish to deliver self-determinism into the hands of the preclear himself, or who did not really realize how to do so—because it was something one sort of learned, like wiggling one's ears—might not have had as swift results.

As a consequence, the last year and a half has been mainly a study of what auditors had to know in order to produce results. Every time a new codification of technique was made in order to communicate it, lo and behold, some more data fell out of the hat. It kept doing this; it was very embarrassing. The more one studied, the more one knew; the more one codified, the more one had to work with, and the more one worked with . . . It got people pretty dizzy sometimes.

But we were following along a strangely single-line path. It has been a very straight path, actually; there hasn't been very much variance to it. But there has been change in emphasis.

The first really new data that came in appeared when an examination was made of language. And then when an examination was made of theta with new MEST, theta and

MEST, getting theta back out of entheta and so forth, that theory developed a little data. But the great, big, huge, enormous datum that fell into our laps was the fact—which is extrapolated from these other axioms—that every thought is preceded by a physical action.

This meant that language was simply a symbolization of physical universe actions. And if this were true, then all you had that was valid anywhere along the line was effort. All the mind did was calculate efforts. When it miscalculated them it got in a bad way: it became invalidated. And how did it become invalidated? By miscalculating an effort.

Therefore the mind's effort to postulate and calculate efforts was obviously the center button. I have said many times to classes in Dianetics, "I am looking for the center button—the button which, when pushed, will blow up something on the order of the atom bombs in New Mexico."

Now, the boys in research may have mentioned something of new developments. It is always unfortunate for anyone to talk to anyone in research.

I remember going to Kansas City and finding a research preclear spinning slowly, quietly, sadly—but spinning! I audited him for a little while and found out they had been auditing him on three levels: they were giving him Straightwire, he was doing freewheeling and he was running incidents on the track, all at the same time. The research people had set this up as a means of finding out if it could be done. They found out that it could be done and then they said, "Well, guess we'll go on to another preclear."

That preclear went back to Kansas City and last fall I got into his case and found out that he had been left parked in birth for a long time. This was unfortunate; he had gained about twenty-five or thirty pounds. I triggered the groupers out of this and he evidently straightened up. I think he is still in good shape now.

The point is, let's wipe out now all of the rumors and the statements you may have heard from the research boys. There is always a radio set back in the research laboratory which is in advance of the radio set on the assembly line and being sold. You know this very well. Probably this will always be the case in Dianetics.

But right now, I can tell you bluntly that we have entered into what is known as the second echelon of processing. The first echelon was buttoning up the first dynamic. It took us as far as "why," but it didn't tell us why. At "why" you turn around quietly and look out, and you can now see "how," and you can see it with great clarity. And we now have nearly two hundred axioms that tell you how it comes about.

Not all these axioms are necessary by a long ways, but they are axioms. They are mathematical axioms; they will extrapolate into some interesting material.

So, we can tell you "how," and in addition to that we can give you a process—a codified process—that you can use on preclears which will produce, if not always an absence of the preclear, at least an absence of certain chronic somatics.

Those who have been working mainly with words and with boil-off will be interested in this axiom: Every thought is preceded by a physical action.

Every word is merely a definition of a physical action. Words are symbols of action; words are symbols of motion or lack of motion in the physical universe.

Now, any time that you process delusion or illusion in a preclear, he goes down the tone scale. Any time you start validating dub-in, he starts going down. You know this by experience. The same thing happens with processing words. You process words and your preclear will go down the tone scale. What you want to process is the action defining the word, and you will process the words.

The actions defining the words are very easily found, but there is something much easier behind all this. You can just start processing “gunshot” on the effort to postulate or effect action. That is all you have to do, and you will shoot the whole bottom out of the vocabulary so that the vocabulary is no longer very effective.

I wish to call this to your mind, too: Every time you see somebody who is very anxious about words, you see somebody low on the tone scale. Have you ever been around somebody who continually corrected you in your speech? You say so-and-so and they correct you; you say so-and-so and they correct you; they just neglect the idea entirely but correct the words. When you start to sing a song they say, “No, that isn’t the in the second line of that song, it’s an of.” You finally admit “Yes, it’s of” and they sigh with relief.

