

AUDITING THE LIFE CONTINUUM

A lecture given on
31 December 1951

This demonstration session follows directly after the preceding lecture. The preclear in this demonstration spoke with a heavy accent and had some difficulty with the English language. This session was published in slightly edited form in the January 1952 issue of the Dianetic Auditor's Bulletin, which was later reproduced in the Technical Bulletins of Dianetics and Scientology, Volume I. It is presented here as a part of the running record of Ron's research into the mind and life.

Sympathy, Blame and Regret

PC: Ron, don't you think there is a period of time for readjustment in relation to glasses because of the many years . . . ?

LRH: No. It is instantaneous readjustment. If you have gotten the real cause of the glasses, if you are dead center on the computation, it is instantaneous. If you are just picking it up in fragments here and there and unburdening the problems of the individual, his sight gradually gets better and better and better—up to a point. It will hang at that point because it is then waiting on the central computation on glasses, which is obtained by running regret, blame and so on.

PC: I would like to say I agree fully that there's nothing physically with my eyes in relation to myself, because a year ago I wear two pairs of glasses: one for vision and one for reading. And I read something and changed the glasses—took my glasses off and put on the reading glasses. I think this was my—what I thought I did. I read for two hours, and then I changed back the glasses and I realized I read with my glasses which I use, and not which I read with. And I immediately took back the glasses to look and I couldn't read anymore. I realized that I had the glasses on which I couldn't read with. Until then I tried every opportunity—I can't get rid of them. So I am aware that I can read with these glasses where I usually cannot read with them.

LRH: All right, tell me this: Who's dead?

PC: I went far back. In my family was only my brother, who I know—oh, gosh! When he read he needed glasses. (laughs) Oh, dear! I am assuming you want it as you said yesterday and today and anytime: Who had glasses? Was my father. And he only had glasses—because he only used to be on Saturday home, when he wasn't drunk, and then he had glasses and he read. And so—but I still didn't run this particular incident. I assume I need a good auditor and I cannot run myself.

LRH: (laughs) Well, of course, there are many interesting factors with regard to this . . .

PC: He's dead, by the way.

LRH: He is dead, sure.

PC: Yeah.

LRH: Sure, he's dead. Well, now, how did you cause his death?

PC: Uh . . . I wouldn't say I caused his death. I contributed to his death. I was in his way.

LRH: Well, how didn't you cause his death?

PC: I didn't contribute to it; I didn't cause it.

LRH: Either way?

PC: I indirectly contributed to his death.

LRH: Yeah. How?

PC: He didn't like me, he didn't want me, and every time I was around, he used to get disturbed. See, it's a large story but I'm going to give it to you.

LRH: Sure.

PC: I was a foundling and he took me—they adopted me; not adopted me, actually took me in for pay.

LRH: Hm-hm.

PC: But when my parents or my mother stopped paying, he felt I was a burden to him.

LRH: Hm-hm.

PC: And every time he saw me, he didn't want me around. Said, "Here I keep something that doesn't belong to me."

LRH: Hm-hm.

PC: So me being there—computationally, of course—I disturbed him, and the more X disturbance I caused, then, the more I shortened his life span.

LRH: Do you remember thinking this after his death?

PC: I did think to go away . . .

LRH: Who said so?

PC: It's computational.

LRH: Didn't anybody say so?

PC: Hm, I wouldn't say so. No.

LRH: You wouldn't say so?

PC: No. Because when he died I was away from home. I received a letter.

LRH: Would it have been possible in any way for you to have kept him alive?

PC: I thought of that.

LRH: How could you have kept him alive?

PC: By financial support.

LRH: You didn't give it to him?

PC: No.

LRH: Ah. Do you remember regretting this afterwards?

PC: Yes.

LRH: Hm-hm. Have you contributed, then?

PC: In a sense, as I said. Computational, yes.

LRH: Do you remember any early periods in your life when you wanted to contribute?

PC: I did, as a matter of fact. He made me contribute when I was a boy of six. I had to work already to contribute to them.

LRH: He forced you to contribute?

PC: Yes.

LRH: Did you want to contribute?

PC: No.

LRH: Did you want to before that?

PC: I'm sorry, I didn't . . .

LRH: Did you want to contribute before you were six? Do you remember anything about that?

PC: You see, when you say, did I . . .

LRH: Did he make you do something you earlier had wanted to do?

