

INTRODUCTION TO THE SERVICE FACSIMILE

A lecture given on
24 October 1951

The Excuse for Failure

I have worked up an auditing system for auditors which uses rotating cards or discs, which you will find very interesting. It is based on the dynamics.

Around an outside card the dynamics are laid out—one, two, three, four, five, six, seven, infinity. The center card is divided up into start, stop, change, not-stop, not-start and not-change. There are those six parts for each one of the dynamics. Using this, you can think up an enormous number of situations.

This isn't complete; there are about four other discs which could be used on it. But you can think up, just out of that little center, a terrific number of situations to straightwire.

The various component parts of the physical universe—matter, energy, space and time—could go on one of the discs, and you could add organisms. But actually these are component parts of the dynamics themselves, so if you wanted to translate the “dynamics” card into all of its component parts, you wouldn't put down the dynamics, you would just list the component parts of each dynamic.

The second dynamic would be sex and children. Dynamic one would of course be you, but you could divide it off into mind and body if you wanted to. Seven could subdivide rather nebulously. But the sixth dynamic divides into four categories—matter, energy, space and time. Dynamic five, of course, is life, but you could divide it up into the various kingdoms: vegetation (vegetable life), marine life, domestic animals, wild animals, game animals and so on. You could get a terrific number of combinations. As far as dynamic four is concerned, you can take the component parts of all the dynamics out of four—those things which man holds to be true. Naturally, the third dynamic falls apart into various types of groups, including county, state, national and social groups, professional groups and all of these various subdivisions.

So if you wanted to list each one of these separately instead of by dynamics, you would find an enormous number of Straightwire questions. But actually, if you really know what these various dynamics represent, this is an adequate card.

Apropos of nothing in particular, somebody asked me a question which I think I ought to give an answer to. I worked out a pat answer many years ago for people who had started to go into the static. I didn't know quite what they were going into, but I knew it wasn't good for them.

People talk about ESP or spirits or trances and seeing the future and all of this sort of thing. It isn't very good to just say “No, no. No, it isn't so,” or something of that sort; that is a dull way to go about it because immediately the fellow has to invalidate you. Therefore he has to accept more solidly what he has, and he kind of goes down into apathy about the whole thing if he can't accept it as solidly as he thinks he ought to. It makes a mess.

So, what you say to a person who is doing this is “Yes, I know! ESP and spirits and trance, Rosicrucianism and yoga. Yes sir! Of course, there is the question of whether or not it's good for you.” When he doesn't have to defend it you can get him to back out of it

in most cases. That is a good trick. You simply say, “Yes, it’s not a question of whether or not spirits exist. It is not a question of that—it’s whether or not they’re good for you.” This brings in a whole new line of thinking. It gives him a nice out. Now he can establish ARC with you because you are evidently concerned with his state of being, which is what he wanted you to be concerned with in the first place.

Now, you may have thought that I was rather drawing a long bow’ when I mentioned earlier about a governor.

There is no particular reason why the past should affect the present. This has been accepted blindly since Breuer first brought it up about 1884—that the present could only operate well if you addressed the past.

But this is something that has only a surface truth. The fastest route we know of, at the moment, to patch up the present is to patch up the past.

But look at the position on the tone scale of all of those cults, groups, studies and schools of the past; look at where they have been on the tone scale. They were actually individuals who were wildly endeavoring to solve their own problems. Most of them were not interested in a broad survey; they were interested in their own problems. And naturally it occurred to them that this was a way to go about it. Why?

The psychotic is interested in the past, the neurotic is interested in and concerned with the present, and the sane person is interested in the future. Therefore, a position of authority can be estimated on the tone scale by its concern with one or another of these points. I can tell you that it is obvious that the way you get your data with which to compute on today is from what happened to you yesterday, and therein lies a most horrible error. Personally, I don’t think that the computer has to be liable for this error.

There is a lot of talk on the part of men who are broken down with rheumatism and can no longer get up and fight the young men who walk into the office and demand things; these old men say, “Experience is the thing.” What they are doing is palming off facsimiles, many of the mental facsimiles, as an excuse for physical disability.

This is just like many people who drive very fancy cars, maintain enormous social activities like parties on Saturday night at vast expense, spend fifty thousand dollars for dear little Betty’s coming-out party and all that sort of thing. These people may be substituting “flash” or the power to buy for the power to be.