That comes from an axiom which we will cover: One handles words and regards words and all thoughts and all symbolism’s of thoughts just as he does the physical universe. So if a person has to hold on to material objects very hard, he will also hold on to words. If he has been beaten down to a point where he will give great, painstaking care to physical objects, he will also take care of words. Therefore he mustn’t violate these words. This is a very low level on the tone scale.

Processing of words came from sources of that sort; they started validating words too heavily—words, words, words—rather than the acts. In the first book it talks about kinesthesia, it talks about visio, it talks about sonic movement on the track and these other things. But out of those things many individuals selected only words to be processed.

This was very bad for processing. You start processing words in a preclear and you are validating them. Every time you start that, you are telling him “This is what’s wrong with you.” You can’t process all the words out of the bank. The whole English language is in any reactive bank two or three times over. Try and process all that out and you have really got a job on your hands. So don’t try it—the devil with it.

Process out the effort, and don’t even process out the highly specialized efforts like “What is the effort behind the word don’t?” That is too slow!

Very probably the technique which you will be using in Effort Processing will be just the technique on an event level: you will find an event and you will process the effort out of that event. I can tell you how to do that very rapidly; there is nothing much to it.

You get the preclear in contact with an event and you want to know his effort to understand this situation as he runs through it—his physical effort to understand. Get him to reexperience his physical effort as he runs through this incident. The first thing you know, you will have him in a complete apathy. Great. Now when you have him there, roll him through it again and get his effort, when it is due to come up, to not understand his surroundings. You will find that his reality turns up like turning a rheostat on a radio turns up volume.

Understanding is basically ARC. Out of affinity, reality and communication you can make every mathematical computation or mathematics known to man. Understanding subdivides into affinity, reality and communication. You know this from the earlier books.

The point is that a person is forced by counter-efforts to agree. Now he is agreeing with a counter-effort, so he more or less becomes the counter-effort and goes out of valence .1 There is the valence mechanism. You have to get his effort to agree in order to get him back in valence. The second you have him in valence you can get his effort to disagree, and the incident will blow. It is fairly rapid.

Furthermore, although we were producing considerable results by taking the perceptions of engrams, that is nothing. There are five thousand gallons of theta releasable by processing effort for every one releasable by processing perceptions. We have been doing it the hard way; we have been picking this stuff up with a pair of small tweezers—trying to clean a desert of grains of sand with a very small pair of tweezers. It has been tough work. And even that made preclears feel better; it did things for them. But now there is so much more that can be done for them.

Now, I also want to touch on something that you are going to run into with Effort Processing whether you like it or not.

I am reminded that Aldous Huxley told me that a woman by the name of Margaret Fuller said she had practically made up her mind to accept the universe. Somebody told this to Thomas Carlyle, and Carlyle said, “By God! She’d better.”

We have had a lot of yak about past deaths. I am awfully sorry to have to tell you that you are going to be up to your ears in them the second you start any Effort Processing, unless you are very careful. If you want to do it the hard way, you can work and just use all your attention units and be very careful all the way along the line and make sure that your preclear doesn’t go out of this life. It is tough to do, but you will be able to do it if you are very, very careful.

Now, I can give you a Straightwire which will make it fairly easy to keep the preclear in this life—unless you use it too long, and then you go back straightwiring into the other life, which is unfortunate. So you want to be careful about this.

We are talking about phenomena, not opinion. There is a big difference. It may seem horrible to some of us that there seems to be a life cycle going on whereby you kick the bucket so you can learn something and then get born again only for the process of kicking the bucket so that you can get born again. This is horrible. People have been talking about this in that terrible and detestable field called reincarnation. It is very unfortunate that a bunch of crackpots used this one way back when, because now we look at it and we say, “Oh, no! “

This is like the way I felt when I looked at prenats for the first time; I said, “Oh, no! What a dirty trick for the physical universe to play on me! It was bad enough when I was running them into birth, but prenats!” And then it was “Sperm and ovum sequences? Oh, no!” And now it is “Past deaths? Oh, no.”

