

## BEING RIGHT

A lecture given on  
24 October 1951

### Making Others Wrong

I had a somatic which I had been trying to undo for a couple of years on other types of processing. It would go away, but it would come back again. I found it yesterday with Effort Processing; I found its source, and in the process of knocking it out I learned a couple of things. That is a good way to study.

We are going to cover the length, breadth and thickness of overall processing, particularly the combination of Conclusion Processing and Effort Processing, the way the two mix up and the way they intermingle and how you shift from one to the other. I think this may be of some interest, because you are going to be doing this to a lot of preclears. The only mistake that you are going to make is in not getting all the effort out.

Perhaps it will require a little facility on the part of the auditor to look into the preclear's mind. That facility is furnished by an automatic index on the tone scale which isn't written into Science of Survival. It has to do with muscular tension. Muscular tension is an excellent index.

You have a tone scale which runs, in terms of speed, from 0.0 to 40.0. An individual fluctuates between 0.0 and 40.0—which could also be called zero—and the 0.0-to-40.0 index would be an index of motion, the amount of motion the preclear is traveling on at the moment. This would be an actual index of speed—0.0, 4.0, 20.0 and so forth.

I want to tell you about a gimmick in Dianetics that has not been discovered yet but which exists simply as an extrapolation from the Axioms. Somewhere—and this may be also the solution to practically the one-shot Clear!—there is a “governor.” There is some factor of speed of motion of the individual's internal concerns and of his external concerns. There is a speed, a velocity. When an individual travels at a lower velocity he picks up the file of enthefa facsimiles of that velocity. If you can get a fellow down to 1.1, he will have a large file of material which has, as a common denominator, the tone level of 1.1.

In the middle of an engram, at its greatest depth, is apathy, a close approach to motionlessness. As you move through an engram you find an area where there is still a fight to get out of it, and at the end are the feeble struggles to regain and come back to balance. The whole tone scale is represented in a severe engram—the whole tone scale, from one end to the other. At the beginning the fellow is more or less at a normal level of activity, and all of a sudden he gets hit. Whether it is sharp or slow doesn't matter. The fellow moves down the tone scale, slowly or quickly, to 0.1. Just before that is grief. At a point both before and after the bottom level of the engram the individual will be found to be covert. There is a point in the engram where he is at 1.5, and his direction is very overt as far as destruction is concerned; the second that fails, he starts caving in on himself.

It is very interesting to you as an auditor that every engram, if it results in unconsciousness, has in it every point of the tone scale from 2.0 down. Every one of them has.

Therefore, you could take a large number of engrams and you could lay these things out on a chart, and you could draw a line through the 1.1 point of every engram and you would

have a speed, a speed of being. You could take an engram received at two years, an engram received at five years and an engram received at ten years, and these engrams would all start down from about 2.0. Right below that are these points of 1.5. Maybe two of these engrams didn't get any lower than 1.5, but one engram got to 0.5. That is a speed; 0.5 is a speed. It is just like twenty miles an hour on your speedometer.

This is like a fellow driving down the road at five miles an hour. Let's just arbitrarily say that he picks up at five miles an hour. At any instant that he is traveling at five miles an hour and receives intelligence of a failure—it is important that he gets that trigger, he fails at something—he will have available to him, for his use, all these points of 0.5.

If he is traveling at thirty-five miles an hour and he meets a sudden bang, we could say that he suddenly has available to him all the points of 2.0—and I mean by that all 2.0S down the whole genetic line and everything else. He has all the 2.0S, SO he can choose them. A choice is operating there, but that is what he chooses at that point. He chooses 2.0—that is his velocity.

Now, this may be something that is not quite within reach because you haven't seen it in a preclear. But one of these fine days, some of us are going to look at a preclear and we are going to suddenly realize that this individual is traveling too fast or too slow and that what we are trying to do is equalize his speed, and we are going to be able to lay our hands on the governor— actually lay our hands on the governor.

The governor is self-determined. The fellow puts his speed down. When he makes a choice of an entheta facsimile, he does something with himself to match it. Just clumsily, I am going to call it speed. An individual has a certain inherent velocity or something. The static from which he is operating at the moment is capable of receiving a certain amount of velocity. This is very nebulous, but it works out even though we can't lay our hands on the governor right off the bat. I would dare to say that within a month we will probably find it.