People can very easily do this. We run into some girl who has no social charm at all. But if she can put on a ten-thousand-dollar diamond collar and a fifty-thousand-dollar mink coat, it excuses a lot, doesn’t it? Now she doesn’t have to have any social charm!

This is no dissertation on the subject of the rich. The point I am trying to show you is that this is a physical-universe item being substituted for a possible inadequacy. It isn’t necessarily being substituted for the possible inadequacy, but it could be. And very often, if you start examining people who do that, you will find that they are substituting for an inadequacy that they feel.

There it is in the physical universe: one ten-thousand-dollar diamond collar and one fifty-thousand-dollar mink coat—a substitute for social charm. There is nothing wrong with fifty-thousand-dollar mink coats, but when you look around you, you will find this very often obtains. And this is the closest physical-universe approximation that I know of,

offhand, in terms of good, solid, big chunks of M EST which approximate the use of a theta facsimile or an entheta facsimile.

A person will reach out and pick up these entheta facsimiles and hold them up as an excuse for disability. It is usually dramatic experiences that a person holds up.

Have you ever listened to anyone talk about his operation? You have heard somebody mention an operation: “The doctor told me, ‘Mrs. Smythe, your appendix was easily the most difficult operation I have ever performed. It’s a wonder that you lived through it.’”

This is like the fellow who says, “You know, I am the deafest man in seven counties!” Drama! But if people can’t get drama or action out in the universe at large, they try to make drama and action out of entheta facsimiles. This is a very beautiful piece of randomness. And people come around and hand you these things: “Yes, I remember when I had my tonsils out. As a matter of fact I bled for four hours—came very close to dying. They said that it was the worst tonsillectomy . . .”

I conducted a survey one day to find out if there were any ordinary operations ever performed on anybody, and I found out there weren’t!

People will actually pull up entheta facsimiles and offer them as drama. There is this thirst for experience, this thirst for motion, this thirst for adventure, and people in a low-toned society aren’t impressed with the fact that somebody had a good time.

Somebody says, “You know, I went clear to the Mountains of the Moon and all the way back and I never lost a single bearer. Nothing happened—we accomplished the objective perfectly, we had all of our equipment when we returned.” And everybody says, “Oh, how dull.”

The next fellow says, “You know, we went to the Mountains of the Moon, and halfway there, beriberi overtook us. We lay for eight days! Nobody was able to move a limb in the whole camp. Jungle cats were prowling all around us. Two of the bearers were eaten on that occasion.” He goes along like this, and everybody says, “Gosh!” Drama!

After all, we are involved in a terrifically dramatic operation. We are alive and in motion, in contest with not being in motion, and that is an interplay of drama. That is drama. So to demonstrate drama, what you do is demonstrate that you are still in motion, but that you can skirt down toward statics and come back on up again.

You will find that nobody is quite as dramatic as a spiritualist. That is her drama. She knows, really, what she is doing: she is going down toward death! She wants to convince you that she too lives a dramatic life. She can post her motion against a lack of motion.

Life versus death—that is the dichotomy of all drama. You are dealing with preclears who are pretty dramatic, ordinarily, and it may be that all we are doing is finding a good reason to let them get out of all the drama they have loaded on themselves. It may be that we are only taking them back on the time track and running them through effort until they can find an excuse which is adequate to themselves. Then they find this excuse and they become well. They find they don’t need this excuse. No matter how real the experience seems to have been, that may be it. And you as an auditor should keep that in mind.

Let’s look at it on a small level. A little child breaks a vase; it goes bang! and flies in splinters. Then Mama comes in and says, “You broke the vase, didn’t you?” The child has no out; there is the vase lying there. He is wrong. But he must not be wrong; that just must

not be. He can go through the widest sweeps of skirting rightnesses and wrongnesses, swinging back and forth in all directions and have himself a wonderful time in life, but he mustn't ever come to the point where he says "Yeah, I was wrong."

She says, "Now, you broke that. It will have to come out of your allowance till you're sixteen, because that was the present that dear Aunt Mamie gave us, and as a matter of fact, that vase was full of her dying breath." Now, if this child is going to make any recovery at all, if he is stopped right there and made to be wrong, he will find an entheta facsimile someplace or other to prove he is not. He will probably be sick within twenty-four to forty-eight hours. But people don't remember very far back so they don't really very often connect these things. He will get sick or he will start saying, very dramatically, "I am the sort of a person that breaks everything; I just can't seem to help it"—crash! "Well, I guess there's nothing you can do about me"—crash! Or he will say, "You see, I'm so feeble that it fell."