PC: He made me do the things I didn't want to do.

LRH: Oh. Well, now, do you remember where you were when you regretted the contribution of financial support?

PC: Yes, very distinctly. I was eight and a half years of age, and I earned some money by being a witness. And he took the money away and bought me a pair of shoes (one of the first pair of shoes I had in my life). But he only contribute—in other words, a small part of this money went for shoes; the rest he took, and I didn't feel it was justified to take my money away.

LRH: Hm-hm. Have you got a visio on that?

PC: Yeah. I have a good . . .

LRH: Try to run a little regret on the one visio that appears important to you. Just run the feeling of regret on it for a moment.

PC: (pause) I see the shoes; they're very nice shoes. The name of it is Salamander. (laughs)

LRH: Hm-hm. Just run a little regret over it now.

PC: (brief pause) I'm getting emotional about it.

LRH: Now, can you run the feeling of blame concerning the shoes? (brief pause) Let's run a little more regret on it.

PC: (sighs; pause) The feelings of regret is a sensation over my whole body.

LRH: Hm-hm.

PC: A sadness inside.

LRH: Hm-hm.

PC: It drags me down.

LRH: Is this still on the shoes?

PC: I believe the shoes are in here, and regret acts in here. In other words, the shoes in itself do not seem to have regret because I enjoyed the shoes.

LRH: All right. What's another visio you've got there? Earlier than those shoes.

PC: Earlier than the shoes?

LRH: Hm-hm.

PC: Oh, a beating-up.

LRH: Have you got a feeling of regret on this?

PC: Yeah, I stole eggs. I got beaten up for it.

LRH: Hm-hm.

PC: And I regretted doing it because the punishment was very strong.

LRH: Hm-hm. PC: I regretted it because my mother

LRH: Have you got a feeling of blame on that?

PC: Yes, because my mother got punished for it too, and I felt she shouldn't have done. Oh, gosh! Now I'm going to get an emotion. (laughs) I think I don't want to give this exhibition. I mean . . .

LRH: Well, you asked me.

PC: Oh, I appreciate that. (laughs embarrassedly) All right, well . . .

LRH: Feel the emotion of regret on that, and blame.

PC: (sighs) The regret is only in relation to my mother.

LRH: All right. Can you get a visio there of your mother anywhere?

PC: Yes.

LRH: All right. Can you run regret on that?

PC: Yes. She's crying.

LRH: Hm-hm.

PC: She's sitting down there and . . . (coughs)

LRH: Just run the emotion of regret as you watch her there.

PC: At the time this . . . I had a lot of emotion on it, a lot of grief on it.

LRH: Did you run grief on it already?

PC: Hm-hm.

LRH: All right. Can you get your feeling of trying to stop her crying?

PC: Stop her crying?

LRH: Hm-hm.

PC: Yes, I did tell her not to cry. But, of course, when I went over to her and I hugged her and said “Mommy, don’t cry,” I cried too. So we both cried. I didn’t have sufficient effort or strength . . .

LRH: Did you get any feeling of not being really able to help her there?

PC: Yes, a feeling of helplessness.

LRH: All right. Can you run that on the incident?

PC: Yes. It’s a mutual helplessness.

LRH: Hm-hm.

PC: A mutual—I feel a mutual inability of doing anything about it.

LRH: Hm-hm. Let’s go over that feeling again a couple of times.

PC: (sighs)

LRH: Who are you blaming in that incident?

PC: Me. Myself.

LRH: Yes. Well, how did you cause this?

PC: I stole and she got punished. She was innocent. She wanted to protect me, and he pushed her and hurt her.

LRH: Hm-hm. All right. Now, do you find just before that your effort to stop him from pushing her?

PC: No. He had me down; he was kneeling

LRH: What effort did you make to get up and stop him?

PC: I tried with my hand to pull myself . . .

[gap in recording]

I forced myself much stronger. I had more—uh, whether it is his own loosening up of pressing down, or my . . . I would say it’s both, it’s mutual, and I feel a little of relief. I push myself loose and I get through, and then he, of course, curses us and leaves, and . . .

LRH: Did you succeed or fail in your effort to help her?

PC: (sniffs) Neither, I would say. I didn't succeed and I didn't fail.

LRH: Did you get the feeling of being thwarted in your effort to help her?

PC: I'm sorry, this word . . .