A person, all through his life, has been choosing entheta facsimiles at his various levels of operation. Oddly enough, he chooses them on the whole gamut all the way up and down the tone scale. He travels at a certain speed, and all that establishes the speed, evidently, is just his belief in what speed he has. It is just as simple as that. The fellow says, "Now I am going at such and such a speed," something goes whir, click, and he says, "This matches up Aunt Agnes's funeral. Poor me, poor I. I don't feel very good today; I don't think I'll work." It is just about that mechanical.

But you can see for yourself that self-determined effort, those selfdetermined postulates and so forth. You have been back into this stuff and you have found that you had periods when you wished you were sick. You weren't sick; you just said all of a sudden, "I will be sick," "I will have bad eyes," "I am going to get sick at my stomach—I'll show her!" and so on. You have found these points.

The mechanical mechanism of choosing the level is matching a speed to the environment and finding that that speed matches an entheta facsimile, and then using the entheta facsimile. It is very simple. A fellow does a self-determined selection from his own card-file system—a self-determined selection. He says, "This is what I am going to throw at them."

Let's say a fellow has just received an entheta facsimile. He has come out of a tonsillectomy, and somebody says to him, "Aw, that doesn't hurt, that doesn't bother anybody." The individual could do two things: he could say, "It doesn't matter whether this character is validating or invalidating me," and just let it go, or he could say, "It's

important whether this character is validating or invalidating me; it is now necessary for me to validate or invalidate him. To be well, now, is to validate him—if the tonsillectomy isn't anything. But if I am sick, the tonsillectomy is then capable of invalidating him." So he takes the tonsillectomy which has just been gone through and he says, "I'm sick. You're wrong!"

This is an insidious method of control, and I will show you why in a moment.

But the nurse says, "Oh, you're not sick. Nobody ever gets sick from a tonsillectomy."

The fellow says, "Look at me—sick. You're wrong, you're wrong." All he is saying is "You're wrong." It is his method of putting the nurse into apathy, because the way you put people into apathy is to make them wrong.

So all he has to do is pick up this handiest facsimile, but maybe it isn't a tough enough facsimile. Maybe the necessity to invalidate the nurse is so great—according to the individual's own choice—that he thinks, "Let's reach back and pick out a big engram in the file and get really sick." Then he says, "Not only am I sick . . ."

You can actually find places on the track where the individual does this consciously. "Oh, this tonsillectomy isn't so much. I think I'll reach back and get the time I fell out of the baby buggy," so he lies there half unconscious— boy, is he pathetic, is she wrong!

Or, a child has been lying in bed on a school morning, and just in the line of experience and action (he isn't accepting these facsimiles) he is halfway thinking about the time he is going to be a bomber pilot or something of the sort, and he gets over the enemy lines, he is shot down and there he falls in flames.

Then Mama comes in and says, "It's time you got up and went to school! "

It is always necessary to make Mama wrong, if possible, because she is a big control mechanism in the environment. The little boy has postulated this mood for himself, and all of a sudden a new factor enters in on him. He is being shot down in flames over Germany, but obviously Mama is not going to swallow being shot down in flames over Germany. However, it is necessary that Mama be wrong at this moment, so he reaches back and picks up the snivels he had last Wednesday. He says, "You're wrong; I can't get up."

And she says, "There's nothing in the world wrong with you, Reginald! Nothing. You get up this moment and go to school!"

So he thinks, "Well, those snivels weren't good enough; let's see, what can I find back here now? Oh, boy! My pneumonia (cough! cough!). Boy, are you wrong, you slut! " That is what he is thinking to himself—"You're wrong. Boy, am I sick."

Now, if Mama said "You are just faking; there is nothing in the world wrong with you. That is just your imagination" (little does she know it is his self-determinism), this child may reach back and pick up birth and hand it up—after all, she did it to him—and say, "My head aches and I've got a stomachache and a sore jaw. I can't get up."

Somewhere along the line, as he picks up facsimile after facsimile after facsimile, he is finally going to get one that will trigger a facsimile in Mama, and when he does that he is of course stuck with exactly where he triggered it, because now it is necessary—in order to be honest, forthright, ethical—to go on with that facsimile for a day or two.

He is perfectly all right until he forgets that he himself brought it forward. If at any moment he falls into his own trap of saying “This is real,” it becomes real to him. Then he is sick. And here starts a lifelong siege of hypochondria, illness, spectacles—all sorts of things.