Of course, if he is very young and hasn't learned yet that grown-ups are very, very crabby about what they consider reality, he is more likely to say, "A great big polar bear came in through that window" (which isn't even open) "and it jumped across the table. As he jumped across the table I tried to stop him but couldn't do so, and the vase fell and broke. He went out the door—he went that-a-way."

He may try this in varying forms. The first time he tells one of these things and doesn't get away with it, he will try some other thing, and he will find out that about the only thing acceptable is nothing big and adventurous like a polar bear jumping in the window with him standing there, small, braving it all! Did he flinch? No, he didn't flinch—he tried to grab the polar bear so the polar bear would not knock over the vase, but the polar bear knocked it over. He did the best he could.

Children will do this, but only very early in life, and it breaks down pretty quickly. In a very short space of time they find out that there is only one excuse which is acceptable. It is not the great, big, adventurous lie. It is the acceptable lie of "I'm sick, weak, small and need care. Poor little me."

I dare say you can't go back on the track of any preclear without finding the time when he was a child that he wished he were dead. Children go around gloomy; they think about it for a while and they do the most beautiful job of getting up a flock of tears on it. They think of themselves lying there in the coffin, all the things people would say around them and how sorry everybody would be that they had treated them that way and so on.

I have run into a little child sitting on a curbstone with tears rolling down his cheeks. I said, "What's the matter, son?" (Sometimes children tell me the truth.)

He said, "Well, I was just thinking how beautiful it all was at the funeral."

I patted him on the shoulder and said, "I understand thoroughly." This satisfied him a great deal and he went on crying some more. It was wonderful: he was having his own funeral! Real drama.

Why does anybody read the trash put out these days as literature? (I say that advisedly; I have some experience in the field.) About five or six college boys are perennially hired by a certain publisher to be a fellow by the name of Ellery Queen. This character Ellery Queen carries the banner on his own books and also is his own hero. He goes through all of these operations with death and mystery, and he is always shaving the corners, risking death and

so on. People buy these things and they sit down and read them, and they are willing to accept this as reality.

Then somebody comes along from the field of criminology and takes a snide look at these detective stories and he says, "You know, those don't compare with reality." He thinks that this is something wrong.

The one thing you mustn't ever do when you are writing is have anything compare to reality. Somebody writes in to the publisher and says, "I can't understand why you rejected my story, because every word of it's true." That is the exact reason it was rejected.

It takes an aesthetic interplay of this life-versus-death proposition in order to get people alerted to the situation. And in a society which is so narrow-minded as to insist that no polar bears can jump through unopened plate-glass windows, there is only one thing left: the reality of sickness, the reality of accidents.

But how real are those? How real are they? You find, before every accident that anybody gets into, a decision to have it.

A little boy gets slapped by a school teacher, and three days later we find him falling off the top of the chute and busting his arm. Isn't that interesting? We find that every single success brings about a tendency to continue in the direction of success, but these various failures bring about a tendency to continue in the direction of failure. And every single bit of it is self-determined. Isn't it horrible what a fellow does to himself? But there is drama.

If one is going to be alive, one tries to be alive at the greatest possible level of life.

So when we go back into a preclear's past, it may be that we are only trying to find a good excuse for him—one that he is perfectly willing to get away with, one that you as the auditor are willing to accept, a computation which looks sufficiently valid—to account for his being in the state that he is in.

If you are not willing to accept the state that he is in and you just bluntly keep kicking it back at him, he will get into tougher shape. But there is an interesting attitude in the higher reaches of ARC which is very inexorable: "He's going to get well; running this stuff out will make it all right. Horrible things have happened to him, terrible incidents—it is gruesome! But we're going to fix him up. It's inexorable that he'll get well. That's all."

You as an auditor are operating on this kind of an attitude. A preclear comes in and he says, "I don't think I'll ever be the same again," and that sort of thing. Your attitude says, "You're going to get well; there isn't any doubt about it. The unfortunate thing about it is you walked in the door, and that was your first mistake. You walked in the door, and your second mistake was lying on the couch, and your third mistake was trying to tell me that, because now you're done for—you're going to get well. And it's tough!" Of course, you don't say it in these words, but that is more or less your attitude.