But when you use Effort Processing you will snap your preclears right into them. You ask them five, six, eight, ten questions, start processing them, get the effort within the efforts and all of a sudden—boom! He is lying there and the dinosaurs are marching over him and all sorts of things. And you have taken this preclear off the street; this preclear doesn’t know anything about reincarnation or past lives or anything, and you are just trying to fix up his lumbago. It is very embarrassing to an auditor to find out it was given to him by a dinosaur. It is also hard for the preclear to swallow. The point is, that lumbago will go away. But if you say to him, “No, no, no, no. Now, we have agreed with the American

Medical Association not to run any past deaths, and you'll just have to keep your lumbago. I'm sorry," you will have to refund his money and let him walk out the door. That is the only alternative.

On none of these people do you have to enforce any understanding of what is happening to them. You don't have to say "Well, what you're running is a past death." They won't need any of that information. They will gasp and sigh and choke. But you do have to know when they are in one and you have to go ahead and process it out.

It is a very nice thing, by the way, that when a preclear skids into one of these things, theta is released by the gallon. A preclear will jump way up the tone scale if you get all the effort out of a past death. It takes you some little time to run a past death; it takes you a couple of hours sometimes to get a past death run out completely clean. Sometimes it takes you longer than that if it is very late. But all you want out of it is the effort; that effort has theta wrapped up in it.

So if your preclear is stopped somewhere on the track and it happens to be in a past death, you haven't got much choice about the matter. You just start asking him for the effort to like this chronic somatic.

He will say, "Huh?"

And you say, "Yeah, the effort to like it. Well, now, can you get any inkling of any kind of an effort? You know how it is when you pick up a table, or you know how it is when you get up out of a chair—that is physical effort. Now, can you get any kind of a physical effort of a feeling of affinity for your mother, there, as she beats you?"—something like this. (It is sort of like teaching him to wiggle his ears sometimes.)

All of a sudden he will turn this on. "Oh yes, yes," and his tone will dive down to the bottom of the scale. "Yeah, I can get that."

"Now, let's get the effort to agree with her as she beats you," and again he goes sliding down tone. And you say, "Now, let's get the effort to communicate with her, the desire to communicate with her."

The fellow will say, "I haven't got any." He is down in apathy.

You say, "All right. Now can you get any effort to disagree with her?" He is starting to get this in terms of physical motion, and it is actually the physical motion of wriggling around and trying to avoid the switch and so forth, or just sitting still. You get this effort to like and to agree with the engram, and there is just no motion connected with it. But when you get the effort to dislike, you start to get the action and the somatics.

So you start in with almost no effort and then you graduate up into actual effort. And when you start to get his effort to disagree with Mama, his reality on Mama will come way up, until you say, "All right, now, let's get the effort to make this effort," or something like that. He will very happily say, "Oh, sure."

"Now can you get the effort to like this effort you're making?" You have backed him up one step.

"Sure, I . . . Injuns!"

Don't show any surprise. Just go ahead and say, "All right. Let's like this effort to look at these Indians."

"But I don't like it! "

"Well, all right. Get your effort to dislike it, then." Reality turns up, he hears arrows going over his head and he thinks he is in a cavalry picture. But it isn't; he is actually in the Stone Age or something. But who cares?

The point is that you just want to get all the effort off this case. Wherever you can get the effort off this case, get it off. This is a very hard-boiled, uncompromising attitude, I am afraid, but it is just the attitude of accepting what the preclear thinks is real as far as his efforts are concerned. Whether they are real or not is none of your business; that is his self-determinism talking. So you just let it run and you exhaust the effort completely and you will find him going on up the tone scale.

There are various reasons why this happens; I will go into them later in explaining the Axioms and so on. I just wanted to give you a brief resume and tell you what to expect.