The first contest with Mama was not on a mental basis. The first contest with Mama was strictly with the dukes up. Baby is lying there enjoying himself, life is going along perfectly fine. But he doesn't get fed! He feels mildly hungry, so he says, “I have got to have fuel—whimperwhimper”—and nothing happens. “Whimper-whimper! “—nothing happens. That baby is liable to reach back and pick up birth or something of the sort, or reach back into a prenatal—get some action somewhere that is very convincing—and put himself into a screaming hoopla.

Mama comes in and says, “Well, what on earth is the matter with you? Why don't you shut up?”

That is the wrong result, so he is going to get a better one. Somewhere along the line he is going to get service.

But other things happen, too. For instance, he is lying there but he gets disturbed. He is picked up when he doesn't want to be picked up or he is too warm—his self-determinism is interfered with. This is like a little baby just out of the hospital whose mother is trying to feed him cod-liver oil. She holds his head—she is going to break him down to apathy on the subject of cod-liver oil. That can go so far as not even utilizing it in the physical system. Why Mama doesn't take it, when the baby would get it as a breastfed baby, I don't know. Maybe she doesn't like it. She has to dramatize; she holds him down, puts a knee in his chest and gives it to him.

The baby objects to this sort of thing, so he decides he is going to haul off and plant a haymaker on the person who is doing this. That is a good solid decision—one haymaker called for; the right bicep gets tough, he is about ready to brace himself and let fly, and all of a sudden he finds out that he hasn't got the muscular control. Furthermore, at the moment of this haymaker, which is just going to end up as a light tap, the grown-up says, “Oh, don't struggle, dear”—crush!

Now what does he do? If he is pulled all the way down into apathy, he has his choice of all of the death engrams, all of the apathy engrams that he has. He is going to make somebody sorry for that if he possibly can, because he has to make somebody else wrong; he has to. He wasn't right! He let himself down; he wasn't strong enough or tough enough. So he establishes a new velocity of being.

Most infants spend their infancy in a docile state thereafter, after they have broken this down. But there really isn't any reason why an infant should.

I went through a little series of experiments with a baby which were quite interesting. This baby was five weeks old. I was rehabilitating his belief in his own toughness. We could call that now, more technically, “getting him up to velocity,” because he was way down—he was snively, sick, he wouldn't cry very lustily and so forth.

I had this child around for a while. He would say, “Waaah”—instant service. If he gave me the faintest struggle, it was “Okay, anything you want.” This baby got to thinking it over. If he wanted to turn over, I let him turn over; if he wanted to grin and be cheerful—sure, grin and be cheerful. In other words, I let this child self-determine everything that was happening— everything. Didn't want his bottle? So he didn't want his bottle! If he wanted a bottle he got a bottle.

This baby started to get tough. He didn't cry any weak little whimpers; he cried "Waaah!" When he said "Waaah" he was coming up the tone scale, and I would give him service quick! The first thing you know, this baby was in much better health.

I did this with a cat. I had a cat that was very, very down in the mouth. (I'm telling you this so that you will realize that we are working with purely mechanical stuff, not words, coaxings, understandings or anything.) This cat had what they used to laughingly call an inferiority complex. I don't know who doesn't have one; that is something like saying, "He is a human being." This little cat had taken a terrible beating from life. Mama evidently deserted her, and a little boy had picked the cat up and thrown her onto a front porch. This kitten was just bare, bruised up and hungry. I found out she was very smart; I kept the cat around.

People started to get mean to this cat. The cat would want to come in, so they would shove it out; the cat would want to go out, so they would keep it in; the cat would want something to eat, so they wouldn't feed it; the cat didn't want anything to eat, so they would hold it and make it eat.

This cat was not doing too well, and she was showing a tendency, when strangers would come in, to go around and hide, slink. She wasn't keeping herself clean; she wasn't keeping her fur licked up good and clean, she wasn't keeping her face clean.

What do you do about a cat like this? Just get the cat up to velocity. So what I would do was touch the cat's toes, and if the cat flinched that meant I had touched too hard. So I would catch the cat again just when she was sitting still and touch her toes very gently, and when the cat started to swat at me I would say, "Ow! Ow!"