LRH: Did you get the feeling of being thwarted?

PC: I don't know this English word.

LRH: What is the effort to hold you in place when you try to get up to help her?

PC: The effort is his. In other words, the inability—the position I am lying here. He uses his knees on me and hits me.

LRH: Hm-hm.

PC: And pushes my face in the dirt.

LRH: Hm-hm. How do your eyes feel at that moment?

PC: Well, I scream, I cry. They feel inflamed, red; it must be—yes, I feel them red. They burn.

LRH: All right. Do you get your effort to repel those shoves?

PC: (sighs) Yes, I do.

LRH: Okay. Experience that effort again— your effort to get out of the dust.

PC: I raise up. He holds me pressed down and I scream, and then my mother comes and with her help (sniffs)—my mother was fighting with him—he loses his pressure on me, and then I was able to pull myself through.

LRH: What emotion are you feeling at that moment?

PC: Emotion of relief in a sense, like escaping an enclosure.

LRH: Hm-hm. Can you scan straight through this incident from the first moment that he challenges you, right straight on to the end of it?

PC: Yes.

LRH: All right. Do so, please.

PC: Shall I verbalize it or not?

LRH: No, just scan it through.

PC: (pause; sighs) I'm through.

LRH: All right. Let's pick it up at the first moment he touches you there, and get your feelings of repulsion or disgust, the effort to help and so forth; get your emotion along that line.

PC: (pause; sighs) All right.

LRH: Now, how far are you carrying it through?

PC: I am through to the time when he left.

LRH: All right. Let's pick it up at the first moment you're apprehended about this, and just scan the emotion of it straight on through to the end of it.

PC: (pause) I feel a tenseness in my spinal muscles.

LRH: Hm-hm.

PC: I get tense.

LRH: Just scan the emotion.

PC: (pause; sighs) Mm . . . yeah.

LRH: Come through to the end of it?

PC: Hm-hm.

LRH: Okay. Let's pick it up at the beginning again and scan your emotion straight on through, with all its variations.

PC: (brief pause) I'm aware now that I was out of valence. I saw myself. (pause; sighs) All right.

LRH: Okay. Let's contact the beginning. Now, I think you'll find a little more variation of emotion in there this time than you have been running. Now, let's roll it through again.

PC: (sighs; pause; sobs softly) All right.

LRH: Okay, let's contact at the beginning there. There's probably even a little more variation in the emotion there through the incident. Let's scan it again.

PC: (more grief sounds; sighs; pause) The worst emotion in this—I have my mother's. I tell her not to cry. There's this strong emotion. (sighs; pause) I'm through.

LRH: All right. Let's scan through from the beginning to the end of it again, and there's still a little more emotion there needs contacting. Straight through to the end.

PC: Uh...

LRH: And this time, contact your thought stream.

PC: Another incident right away came up of a similar situation.

LRH: Well, let's just roll this one along.

PC: Okay.

LRH: Hm.

PC: (pause) He saw this; I ran away, then he hits me. I would like to kill him.

LRH: Hm-hm.

PC: Oh, I'd like to bite him and kick him.

LRH: Hm-hm.

PC: I did scratch him on his hand. (sighs; pause) Feel this hate against him. (sighs; pause)

LRH: Tell me when you reach the end of it.

PC: Yes.

LRH: All right. Now, let's contact the first moment of it and get your thoughts or statements—you don't need to verbalize these—as you swing on through, still running the emotion.

PC: Got a pain in my arm in here. I used to get it—I didn't know why—very occasionally. (pause) There's a lot of fear also.

LRH: You can contact it.

PC: My elbow was in this position, and it presses in here. (pause; sighs) All right.

LRH: Okay. Did you get any of your thoughts through the incident?

PC: Yes.

LRH: All right. Let's contact the beginning of it and scan through it again with particular attention to your thoughts and whatever fear is there.

PC: (pause) Fear he might kill me—he's so large; he's so vicious. (pause) All right. (sighs)

LRH: All right, let's contact the first moment of it there again. You'll probably find a little earlier thoughts than you . . .

PC: Yeah, there are probably other thoughts in it.

LRH: All right, let's contact those and swing right on through the incident again. There may be a little more emotion there you haven't contacted yet. Get your thoughts.

PC: (pause; sighs) Hm-hm.

LRH: All right. Let's scan it again.