Actually, the quiet theme of these axioms on logic and so forth has nothing to do with whether or not past deaths exist. Any bright boy in a university who looks these things over and looks over the phenomena and finds that those phenomena exist can go ahead and examine the subject.

Nothing is being said about past deaths or anything like that in these axioms as they are to be released. But it is obvious there have to be if the thing holds at all, and there are, in fact. We will just let somebody else make the discovery.

But you as auditors will find yourselves confronted now with this phenomenon, and the process which you are using you will find to be very efficacious. You will find that you can turn off chronic somatics with it fairly easily. And so you are going to, whether you like it or not, occasionally turn up one of these past deaths. If you can avoid it, fine; if you can't, that is tough. Run it. And you are not even interested in how many words are spoken or in anything like that; you just want the effort, that is all. It runs fast.

Now, Dianetics is in a form of organization which is a logical step-by-step process as far as its logic, its axioms, its explanations of human behavior and so on are concerned. The Axioms are embracive of the whole subject of Dianetics, not just Dianetic processing. These are the axioms of the first echelon of Dianetics. We want to organize them in a book. The first axiom will be across the top of the page in italics; then there will be a little graph of some sort and an explanation of the graph. Next will be the phenomena which prove up this axiom, the logic behind it and how it joins up with other axioms. That will be on one page. The next axiom will be on the next page in italics with a graph and an explanation of the graph. The whole thing will be laid out, in other words, just like a geometry book.

The material is being organized in this wise and it is going to be put on the shelves of university libraries. The boys in psychology can have a good time with it and they can be very disgusted with it until they look and see that there are phenomena outlined and delineated there which they can look for. They like an empirical science, so they can go and see if this phenomena exists. Of course, that sinks them!

Nothing is said in these axioms about past deaths as such and nothing is said about various odds and ends of processing. Just phenomena are pointed out in order to point up the axioms.

So there are two levels of instruction that I am trying to give you. One of them is just the Axioms per se so that you will know the subject of Dianetics. Once you have the Axioms you will know the subject; you will be able to say “Yes, that means so-and-so,” and act very learned. You will be able to show your student the whole circuit of the first echelon of Dianetics. You can show him where everything fits and he can argue with you and try to get isolated phenomena that disprove this or that. He will come in dragging a dead horse—something out of psychology that says, “Every time a kleptomaniac cannot steal something he burns down the house” (one of the phenomena mentioned in psychology)—and say, “Now, that’s not covered by the Axioms.”

Of course it is up to you to prove to him that a kleptomaniac does not always burn down the house but maybe one did one time or another, and this was just an engram in operation.

What you know about the behavior of engrams is very valid in terms of human behavior. It is just that processing has advanced on a mechanical level to a point where it can be ignored. But you know behavior, you know why people do these things, and nobody can take that away from you.

The point in all this instruction is just to invite your level of understanding on this subject and to place in your hands, in as automatically codified a process as possible, a way to knock out chronic somatics or to free all the theta which is “enthetafied” in the individual, if you want to take off two or three weeks and work somebody, or a couple of weeks anyway—or maybe just a week: I don’t want to exaggerate and give you an idea that you can collect fees for three or four weeks just working on one preclear; I don’t know whether you would find that much stuff.

Now, you can discount anything wild that you have heard about this new process; it is actually quite simple—not very difficult to follow. But it is very startling. You don’t pay any attention to line charge, boil-offs (you occasionally get a yawn off somebody) or any of these enMEST manifestations to amount to anything, because they are not necessary. They are not contained in the body. Those things are just theta facsimiles, so why worry about them? What has been discovered is this: It is the preclear himself who keeps the engram in present time. He himself determines the engram into present time. When you knock out his determination to keep the engram in present time or to hold on to the engram, it goes by the boards.

Maybe after we have worked this for a while we may get a complaint from part of the celestial heavens and somebody will say, “Hey, what’s the idea of kicking all these theta facsimiles loose so they can never be picked up again? You’re getting this whole place cluttered up with theta facsimiles.” We will wait till we receive such a complaint.