I kept this up for a few days. Every time I would find the cat around someplace, I would flick its ear, and if it turned its head sideways I would jerk my hand back: "Now, stop it; leave me alone! Don't scratch me!"—that whole attitude. Finally I got her up to where, if I hit the cat's toes hard, the cat would just whack me.

That cat got up to velocity. Guests would come in and the cat would walk over and claw their ankles all up, untie their shoes and so on. She started keeping herself clean, started walking straight up, looking tough; she got self-respect, came up the tone scale, and then got very happy and friendly with everybody. And if somebody would get unfriendly with the cat, she would tackle him back.

That cat subsequently developed into a hunter. Very few cats in this modern society ever really develop into hunters to amount to anything; they will play with mice, and that is about all.

But rats are very often as big as cats. And squirrels are the most formidable enemy that a cat has, because a squirrel has a claw in back of his paw and he can walk down a tree upside down; he can walk down a tree head-down and a cat can't—a cat has to back down. So in fights between squirrels and cats, the cat always loses, and cats more or less just inherently stay away from squirrels.

Not this cat! She went after these great, big, tough red squirrels. Pow!—one dead red squirrel! Of course, it was rather embarrassing; she would come in with c an ary b irds an d al l sorts of things fro m the neighbor hood, and very proudly leave them laying, with a certain nonchalance. That was a real tough cat, out of a timid little kitten.

You can do this with a human being, and the point is that you had better. But just how do you do it with a human being?

Let's look again at this scale of velocity; these numbers from 0.0 to 40.0 would represent relative speed. A human being can go too fast until he stops. There is a speed way up there someplace which is a static. You increase velocity—*increase, increase, increase, increase*—and then hit a static. Or you decrease velocity—*decrease, decrease, decrease, decrease*—and hit a static.

Actually, up at 39.05 is grief; at 39 is covert hostility, at 38.5 is anger, and so on. You have the same tone scale in reverse up at the top, from 40.0 down, evidently; that is where it lies.

In other words, a person's velocity can come up, and if it hangs up around 20.0 he is in good shape. But then his motion starts falling off. And there is a direct index between his belief in his own ability, his own selfconfidence in his environment, and his velocity; there must be a mechanical trigger there.

I have seen it work too often not to suspect. Whether or not we can find the trigger and regulate it more or less automatically is a horse of another hue, but the point is that all of the preclears you watch are going on a speedup toward the upper zero or on a slowdown toward the lower zero if they have hit the dwindling spiral.

In increasing years, alone, one hits the dwindling spiral. The reason for this is very simple: A person keeps postulating all during his youth on the state of age, and then falls into it just in numerical terms of years.

Now, oddly enough, at 0.0 and 40.0, or the upper zero, there is something very peculiar going on: it is terrifically pure thought! And it is only when a person suffers some kind of a reversal and slows way down that he thinks himself a few tremendous thoughts. The trouble is that out of that new static he may or may not resurge.

But there is a sort of an operation going on whereby an individual can pose his own static. He reaches a static point and then poses a new static and goes on from that new static—only it is a false static. And if you look over a person's life span and you look for the time when he had these big ideas or when he had an enormous concept of something or other, you are going to find a slow place which is immediately preceded by a tremendous failure.

This is the big cycle or the small cycle. This goes on from day to day, it goes on over weekly cycles, it goes on over yearly cycles and it goes on over the cycle of a whole lifetime.

Now, there is a governor of some sort which the individual is in control of. I am afraid that controlling this is like learning how to wiggle your ears. You say, "I am traveling at such and such a speed." You don't quite say it that way; the way you would term it is "My relative dangerousness to my environment at this moment is such-and-such," and out of that you set your speed. 0

How does an auditor use this? The tone scale of relative velocity is also accompanied by a lack of tension or by too much tension. There is nonoptimum muscular tension present in the individual—the cords up in the neck and shoulders and so on. This forms a tone scale of tension.

If a person has too much residual tension, he gets slower and slower and slower until he stops. What he is doing is holding on to motion. How much motion is he holding on to? How much motion is he trying to damp out? What is he trying to do with the entheta facsimile? This is sort of a game he plays. He gets the entheta facsimile and then he damps it.

The degree that he is damping out that motion called pain is the place of fixedness he will occupy on the tone scale. That is very simple.