PC: (pause; blows nose) All right.

LRH: Okay. Let's contact it once more through the line.

PC: (pause) All right.

LRH: All right. Let's contact it once more.

PC: (pause; sighs) All right.

LRH: Once again.

PC: Of course, now I like this way. Very fast.

LRH: All right, try it once more.

PC: (slight pause) I don't have any more thoughts.

LRH: What particular thought in there is related to your eyes?

PC: A burning sensation.

LRH: Yeah, but what's your thought related to that burning sensation?

PC: It hurts.

LRH: Did you comment to yourself during the incident that they hurt?

PC: Hm-hm, because the tears burn.

LRH: All right, let's sweep past that thought a couple of times.

PC: (pause) I had to be taken to a doctor for my elbow, and he used to give me eyedrops in my eyes. My mother took me to him.

LRH: Was he sympathetic?

PC: Yes.

LRH: All right. Let's run past that postulate you made in the incident again about your eyes.

PC: The ground is um . . . dirt, there was no floor. Leaves. Dirt. And when he pushes my head into it, dirt goes into my eyes.

LRH: All right.

PC: And when I rub them, it hurts.

LRH: All right, do you get your emotion there as that's occurring?

PC: Yes.

LRH: All right, let's run your emotion on just that.

PC: (pause; sighs) It's all right.

LRH: Let's run it again.

PC: (pause) It's all right.

LRH: Yeah. (pc chuckles and blows nose) Let's run it again.

PC: (chuckles) You want to know why I laugh?

LRH: Why?

PC: (chuckles) From all you said about the eyes, I started thinking right away of my eyes. And it brought me up to this point, to present time when you started.

LRH: Uh-huh.

PC: In a sense I'm laughing about how I didn't ask for it: (laughs) I ran into it. (LRH and pc laugh; pause) Only slight now.

LRH: All right. (pause; pc sighs) Let's run through that about eyes again.

PC: When you asked—said “Let's run through about eyes again,” about a half a dozen incidents come up about eyes.

LRH: Right.

PC: I went to the doctor and he said I have a short axis and I must wear glasses, and I didn't want to wear glasses. And I had bought glasses but I didn't wear them. And then when I came to the United States a friend of mine—a doctor—told me, “Crazy,” he said, “you should wear glasses or you'll ruin your eyes, “ and he somewhat persuaded me against my better judgment, and from then on I had to wear glasses. He told me to wear them all the time. And I wear them all the time. All of this came up.

LRH: Uh-huh. (pause) Let's scan through the emotion on that whole incident again.

PC: You mean in the incident . . . ?

LRH: All of it, on the incident we've been running—scan through the emotion straight through.

PC: (pause; sighs) I'm through.

LRH: All right. Let's run it again and find out if there isn't a little more emotion in there somewhere that we have not yet contacted.

PC: There is a heaviness in here somehow. (brief pause) I feel I'm very much in present time. As long as it's not on my part purely a demonstration, (chuckling) how would it be if you finish the session? (laughing)

LRH: All right, how about scanning it one more time?

PC: I have a feeling of resisting.

LRH: I know.

PC: I have it in here.

LRH: Who are you resisting?

PC: I am resisting—um . . .

LRH: Who?

PC: Myself, of course.

LRH: Yeah.

PC: But for a reason.

LRH: Who are you blaming in that incident?

PC: I'm not . . . this is . . . um, I'm not . . .

LRH: Let's talk about that incident. Run the emotion of blame straight through that incident.

PC: (pause; sighs) Well, of course I blame my father for everything in it.

LRH: Have you got it?

PC: Hm-hm.

LRH: All right, let's run the emotion of blame again, straight through that incident.

PC: Hm-hm.

LRH: Something more show up?

PC: It shifted, from—the pressure in my spinal cord . . .

LRH: Hm-hm.

PC: shifted now, in here.

LRH: Yeah.

PC: It's in here, on this side now.

LRH: All right. Let's run the emotion of blame straight through that incident again.

PC: (pause) Okay. (sighs)

LRH: All right. Let's try it once more, and this time get the postulates—that is, your thoughts of blame as you go through it.

PC: (pause) There is a whole chain of it in relation to postulates. An awful lot of them.

LRH: Hm-hm.

PC: Fear, regret, any other thoughts (chuckles) associated.