You have to add something else to it, but this isn't sympathy. Sympathy is "You poor fellow." That gives the fellow some ARC and he is sort of getting paid for his entheta facsimiles, and he doesn't want to get rid of them now. You say, "Boy, those were horrible things that happened to you. My gosh! That was pretty bad. You certainly must be a tough guy to have lived through all of that," and you give him this kind of an attitude. "Of course, you're going to get well now. I mean, naturally, that stuff was completely adequate to account for your present state. My gosh, that stuff was completely adequate to account for it; it's a wonder to me that you're still alive, that you could totter in that door. Of

course, it's an unfortunate thing you did because now you're going to get well. But it's a wonder to me that you're here! Why, you've been through hell!"

The fellow says, "Gosh, yes, I have! I had it pretty tough. Yeah."

All of a sudden he begins to think this and that over, and he will turn up past failures for you with rapidity. But you want the most dramatic one that you can get—not on the delusion side, but on the actual side. You want the central computation of the case. You will get it as fast as he feels that you are willing to accept it as itself, and that you will accept it on the basis of "Well, you give me that and you'll get well. It is quite adequate that you got sick because that happened."

You get that kind of a state of mind. "There isn't any wonder that you're sick, having had all this happen to you; and it is a horrible experience, but I am going to get you over it, and there's nothing you can do about my getting you over it, because you came in, and that means that you were determined to get over it and your self-determinism entered in."

You can prove this to him by just proving to him his self-determinism; you start proving that. You could also prove to him that the reason he is lying on your couch right now is because of his own self-determinism. He wants to do that; therefore he wants to get over it, he wants to get well. But you know very well that those things are why he is sick; you agree with him. But you only agree with what he tells you. If he tells you this is it, this is it—no monkey business about it. Don't contradict him.

It may be that as we go along the line, as we isolate this little mechanical gimmigahoojit that is left—how does a fellow put himself back up to speed? how can we do that rapidly?—maybe all that we will have to do is merely account to the fellow for why it is down in speed so he can then put it immediately back up to speed. It might be that simple.

But if you think you are going to get rid of every entheta facsimile an individual has, as a facsimile, you will find there are too many years stretching between here and the creation of the universe way back then. You would just have to work too long. The most you are going to do for a preclear is get rid of a few entheta facsimiles for him. You are going to get rid of a few facsimiles and you are going to knock out his conclusions for him. This is what you are going to do for him.

The one thing that you could do wrong is let him get into an entheta facsimile that he wants to keep very badly because it was survival of some sort or other, and then not let him get all the effort out of it so that he can't keep sitting in it. You get the idea? You can leave these entheta facsimiles with effort on them, and you can leave enough effort on his ability to hold on to them so that he can continue to use them.

Actually, I am being very brutal when I tell you what is wrong with people. There is this beautiful mechanical setup that individuals use. They have used it without understanding it. They at first used it a little bit and then the mechanism swamped them. Now they are trying to fight their way through this morass, and naturally, for them to admit they were wrong in the first place to have wished such things on themselves is not good. So you have to unburden it to a point where they can suddenly say "Yeah, that is it."

That is your course and process of processing—the rehabilitation of the self-determinism of an individual. This is done by picking up his erroneous conclusions, getting out enough entheta facsimiles to demonstrate to him that he had adequate reason for them, and getting those facsimiles out of the road.

An individual theoretically could be at a point where he could just jettison them all without touching the past; without touching any one of them, he could just jettison all of them. That is the button you are looking for.

That is what I am talking about when I say the “governor.” All he has to do is start traveling at a different velocity—start traveling at 20.0 on the tone scale all of a sudden—and they will all be gone. But where is the button? Where is 20.0?

Next to that, the way you get a preclear up to speed is by picking out all his conclusions, because you are inevitably going to pick out decisions which were down-speed decisions. It is as though an individual were in this static all the time and just changed its speed vectors and handled the physical universe by doing so.

The horrible thing is that individuals don't have this understanding of things; it hasn't been proven to them that this is it. It is hard to prove this to them because you are going up against the necessity of the individual to be right. As a result, the individual started this very early and he has gotten a lot of enttheta facsimiles, he has pulled them all in on top of himself, and now all of a sudden he gets so bewildered he doesn't know which is him and which is enttheta facsimiles or anything else. You, as an auditor, can straighten it out for him.

Now, here is a handling you can do by rote: (1) Make an estimate of where your preclear is on the tone scale. (2) Estimate what enttheta facsimile he is in, in terms of years and type. That is probably in his present life. Assume that it is present life, because the one that will have the most effect upon him will be present life. He wiped out all his sins by getting killed in the last life anyhow. (I will tell you how you do some of these things shortly.) (3) Pick up start, stop and change locks on the third dynamic—particularly those which are pertinent to talking, walking, having pleasure and having pain. You can pick up a few of those.