The point is that these things don’t have to be run! That is what has been discovered. All that has to be run is a fellow’s effort to agree and disagree, to have affinity with and not to have affinity with, to communicate and not to have communication with—in short, to understand or not to understand—the engram. And that is a physical effort that comes from some earlier engram. All you do is knock out his effort with regard to the engram, and then all of the efforts and everything everybody said and did and the enMEST manifestations and so forth go by the boards.

This stuff disappears. I don’t care where it goes. Maybe it can be found again—I don’t know. We haven’t even bothered much to look for it. But as far as the preclear is concerned, you start peeling this stuff off him and he evidently contacts a pure theta source somehow or other and he starts rolling.

You can take a preclear and you will find that he is resisting efforts. We call these counter-efforts. You have the preclear and there is a counter-effort coming in against him, but there is resistance to that counter-effort. That is a physical-action resistance. That is called self-determinism.

He has to keep some self-determinism on this counter-effort in order to keep it in place. If you could just keep him from putting his self-determinism on that counter-effort he wouldn't restimulate.

Now, here is the mechanism: A truck runs into him one Tuesday, dents his back somewhat, and he goes into apathy immediately. He says, "All right, truck, I agree with you; go ahead and kill me. I agree with you, I agree perfectly and I'll communicate," and it hits him. He tries to stop time at this point because he is trying to stop the truck's motion, trying to stop the motion of pain inside of him, and so forth. He just holds on to time or he wishes himself out of the time he is holding on to or does both so that he apparently goes off someplace else, but he is still in the engram. And he forgets all about this.

Then one day, five years later, he sees a red truck; he happens to be very tired that day and it is the same kind of truck that hit him. He evidently has scanners in his mind in operation consistently and continually, and they scan, scan, scan: "Is there anything dangerous about this environment? Is there anything dangerous about this?" All of a sudden they say, "Wait, wait, wait—red truck!" Bong! "Oh, it's a dangerous truck. Good. I don't feel well." That is really the whole mechanism.

The auditor's mechanism is to take the preclear's scanner and knock out his effort with regard to that engram, and the red-truck engram disappears. The engram still has the preclear's determinism to agree with the truck in it. As long as that first engram has an effort to agree, the preclear's scanner in present time can switch down across the bank and it can find "Hey, I agreed with this one," and put it right up in present time. "I'm in affinity now with being hit by a truck." The preclear wants to be hurt.

There was an observation in the first book that said a person couldn't be aberrated unless he agreed to it. This self-determinism is his agreement with it. That is all there is to it. Now, the auditor will find in a preclear these counter-efforts. The preclear is madly holding a counter-effort out there and he has been holding it out there for years. He is agreeing with it, and agreeing with it puts him a little bit out of valence. If he agrees with it he goes a little bit out of valence because he can't be himself and agree with it; it will kill him if he is himself. He has to disagree with it to be himself; but it has put him into apathy, so he can't be himself.

Here he sits, just a little bit out of valence. He sneaks into valence a little bit, then he gets hit and he goes out of valence. He has been doing this for years. He never gets over where he can be hit by the truck, so he stays out of valence.

That truck is the counter-effort; the counter-effort is always there. This is very easy for you to find in a preclear. Take a look at your preclear and find a physical deformity or a psychosomatic illness and you have a counter effort, right there. Either the preclear is bulged out at the spot to resist this counter-effort, or he is caved in at the point of the counter-effort.

Take glasses, for instance: There is something coming toward a person who has glasses; there is a counter-effort there with which he has agreed. He has a self-determined effort that

that counter-effort be there. In other words, he has the counter-effort coming in and he has an effort to agree with it because it put him in apathy.

Now, the way you get a child to mind is to beat the devil out of him—"everybody knows" that. As a matter of fact, I could throw you into apathy by just asking you to repeat "Okay, I'll mind." You would go right down the tone scale, because you would be going toward a moment when you agreed against your own survival. And you agreed because of a counter effort, basically. You didn't agree out of data—that is something else, another brand of ARC entirely. This is apathy ARC; we can distinguish it that way. It is enforced agreement and so on.