LRH: Let's get the blame off just that one incident now, just that one. Roll that straight through. (pause) Blame.

PC: All right. (sighs; pause) I mean, in all fairness, I am resisting and I feel that resistance.

LRH: Sure. Sure. Now, just let me ask you this question:

PC: Hm-hm.

LRH: Who are you blaming there?

PC: I'm blaming my father.

LRH: All right. Has any of this blame slopped over into present time?

PC: Yes.

LRH: Are you blaming the auditor a little bit for keeping you going on this?

PC: No. No, I . . .

LRH: No. All right, who are you blaming in present time with this same emotion?

PC: I wouldn't call it blame; I would rather call it an analytical awareness, and having my analytical awareness in here, in the incident here, I somehow keep on a given level, not

to let completely go, because if I leave completely go, as I say, I will cry a lot. So I hold.

LRH: Hm-hm.

PC: And if I . . .

LRH: Get your postulate in that incident that you're sure not going to show him.

PC: I probably never wanted to show him I would cry.

LRH: Yeah.

PC: (laughing and crying simultaneously) I didn't want to show him that he win.

LRH: That's right. (pc laughs) That's right.

PC: (laughs) Silly, isn't it?

LRH: Now, you want to sweep it again? What do you want to do with this incident, now?

PC: I would like to have it run again with an auditor and myself.

LRH: Hm-hm. Do you think there's very much grief left on it?

PC: Yes, it's still—I feel it in here.

LRH: All right. Sweep past the portion of it where you feel it in there.

PC: (chuckles; pause; coughs)

LRH: Find it?

PC: Hm-hm.

LRH: All right. What postulate goes with it?

PC: It's actually, in a sense, I would say a visio of a channel of grief related to a similar incident.

LRH: Another incident there?

PC: Yeah, a whole—a whole. . .

LRH: Well, is there a time in that incident when you think that this is going to keep on going, or this is always this way, or a feeling of despair about it?

PC: Um.... no.

LRH: No? Is there a feeling there that this is like many other times?

PC: Yes.

LRH: All right. Let's run that feeling in that incident.

PC: (pause) Hm-hm. (sighs) I'm through.

LRH: Got it?

PC: Yeah.

LRH: All right. Let's sweep through that a couple more times.

PC: (brief pause) As much as I try to stay on this particular incident, they pop up.

LRH: Yeah.

PC: I try not to, but . . .

LRH: What's the atmosphere of present time?

PC: Awareness.

LRH: Yeah. All right. Awareness of what? What's the atmosphere?

PC: Well...

LRH: What's the counter-emotion of present time?

PC: To resist.

LRH: No, the counter-emotion of present time.

PC: Counter...

LRH: Not your emotion.

PC: Pardon me?

LRH: Not your emotion, the emotion around you. The atmosphere around you . . .

PC: Yeah, the counter-emotion.

LRH: I.. in the room.

PC: The people in the room are having a counter-emotion.

LRH: Okay.

PC: Yes.

LRH: Feel that?

PC: Yes.

LRH: All right. Let's feel it in your shoulders.

PC: It has a little pressure—effect of pressure.

LRH: All right. Let's feel it in your back. Just from the room here, let's feel it in your back.

PC: Hm, yeah.

LRH: Let's feel it in your knees.

PC: They are getting cold.

LRH: Hm-hm. (pc laughs) Let's feel it in your chest. Is this atmosphere here friendly? Unfriendly? How would you classify it?

PC: Hm. Maybe. . .

LRH: Let's be honest, now.

PC: A little too friendly.

LRH: A little too friendly?

PC: Yes.

LRH: All right. Can you feel that?

PC: Yeah. I feel sympathy, somehow.

LRH: All right. (LRH and pc laugh) All right. How's it feel?

PC: I like it. (LRH and pc laugh)

LRH: How does it feel to your eyes?

PC: My eyes are a little watery.

LRH: Now, how does this atmosphere feel to your eyes right now? The emotional atmosphere of the room.

PC: Hm. I wouldn't say I have a specific feeling here . . .

LRH: How's it feel to your nose?

PC: The nose feels clear; I had a cold.

LRH: Hm-hm. How's the chair feel under you?

PC: Not bad.

LRH: Feel the chair under you?

PC: Hm-hm.

LRH: All right. What's the atmosphere of the room now? How does it feel to your eyelids as they're closed there?