Now take another look at your preclear. This is the next step—diagnosis by obvious error. What is wrong with him? Just look him over: Is he too thin? Is he too fat? Does he wear glasses? Is his hearing a little bit off? Is his speech as smooth as it should be? Is there anything wrong with his teeth? Has there been anything wrong with his teeth in the past? Take a look at his stomach; is the muscular tonus good on his (or her) stomach or not? On a woman, look for the extra fat on the back of the ankle and so on. The shapeliness will tell you what condition the endocrine system is in, and that is almost a direct index on the second dynamic.

This is just a surface look; you can call this inventory if you want to, but it is just a surface look.

Remember to be sensible at this stage; it is not esoteric at all. Let's take glasses: The locks that go with glasses have to do with when he has tried to keep people from looking—either start, stop or change—to keep people from looking or to make them look, ending in failures. On every one of these you hit, the preclear will fix up his own eyesight just that much. So, on glasses, you are looking for start, stop and change on the subject of looking, and it is on the third dynamic.

If it is his stomach that is wrong, you look for start, stop and change on eating—third dynamic. When has he tried to make others start, stop or change on the subject of eating? Let's just pick up the five or six billion locks at one swoop, because that is going to influence the individual. You know those locks are there; they are heavily there because they are obviously reflected on the preclear's own being.

Let's look at a girl whose endocrine system is even faintly out of line. It is very obvious what you are trying to pick up there. You are trying to pick up times when she has done start, stop and change on the subject of sex—third dynamic. It is really the second dynamic, but I am talking about other people.

You will find that it is not simply restraining somebody from attacking her; there will be other locks—hundreds of them. She wanted her sister to look better so she would be more attractive to the boyfriend because they were going to fall apart, but she didn't succeed in making her sister look better. Later on she didn't succeed in making herself look better. Do you get the interlock?

She tried to force Mama to buy her dresses to make her attractive to boys, but she failed. Do you get the combination there? It is anything that would tie in to the attractiveness of a woman or a man on the second dynamic—anything that would cancel it out or enhance it: the effort of the person to cancel out other people's attractiveness, to enhance other people's attractiveness and so forth. Let's just keep it out there on the third dynamic, and that makes it good and safe for your preclear to work on. The first dynamic is too darn close to home, ordinarily, to work on. So let's have him start and stop and change other people. This is his control of his environment.

Now let's take something like arthritis: What has he been trying to do to people, on arthritis? This is very simple. You know that arthritis is holding; the tone scale is very good on predicting behavior and physiology. It is a holding disease. He is trying to hold motion, he is trying to damp out motion, so let's get all the times he tried to damp motion out in his environment. When did he try to damp motion out in his environment? Who used to do things that annoyed him and so forth?

The first thing you know, he will start scanning through this stuff more or less automatically. He will be all over the track; it just starts coming through too fast.

When has he tried to damp out motion? You take those off, and it is the first locks that come off. They are very easy to get. The next thing you know, you will be getting the moments when he decided to have that error.

You will have him looking, by the time you have done an endocrine setup or one of these other obvious errors. You figure out about what that error is, and figure out how he wished the error on himself by wishing it on other people. What kind of an error was it, which he was wishing on somebody else, that backfired and caught him? All you have to do is make an estimate of that, and that is "diagnosis."

Your next trick (and this one can go in at almost any time) is to start working to restore his belief in his self-determinism. But you probably won't get a chance to do much, because this fellow will be going like a dog after a rabbit right about that time; he will have struck something that looks funny to him. You should really do this until he hits something that looks strange to him in his life. Let him find it. That is a very important step in this processing.

You work him on this other stuff. You try to rehabilitate his self-determinism, you work him this way and that, but you keep working him in the stratas that I have given you so far until he smells a mouse. Somewhere along the line, this preclear is going to tell you, "That's a funny thing—I am very afraid that you're going to get up and leave. This is very peculiar." You have already got the thing triggered. If he recognizes that there is something

funny about it, you have already got that funny item coming through. He knows there is something strange.