So what you do is look at a fellow who has glasses and say, "What is the physical effort to understand any pressure you might have on your eyes?" That is all you have to do. "What is your physical effort to understand that?" (Don't do it, by the way; you would go half blind right this minute.) Get him to working on it and get him to sweep it back and forth. Of course there is no reality on it: he is out of valence.

You will find that as you ask him to resist it, it might flick on for him. But of course agreement is practically no effort in his own position, so he can get out of valence a little bit or something. If you can coax him to be almost motionless you will find this counter-effort—where he is almost motionless.

Now start asking him, "How does your right foot try to agree with this pressure on your eyes? How does your left foot try to agree with this pressure on your eyes? How does your left shoulder try to agree? How does your right shoulder try to agree? What does your right hand think about it? What is the physical effort of your right hand with regard to any pressure on your eyes? What is its effort to agree?"

The preclear's attention will go to all of these various areas, and all of a sudden you will have taken his self-determined attention and pulled it off that somatic. So it hits him and he goes promptly out of valence.

You say, "All right now, what does your right foot feel about it?" and so on. But every time you get that thing to come in you exhaust it a little bit. So you just shift his attention around to various parts of his body and get his effort to agree, his effort to understand, his effort to like, his effort to communicate with—all of these things—and you keep running them any time you want.

All of a sudden he says, "I don't want to communicate with this thing."

"All right. Let's get your effort to disagree with it now." His tone will come right on up on that pressure, and then you take his glasses off and throw them in the wastebasket and take his three, four, five thousand dollars—whatever you charged him—and let him walk out. That would be fixing up a chronic somatic.

Now, take somebody who has a blemish of some sort, something that looks like a tumor, maybe. That is just a counter-effort You get his effort to understand it, his effort to like it and the effort of his right foot to like it, or anything you want. There are many variations; I am giving you the very simplest one. Get his efforts to like it and he will turn on a physical effort someplace.

If a fellow can't get any physical efforts, by the way, you say, "What is your effort to think?"

“Why, just like everybody else, my effort to think is . . .”

“Well, go on. Get your physical effort to think, now.”

“Well, it’s just like everybody else. I mean, I grit my teeth.”

“Well, go on and grit your teeth,” and all of a sudden—bong! Sky rockets! You have gotten his physical effort to think.

You will find people have physical efforts to remember, physical efforts to do almost anything, if they are very badly aberrated.

Anyway, here is this counter-effort on any kind of a tumor or something like that. All you do is take the fellow’s self-determined effort off it. First get his effort to agree, because he is in apathy about it (otherwise it wouldn’t make a blemish on him), and then knock out his agreement and make him disagree with it. Reality will turn on in the sequence, you get him to present time and that is all there is to it. If he went down past it on the track afterwards, he wouldn’t hit it.

The trouble with locating counter-efforts and efforts is that you start locating efforts within efforts within efforts and you march him right straight back down the time track; you will wind him up in birth or anything else, but it doesn’t matter. Don’t worry about where you wind your preclear up. Just don’t worry about it anymore. Don’t worry about winding him up in birth or in operations and so forth, because running effort won’t stick him on the track the way other kinds of processing will; it was only effort that could hold him there.

Of course, you want to try to run early engrams; it is much better than running later engrams. But don’t worry about it. Just ask for the effort and you will get it. You won’t hurt the preclear; you may have to work with him for a while.

Now, working this on an event level, you work all the efforts out of a single event. If this fellow got hit by a truck—this fits best into your frame of experience—you get the effort that connected with the truck hitting him and you work out the whole engram on an effort basis. It is fairly rapid; you don’t have to ask him about the words or anything like that. All you are asking him is what does he think about it? What is his self-determinism with regard to this? That is all you are interested in.

This brings up the point that all there is, practically, is self-determinism. Of course, self-determinism is caused by some other counter-effort someplace in the past, but nevertheless, it is self-determinism. It is only self determinism.