PC: A feeling that most of the eyes are directed at me.

LRH: Hm-hm. (chuckles) Okay. Now, how does it feel to your shoulders?

PC: Not bad.

LRH: Your elbows?

PC: There's a little . . . I don't know what to attribute it to, just sitting here; definitely it's a little tenseness, there. I would say a little rigidity.

LRH: Hm-hm. Is that tenseness in the room here?

PC: No.

LRH: All right. How does the room here feel to you?

PC: I feel a little—oh, a little embarrassed.

LRH: Hm-hm, I know. (pc laughs; LRH chuckles with pc) Okay. All right. Let's call that the end of the demonstration.

PC: All right, thank you very much.

LRH: You betcha. (Here the preclear opens his eyes, sits up and reaches for his glasses; he puts them on, then takes them off and cleans them and puts them back on.)

PC: What do you know? I couldn't see it. (LRH and pc chuckle)

LRH: Time and space has changed.

PC: Yes.

LRH: Now, do you mind if I say what I was doing there? And what we were doing?

PC: No, not at all. As a matter of fact, if any questions want to be asked of me . . .

You notice that the computation came up immediately—on what? The computation came right up on the shoes. We just got a visio and we ran a little regret and blame, and the computation of the case went bang. We got it. Isn't that right? Do you see how that worked?

The first step, of course, was trying to find out something about a life continuum. This defines personnel. Then we got into the next step, recalled a little bit of regret and worked with that for a moment, and we fell right into an incident. That is the stuck incident, as it obviously was.

Now, instead of running the effort out of this incident, we started doing an "incident-ectomy" by taking the emotions off the incident, one right after the other, on emotional passes. And after that had been done for a short time (for demonstration purposes; not as long as you would have run it as an auditor), immediately the postulates began to fall out of the emotion.

You just know this as an auditor. That is the mechanics of it. The postulates start to show up so you start running the postulates. When you run the postulates, you get a little closer contact to the incident suddenly and some more emotion shows up. You run some more emotion and some more postulates fall out of it, so you run some more postulates and a little more emotion falls out of it. Then you run a little more emotion and some more postulates come up out of it, because it is quite long.

All of a sudden we started to get all sorts of stuff coming in, so that meant there must have been an "endure" there. "Endure" says at once "This goes on; this is going on for a long time. It has happened before." And also the continued unwillingness to express the emotion demonstrates definitely that there is a postulate there which is suppressing it.

Now, you remember repeater technique? The sins that we have done with repeater technique! The preclear says, "But I feel too hot," and you say, "Well, run 'too hot.'" If you have worked repeater that way, that is highly illegal. Psychoanalysis has picked up this repeater technique out of Dianetics, and boy, do they louse up cases! I have heard many reports of this.

Anyhow, we have a "repeater technique" in Postulate Processing, which is not a harmful technique. There is a postulate present in the incident which describes what the individual says is wrong. In other words, he says he can't show emotion in the thing: there is a postulate there

that suppresses emotion. He says he feels too tall: there is a postulate there that says he feels too tall.

Now, you can overdo this, but it is not harmful. You don't wish off on your preclear a flock of postulates that he doesn't know are there. But if he keeps repeating some situation as he goes through, you are running across one that isn't clearing up. So your last edge is to assist the preclear. That is slight evaluation for the preclear, but it is the last edge of the thing.

Mind you, just running it will eventually cause that postulate to come up. And it is much better when you just let it come up. But if your preclear is having a rough time of it, try to knock one out from it. Just say "Is there such a thing there?" Right away he observes the fact that he is to that degree dramatizing it—he looks for it hurriedly—and he will find it or he won't find it. But to that degree, you can use "repeater technique" on this.

But if you find yourself having to feed postulates to your preclear continually, it is because the thing is so soggy with emotion. There is your monitor: How much emotion is left on this case? It is, how many of the postulates is the preclear dramatizing? So you just run some more emotion.

Now, any of these incidents, because they are central-computation incidents, will furnish almost unbearable pressure. There is a lot of pressure in the incident. For instance, it would be hard not to emote on such an incident, if the fellow kept running it.

If that incident had hung up in any way—the preclear kept mentioning alternate incidents—there were two choices. We could have knocked those out or we could have run up the line and picked up all the sympathy from the doctors, which gave slight value to the continued wearing of glasses. The fellow didn't want it, but it nevertheless gave slight value; because there was sympathy, it will hang him up somewhere along the track.