He suddenly realizes, “Say, you know, every time I sit down to the table I always hesitate before I pick up my knife!” This is not the time for you to go dashing off to something else, nor really is it the time for you to jump in about knives. What you want to do is remember this mechanism: a preclear who is rationalizing (and that is all he is doing—rationalizing) is rationalizing on the furthest perimeter from the actuality.

The hypnotist makes the subject take his coat off and put it back on by touching his tie. The subject will begin to find something wrong with the room, then he will begin to find something wrong with the hypnotist, then he will begin to find something wrong with the hypnotist’s clothes, and at last he will say, “Tie!” And the moment he gets to the tie angle, the posthypnotic suggestion springs.

You want to remember that mode of operation and that perimeter. When he says, “It’s a funny thing, but I wince just every time I pick up knives—I don’t like knives! You know, I just realized the sound of silverware is very antipathetic,” you say, “Well, let’s pick up something about the parents.” You want to pick up about people he has had to eat with. That is your subject. Get the generalized subject on the particularized item which he hit.

He will climb around on this subject for a little while, and then he will say, “You know, I don’t like tablecloths either! “ You let him climb around on this; you go on looking for start, stop and change on the subject of, not tablecloths, but dining rooms or people eating—people in restaurants eating, if you want to really take it away from home. He will gradually come back in and he will inform you out of the depths of his suddenly acquired knowledge (always let him do the informing of you), “You know, I hated to eat with my parents! “

And you say with great surprise, “Yes?” (You have been waiting on this for a long time.)

He says, “I hated to eat with them.”

And you say, “Well, let’s get a time when you made some decision with regard to their eating.”

“Me make a decision with regard to their eating? Oh, I’d never do anything like that.”

“Well, there is some decision you might have made with regard to their eating; did you ever make a decision with regard to their eating?”

“Yeah, I wished they’d be quiet.”

All of a sudden we find out that this preclear, unbeknownst to himself, was barked at about his table manners year in and year out—nag, nag, nag. Suddenly he finds out that there were two other members of the household that he had forgotten about and that his position at the table was so-and-so, and he had forgotten about this.

You can expect that about the time he starts to get into the core of the whole matter he will trigger an entheta facsimile—probably before he gets into the core of the whole matter. You will run him that far and all of a sudden you will find him getting into an entheta facsimile of one sort or another.

Now give him Effort Processing.

I am not talking here about a psychotic or a severely neurotic individual. I am just talking about a normal when I am talking about this rote procedure.

We have hit on a computation which he made—probably in the depths of unconsciousness or during a struggle or something of the sort. He has made some sort of a postulate. We could fully expect to run into a past death at that moment.

He will start asking a question; he will start telling you that there is a missing incident. There is something missing in his life; there is something that has happened in his life. He will say, “It must have been here, it must have been there—no, it must have been someplace else,” and you as an auditor can keep him picking up locks on allied subjects until he finally triggers it. He will notice something strange.

As a little boy he liked to ride in cars, but he finds himself at fourteen hating to ride in cars. All of a sudden he says, “You know, there must be an automobile accident in here someplace.”

You say, “Well, are there any later automobile accidents?”

“Oh yeah, I’ve got several of those. Yeah, I got those all cleared up.”

“Is there an early one?”

“Maybe I fell out of the crib or a baby buggy or something. I’m not sure. Well, I—no, it must be an automobile accident here when I’m about eleven. Yeah, it must be!”

He maunders around, and you say, “Well, now, let’s go over some times when you have tried to stop cars or something of this sort.”

“No, no!”

He probably won’t have anything to do with you by this time. He goes off like a rocket.

All of a sudden we discover it was when he was ten, and we discover it was an accident all right. He walked out into the middle of the street and got hit by a car. And all the rest of his life, this single datum has been missing. He has kept it missing.

Do you know what else you will find? You will find that he has used the dickens out of this entheta facsimile. We don’t tell him so, but he hid it from everybody, and you will generally find that that facsimile was invalidated to him. It is a missing center on his case—if there is one—but it has always been like that.

Somebody said, “It wasn’t serious,” “It didn’t happen,” or “It was your fault.” Somebody said this to him, somebody argued with him, and he had to keep putting forward this facsimile; he kept putting it forward. His best way to put it forward is to demonstrate it and try it on his own body. Maybe he had this horrible thing happen to him: He got bunged up, he went home and he said to Mama, “I got hit by an automobile.”
“I don’t see anything wrong with you—another one of those wild tales!”