You can take anybody and feel their shoulders, feel the residual tension in the muscles on either side of their spine, even feel muscles in the back of the neck. Are they pretty tense? That is how much motion the person is holding on to out of an entheta facsimile which he himself has attracted. Sometimes you can't get him to let go of this entheta facsimile that he has attracted.

An incident can just have happened to an individual, and there isn't any reason he can't finish up and come to the end of the incident and be right as rain—even though it is a tonsillectomy or anything else. Something has to happen to make him reach back and pick up that facsimile and hand it to somebody. And he does this according to his own concept of his own speed at the moment, his concept of his own ability inside the body to shunt off pain.

If he believes, for instance, that he is practically impervious, he has the feeling that motion hitting him will be immediately converted and utilized in his business of living. That is at about 20.0. The next level down, he has to damp it out a little bit before it goes out. And on a lower level—the level of 1.5—he has to hold it and he doesn't let it go.

This is an interesting example of that: You know about a 1.5's depository illnesses. A person who has arthritis is at 1.5; that is a depository illness. He has the motion of an entheta facsimile and he is holding it; he is holding that motion in the entheta facsimile. Therefore he will hold deposits of chemicals. Also, these 1.5s are the most maddeningly persistent people along any irrational line imaginable. They will start out along a certain line and they won't even turn.

The tendency of a 1.5 in driving is to handle motion by holding it. For instance, when he comes to a curve he doesn't turn it because he would have to change motion. He is not trying to change motion, he is trying to hold on to motion. So if he is going along this straight line down the highway and he comes to a curve there will be a little lag, a tendency not to turn it.

In addition to that, the level of action is damping out motion. So he tries to damp out the motion of the people in his environment. Somebody bounces around in the environment and the 1.5 will try to destroy the person one way or the other—but directly and overtly. There is nothing very covert about it.

You will find that the circulatory system is operating the same way. It gets to running at one speed and it will stay that way. There is no change at this 1.5 level; the person has thrown away his right to change.

I am talking now about very definite and deep fundamentals on this subject. This is what you are looking at in a preclear; you are looking at somebody whose belief in his own ability to handle himself in his environment is damaged. That is the first thing that is wrong with him and it is really all that is wrong with him.

He has taken aboard entheta facsimiles to prove his speed and then he has laid aside his self-determinism in favor of the entheta facsimiles. It is in these steps that you get the deterioration of self-determinism.

There is something horrible about all this; it is gruesome. And you can really use this in auditing, because you will come up eventually with the conclusions if you use it.

Now, we covered earlier that the three possible postulates were start, stop and change—not to be, to be, to change.

On top of that we put ARC across eight dynamics—one, two, three, four, five, six, seven and infinity.

Let me ask you this question: Can a person influence dynamic three without influencing dynamic one? It is all the same bundle of energy or lack of it. Can he influence infinity without influencing dynamic four?

Self-determinism is composed of this package, isn't it?

It so happens that this identicalness only holds true—obviously true—below 2.0. This is the old characteristic of the reactive mind:  $A=A=A=A$ .

This identicalness holds true below 2.0.

There is some differentiative quality above 2.0 where some self-determinism exists. But every time an individual embarks upon an operation which is below 2.0 in its intent, he picks up entheta facsimiles to use against another dynamic. That is a dangerous thing for him to do, because the next thing that happens is that when the entheta facsimile is not wholly effective on the other dynamic, he gets the whole impact of it along all the dynamics—like a prairie fire suddenly exploding.

It is perfectly all right as long as he says to somebody “I'm going to kill you” and then proceeds to kill the person. He is fairly safe then. But if he says “I'm going to kill you” and then doesn't, it is too bad, because it is going to backfire all along the other dynamics.

Now, you are principally treating the first dynamic when you are treating a preclear, because an individual who has gotten down to the practically nonexistent velocity of 4.0 is running pretty slow, and he is mostly concerned with the backfires he has gotten from all the entheta facsimiles he has handed out.

It is a horrible little trick: He hands out an entheta facsimile on dynamic three and he goes along fine until all of a sudden he is brought to a speed of motion where he needs that. Then the thing will switch valences on him and so forth; it goes out of control and it apparently wipes out his self-determinism. He merely becomes an actor in one of those entheta facsimiles.

Much more simply, an individual starts out to operate on dynamic three. For some reason or other, he has freely chosen that other individuals in his vicinity must move. They have to move; he has got to have action out of other people. Where this starts, one doesn't care particularly. He wants other people to move.