This can go off into a Straightwire of this character: “When did you agree to be ill?” In short, “When did you want to understand a contra survival condition or action?” is the full idea. “When did you want to understand it?”

That means when you went into apathy about it. Only those things which were dangerous have to be understood, actually.

So you can give a fellow Straightwire: “When in your life did you decide to be ill?”

“Oh, I never decided to be ill—I wouldn’t think of such a thing! “

“Well, how about school?”

“Oh, yeah, yeah, it was—yeah! I remember a time I said I was ill so I didn’t have to go to school.”

It is just fascinating how much effect this decision had on the fellow’s life. He made this decision then; you will find him making decisions elsewhere, and you will find him making decisions to be ill so that he can propitiate somebody. Some other child is ill, so he decides he will be ill. Some other child is stammering; he feels sorry for the other child, so he starts to stammer to show the other child he is in sympathy. He has decided to do that, however, of his own free will.

What we have been looking at are the causes of these postulates, the physical forces that cause a person to make these decisions. But as far as Straightwire is concerned, they only become effective—these past actions and decisions—when the preclear himself makes up his mind that they will be effective. That is the only way they can become effective upon him.

So you only have to go back over his track and find when he decided to be this, when he decided to like somebody, when he decided to talk to somebody—the first time he decided to talk to somebody, the first time he decided this, that and the other thing.

“Now, when did you decide that what you were doing in life was hard work? When did you decide this?”

And the fellow will say, “Oh, I never—well, wait a minute. When I was a kid they used to tease me about never working hard enough. Oh yeah, I started to tell them how hard I worked. Oh, yeah! Yeah!”

This fellow hasn’t done any work for days, but the next morning he goes down to work and really starts turning it out. You call this to his attention— you say, “Well, I noticed our little session did you some good.”

He says, “I didn’t notice.” It is too easy.

But this is the kind of Straightwire you use: “When did you decide to like the kind of a woman who is giving you trouble?” “When did you decide to like the kind of man who is making your life miserable for you?” “When did you decide . . . ?” They will give you the moment when they decided, first, to feel affection for, next, to agree with and next, to communicate with this person with whom they are currently going. You have it right there. But let’s find now if they decided to go into ARC with anybody earlier on this same subject; you will find a bucketful of them.

The first thing you know, the stuff which, in the past, we would have had to get cried off the case in gallon buckets is coming off this preclear quickly and easily.

“When did you decide you liked your grandfather?”

“Oh, I can’t get any visio on my grandfather at all.”

“What is the physical effort of agreeing with your grandfather?”

“Well, I don’t get any visio on him at all; how can I give . . .”

“Well, just this: Will you get a physical effort now? What is your physical effort to agree with your grandfather?”

And the fellow all of a sudden says, “I don’t know. I sort of feel my head going like this.”

Now you say, “Can you feel how you agree with your grandfather now? Can you feel how you communicate with your grandfather? Can you feel how you like your grandfather?” and so forth. You get this all turned up, and the fellow says, “But I don’t!”

“Well, can you get your effort to disagree with your grandfather?”

“Yeah, that’s this way.”

The second you get that disagreement you have come up from an apathy-level ARC, which you could call enturbulated ARC or commanded ARC. You can get that rising up into actual ARC and the reality on Grandpa will turn on.

This is what you have been fighting for, for a long time.

Now, I will give you how the sessions are run, described briefly.

The first session you more or less work with the preclear to get efforts of various kinds and you finally get real efforts. You want to be careful that the preclear isn’t just sitting there expanding and contracting his blood vessels for days, because this is not effort on his part. He just thinks it is effort, and it is actual physical effort you are looking for.

By the way, one of the tricks you can use with a fellow who has glasses on is to say, “If somebody were pushing you in the face, which way would you be pushed?”

“Oh, that way.”

“Well, can you get that motion?”

The fellow foolishly will say, “Sure, sure.”

“And now can you get an effort to resist that motion?”