The back of his neck happens to be hurt a little bit at that moment. He was probably jarred. Then, maybe a few weeks later, he will be coming around and explaining how he just fell off the back fence and hurt the back of his neck. Mama believes him now and does

something about it. You will find that his concept of what he tells the world has happened to him will go off at that moment, too.

This is just one type of computation; there are many such types. But it gives you an idea of what to look for.

The stuff that you are really looking for on the case has these characteristics: It is not obvious, the preclear at this time is evidently not conscious of it and it is manifesting itself as a psychosomatic illness; the entheia facsimile, of necessity, had to be offered because of invalidation, and it created a pattern reaction. He used it as a pattern reaction from that time henceforward. And it is not necessarily down near an incident.

If you can get this one, you probably will have to work all the effort out of it. When you start working all the effort out of it you are going to have quite a job on your hands, because there are postulates in there that make him hold on to it. But he has made the postulates himself and he will tug away and try to work with these postulates and so on.

It will be a great temptation to you as an auditor not to follow this kind of road but just to gunshot it, and once you have hit the entheia facsimile, not exhaust it all the way. Some of those will really try your patience—hour after hour after hour. It may take you ten to fifteen hours of auditing to knock out the central entheia facsimile which the individual has been using in this life.

What you are trying to do is pick up the service unit, the “service facsimile.” You can just call it that, and it will keep you oriented on what is going on and what you are trying to do. There may be one and there may be five. But I guarantee you, when you have gotten that one or five up, there will be no worries about it.

So, you can knock out conclusions and you can do all sorts of things, and you will find the preclear is ably moving on the track by the time you have done this. There is no great trouble to it. It does not matter to you how occluded a case is, because that occlusion just says he is probably sitting in the middle of an entheia facsimile, and he just blacked out at that point so his perceptics are off.

You start turning on his reality and you work those things on Effort Processing: “Well, what is your effort to have this? What is your effort not to have this?”

“What is your effort to do this? What is your effort to do that?”

“What is your effort to have affinity for this thing? “What is your effort to disagree with it? What is your effort to agree with it?”

“What is your effort to stay there? What is your effort to go away? What are you thinking about at the moment?”

You just keep this up, and you can keep this up very well. After you have asked a few questions, the file clerk gets the hang of it. You can start getting all this stuff on file-clerk responses, and the preclear will push them this way and pull them that way and so on.

You will be surprised how much effort you will find on one of these service facsimiles. You can drain them and drain them and drain them of effort.

You may find yourself working a past death, and it may occur to you that this is it. It isn't; there are lots of past deaths in a case. But out of that past death, the service facsimile in this

life may spring up. And what you want is the service facsimile. It doesn't matter where it is on the track; it will exhaust. The preclear may have been using that past death as the service facsimile, but there is also a trigger facsimile up the track in this life that is hung up with that past death.

You will find him out of valence and everything else. You will find a lot of emotional stress around the incident and you will find a lot of recomputations coming out of it. And generally what you will mainly find at that point is his recognition or his feeling that he needs a lower velocity. And he accepts a lower velocity from life. He is less dangerous to his environment; he begins to handle his environment differently. There will be a shift in action.

Now, when you have exhausted one or more service facsimiles off the case, you then should be able to just swamp out the rest of the conclusions. You will probably find some more service facsimiles, but they will be minor.

I give you this as a means of busting cases, because I have been busting cases with it. Furthermore, it figures; it is very nonsurvival to live on your past computations. Do you know the basic reason why? It is because the past environment has kept shifting, and your past environment is not your present environment.

The organism which cannot shift and change to adjust itself to the environment and adjust the environment to it is nonsurvival. And one's conclusions are always in another environment than one is in. So it is very nonsurvival to compute what one does now by what one has been doing over the past twenty-five years.

What you must do for the individual is free up all of his reasoning all the way along the line. Therefore, with every computation and decision there is the reason why: Why did you do it? What was the reason? "You know the reason for that" is better auditor parlance.

You can see what I mean when I say that you are trying to give him his chance. Once upon a time he didn't get his chance, and he has been using an entheta facsimile ever since to explain that he was right.

Service facsimiles normally contain flagrant injustices. They are not rational in their computations; they go in one way and come out another way, and the fellow won't reconcile them. They don't figure; they just don't compute. And there is a false point on the computation of the thing and there is probably emotion on the thing. They have probably been around for so darn long that they are pretty hard for you to exhaust.

What you are doing as an auditor is you are at last giving him a chance to tell his side of it, and you are agreeing with him that it is pretty serious. Then you get rid of the service facsimite for him, and he will come out walking straight up.