That is “start motion, dynamic three.” That would be exactly what he is trying to do. But he isn't successful and he isn't successful and he isn't successful, and so he finds out he can't do “start motion, dynamic three.” He receives a failure on “start motion, dynamic three.” Now his reasoning is “Start motion, third dynamic—failure.” And the second he says

“failure” on the end of that, he gets the same result on the first dynamic. So, from “Start motion, third dynamic—failure,” he gets “Start motion, first dynamic— failure.” All of a sudden he is unable to move himself because he couldn’t move others. This is horrible and it is very insidious.

Now he wants other people not to move in his vicinity. It works both ways, and both of them bad. He wants other people not to move in his vicinity; he wants to stop motion on the part of other people in his environment. His postulate is “Stop motion, dynamic three— can I?” Sooner or later he is going to hit a moment when he isn’t up to a very high velocity and he is going to realize that they didn’t stop.

He can pick this up out of an engram, by the way, very easily. Let’s say he is lying on his back being operated on or something of the sort, and he wants the surgeon to stop. Then he realizes, as he goes down to sleep in the engram, that the surgeon is not going to stop. So right in the middle of the engram he postulates failure—”Stop motion, third dynamic— failure!” After that, he can’t stop himself from doing things.

If he gets a habit, he is sunk! He starts smoking cigarettes; he knows he cannot stop it.

Now all of a sudden he gets into a wild argument on the subject of God. He talks about it for a while. Then one day he says, “Even though I am going to do something that is evil in the eyes of God, God can’t affect me. In other words, I’m going to change the direction of his action. I’m capable of doing that.” (He is liable to say something like that.) But then, unfortunately for him, he trips over a lawnmower or something of the sort and skins his shins. He adds this in to what else he did and he says, “You know, I can’t change the motion...” He comes up with this terrible “realization” that he is unable to influence—that is, change—the eighth dynamic. Something is going to go wrong.

You find that a lot of children have gone through this rather silly piece of reasoning. Something happened to them—they got a bellyache, or something or other happened to them—and they said all of a sudden, “Can’t do it.”

More importantly, a child has asked God for a bicycle, for instance. Now he has found out he can’t change or influence or produce action from dynamic eight, because he didn’t get the bicycle. So failure on that means that he cannot change himself! The second he recognizes failure, then on the first dynamic it says, “I can’t change my own action. Here I am, I just seem to have this terrific passion for corn liquor and I can’t quit. I can’t quit. But more important than that, I have tried and tried to shift over to Scotch; I’m unable to do so.”

The individual will find he is unable to run a small group that he is associated with. Why? Because he can’t change their course. He will keep insisting that they remain in a static state and not change, because he has lost his ability to change things—he thinks. So if he hasn’t got the ability to change things, then things have to stay in a persistency—a horrible persistency. Yet environments change. Whether he wants it or not, his environment changes; therefore he has to be able to change things!

Any time he postulated action and acknowledged failure—particularly entheia postulates—the failure kicked back against all other dynamics.

I am sure all cases have several central computations where the conclusion says “start, certain dynamic number—failure,” which means “start, certain dynamic number—failure” for the other dynamics. It goes in identities; this is identical reasoning. We are right down to rock bottom now on logic. That is the way thought is carried forward.

Thought is conducted by the selection of theta facsimiles, and an individual, whenever he considers himself in peril, will start comparing his present situation with past enttheta facsimiles. Furthermore, he can postulate to himself that he is going to change location, that he is not going to be there, that it is not going to be real; he invalidates the situation and all that sort of thing. He is just as likely to back into the enttheta facsimile as a choice rather than stand there and face whatever he is facing. And as his consciousness level dies, he is liable to do this very easily.

I'll give you an example of this. This is in operation in auditing; and it is highly practical. Do you recall a time when you tried to start somebody talking? (pause)

Recall a time when you tried to start somebody talking. (pause)

To start somebody talking—how many of those times exist? (pause)

What effect does this have on your own ability to start yourself talking?

(pause)

This is very interesting. If you want to conduct those exercises on yourself for a little while, you will see a better map of all this than I can give you. There is one of these facsimiles for every operation and action—start, stop and change, each dynamic—and for every action phrase in the language. So if you want to alter the first dynamic, work the third, work the fourth and so on.

You can get up more locks with greater speed with this than I have ever seen happen before.