“Yeah—o-o-o-w-w! “

You just keep that effort up with him until all of a sudden you have his effort to resist this other motion. Just that simply, you can do it. Now he knows what an effort is.

You ask him “If something were pushing you at this moment, which direction would you have to move?”

He will say, “Well, I’d have to move this way.”

“All right. Now let’s practice moving this way”—with the counter effort. That puts him out of valence—it makes him the counter-effort.

“Now, which way would you have to move to go against this?”

He says, “Oh, I wouldn’t dare,” or something like this. He is in apathy about it.

You just coax him to stand there and be pushed and like it. So he likes it, he gets the effort to like it—which is no effort. He is getting it good, and then all of a sudden he says, “I don’t like it.”

“All right, what motion would you have to make to resist it?”

“Well, I’d sort of have to go like this.” So you let him go like that.

You train him into doing it, more or less; you get him running nicely in the first session.

You turn on all his perceptics in the second session; that makes him feel better.

You run him out of whatever place on the track he is very badly stuck, or release his major theta in the case, in the third session. Maybe the fourth session you get his conceptual levels on self determinism, but you had better be careful about the fourth session. I would knock off after the third session myself unless I were going to carry him through for four or five more days, because people get so they want to come back on this stuff and they want to get some more processing, and you don’t want to have to spend all of your time monkeying with one preclear! So give him a yo-heave after a certain space of time. It is a good thing to knock off after you have turned on his perceptics or done something like this; it is a good thing to knock off as soon as you turn off his chronic somatic. If he has a chronic somatic that has been worrying him, turn it off and let him go off for a while.

Then when he comes back to you again you can always say, “Well, you don’t have your ‘spinal curvature of the left orifice’ anymore.”

But actually you will probably want to go on beyond this point, so you just keep stripping out efforts, efforts within efforts within efforts within efforts, and exhausting them probably on an event level each time, cleaning them up very nicely, leaving the track in good shape and releasing this sort of thing. But don’t expect to stay in concourse with the human race very long.

It is very interesting, but you get a different set of values doing this. This is what you have been working for, for a long time. On the first echelon, if a fellow got swamped up all the way, we would call him Homo novis, because he has jumped a sort of an evolutionary gap. We are not quite sure what happens to him but it is interesting. Then as soon as we penetrate the second echelon a little bit more, we will have another level of Homo novis. There would have to be a date on this: right now I am talking about Homo novis of October 8 at nine o’clock. I might get another idea before the lecture is over and change all this stuff.

Fortunately the direction is toward simplicity and it is carrying along on its own extrapolated line. You have to know all this if you really want a good command of the subject. It looks to me, however, as though we have done the complete circle and we are in the second echelon. You needn’t be worried about what theta really is anyhow; we can go sailing off and sit down and worry about that one for months or weeks or something before we solve it.

As far as the theta-MEST relationship is concerned, it appears to be buttoned up. I have asked the research auditors and they seem to understand about it, so I guess you can.

It is a bit of a compliment that, in view of how long it took to process somebody with the earlier techniques, anybody hung on at all—except that you could get results. You got results and that is fine, but what you mainly got was experience.

You are never going to see phenomena like this again. Probably nobody else will ever have to look at it again.

Another thing that is going to happen is that, for those auditors who pan out on these new techniques—know their subject well, pass an examination in the mathematics of Dianetics and so forth—we are trying now to see if we can achieve some means of securing a doctorate. That is not a promise, but just something that may be shortly in the offing on it.

I am very happy to be able to give you this material. I want you to get a good solid grip on it. The best way to do that is to get it working for you.

If any of your preclears think they are going into high manics or something like that, it doesn't work that way. Actually, Effort Processing winds a preclear up in what he thinks is a permanent low apathy for a few minutes, then it hits him into what he thinks is going to be a terrifically high manic. He will go all over the tone scale.

But the tone scale is 40.0 down to at least—3.0, and we are using the whole tone scale now—all of it. We knew by extrapolation that there was this much tone scale. So I don't want to see any more of these low-toned tone 4.0's hanging around anymore!