There are probably several of these facsimiles kicking around in any person's life that he has had to use, that have been invalidated but which he has had to keep in order to invalidate other people. They are a very lousy sort of a computation. But there is the anatomy of a computation, and there is the procedure to overcome it.

If you could simply find, without any further to-do, ways and means for a person to bring his speed up so that he would no longer echo across the lower bands and so be able to touch these entheta facsimiles, you would have it whipped right there.

An individual who is in an environment which is attempting to slow him down and does this to him and that to him and so on, will eventually slow down to the speed of the entheta facsimiles, and he will start picking them up in order to reinvalidate the environment. He will start picking up these entheta facsimiles as he goes down the tone scale, and he will get worse and worse. An individual in an environment that is trying to speed him up continually—send him on up the other side—will do the same thing. He will try to come up but he will eventually hit a low level and begin to stop.

But what do we mean when we say “speed him up”? We know that that is exactly what is happening. Some fellow has a job of driving trucks for some truck company, and the dispatcher is always telling him, “Speed up! Speed up! Speed up!” All of a sudden one day he gets unhappy and he gets sick. He has had to choose another speed to make the dispatcher wrong; he has had to choose a different speed in order to invalidate the dispatcher. And the way he chose a different speed has as step one, an unknown, and as step two, the selection of an entheta facsimile.

We do know something about this unknown step; you can call that the governor. How fast does a man run? What is the mechanism by which one chooses one’s own speed on the tone scale? I will leave that up to you; I am sure you will find it in a preclear.

I don’t know whether you use the word abracadabra or foosilar1 or whether or not you tickle the soles of his feet in order to get him speeded up; I don’t know. But I know there is something there, because there is stage one, running at a chosen velocity in good shape; stage two, demonstration from the environment—an effort to alter self-determined velocity; stage three, choice by the individual through self-determinism to select entheta facsimiles to cancel out the factor that is trying to alter his speed in the environment; and stage four, failure and kick-back on self because it kicks back on all the dynamics.

That is the anatomy of restimulation and decline on the tone scale. You as an auditor repair it the other way. There is a missing link; we call it self-determinism, but it is self-determinism directed in a very mechanical direction.

What is this thing-we are calling speed inside the individual? It isn’t that he has to walk faster or walk slower, it isn’t that his heart is speeding up or his heart is slowing down, but there is some essential part—and it will be physical—that is affected, and he has control of it; but through the receipt of engrams (that is, through choosing entheta facsimiles in the first place and having them fail him) he gets this mechanism occluded.

But I am sure that in his native state, without that thing occluded, a person just does it at will. “Well, I, think I’ll be happy.” “I think I’ll be energetic.” “Now I’m going to be . . .” But it becomes an automatic response.

Take some fellow who runs an undertaking parlor: all day people come in and he is very sad. He doesn’t choose any entheta facsimiles at all, he is just very sad and very sympathetic. “Yes, too bad, dear dead departed. Yes, we cut him up and poured formaldehyde in him, and the bill was \$985.”

Then he goes out to the amusement park with the children and he has a great time. It is very funny, but it isn’t the speed of the children that is affecting him directly.

This is one of the stimulus-response mechanisms that psychology went on the rocks because of; they said that everything is stimulus-response and nothing is really self-determined, that everything is action-reaction. That is just not functional. We fell into the same trap in the early days of Dianetics.

This undertaker goes out with his children. What do the children do? He looks at them and this does something to him. He isn't directly, physically affected, but there are the children and he decides that in the presence of these children he is going to be happy and energetic. Then what does he do? All of a sudden he is happy and energetic and he likes the children.

But he could choose a flock of enteta facsimiles to tell him he doesn't like children. So he would slow his speed down. "Be quiet, children. Do this, do that. Run here, run there." It is his own choice.

I think we have gone over this fairly thoroughly. It is time for you to get your hands full of preclear and see if you can find one of these central computations. The way to find it is just by running start-and-stop locks one right after the other—starting and stopping doing anything—until you finally get your preclear triggered, and then all of a sudden he is going to run into something that is blank. He will find out there is something blank and he will tell you that it is blank.

You should be very busy on your preclears. Don't let them boil off; that is no good. Work them pretty hard, work them interestedly. And you will find that once a preclear gets the hang of effort, he is liable to sit there and run effort, run effort and run effort without any great aid from you. But you had better keep him checked up on.