So we could have just taken off from there, where he started talking about the doctors and so forth. That chain was offering itself, and we could have run it as a sympathy chain on up the line. We could have got him up into present time in such a style, in such a fashion, or we could have just kept boring along.

The incident seizes up; he says there is another one like it. If he keeps saying there is another one like it, it probably has an intertwining of emotion on this first one, so you just start running the other one.

The amount of work which an auditor is doing here, I impress on you, is practically nothing. He is working with a very, very precise mechanic, and that is the fact that there is the effort; the preclear in this case demonstrated very definitely the presence of that effort.

I could have gone on and chewed into that effort left and right, but I just chewed into it enough to secure the preclear in it. Then I rolled on the thing and got the emotion off it, because the facsimile and similar facsimiles will drop out if you run the emotion on them.

Now, we could have found this whole incident, complete, without any discussion of life continuum or anything else, by running an emotional curve. You just ask the preclear to run the emotional curve and all of a sudden he will present several incidents of various kinds and then all of a sudden hand you the central computation. The emotional curve goes right on into it.

And I also call to your attention the fact that this incident is preceded by what I was talking about originally: the overt act which fails into sympathy. That overt act is still there, and we have got the other part of the sequence: the time he tried to protect his mother. He had a slight effort in that direction. There is a more precise incident where he was protecting his mother. Who is the overt incident against? The earliest overt incident—who is it directed toward?

Ann: Mama.

That's right. So the preclear did something to Mama very early, and then had to defend Mama because he had weakened that portion of the interdependency of life, and therefore he took it up as a responsibility to defend that portion. So we have this earliest incident of offense against Mama, and that is where the grief and sympathy and so forth come in.

Now, the doctors, sympathizing with the eyes all the way on up the track, are restimulating his own feeling toward his mother. And every time they give him sympathy, all the way up the track, they turn on the overt act and depress him down the tone scale. That is what sympathy does. Sympathy for somebody re-echoes the original overt act against some portion of the dynamics. Do you see how the computation is?

So we are talking here about computation of all cases. The effort to defend Mama tells you immediately that Mama was offended against, overtly and with full self-determinism, very early. He doesn't want the sympathy from the doctors, but he somehow or other accepts it up the line. This tells you immediately that it keeps this darn overt incident keyed. It is an emotional key all the way up the line. I think maybe you understand suddenly (I see several lights dawning around here) what is bad about sympathy. It keeps telling the fellow, "Yes, you poor fellow. I performed an overt act at one time for which I am 100 percent guilty. I am to blame. I desired to be cause, and I was cause all right, but I offended against one of the dynamics. And thereafter I had to feel sympathy toward that dynamic, and I had to defend that dynamic."

Ellen: What kind of an act could you commit against all mankind ? I don't know. What kind of an act would it be? Overt act.

Ellen: You're supposed to separate yourself from it.

Yes, how do you do it?

Ellen: I am running my husband's case, not mine.

All right. He will tell you. He will tell you. You as the auditor don't even have to know. He will tell you all about it. All you have to do is start running some regret and some blame, some sympathy, some protection, and the next thing you know, he is handing you the central computation on the thing. If he is sympathetic toward and has to protect all mankind now, he has offended every one of them. How would you do that?

One of the ways one does that is that by being in the form of man, one takes on a liability of offending against all mankind if he offends against his own form and shape. You understand how that would be, sort of weirdly?

An individual makes himself weak, ridiculous or something of the sort and somehow or other adds this up to the fact that he has made a man very bad off. Therefore he has made all men very bad off. It could add up to that. The overt act against all mankind can be against self as form. You are a representative or an ambassador of a race, and if you go out into the other dynamics and make a confounded fool out of yourself, you to some degree offend against the whole race. I found that on one case where there was an offense against mankind, and that is the only other one I know of.

Bill: It could go from one to eight to four, too, couldn't it?

Sure. You could have any number of combinations. But everybody has got his idea of what this combination is, and you now have the fortune telling cards which suddenly wind you up with the computation.

Now, I'll repeat those steps again: Basically, there is an overt act against one dynamic, which is of course followed by sympathy. Then there is a later effort to defend that dynamic against an offender, which is actually defending the world against oneself.

Just figure that for a minute. Papa offends. The first dynamic has already offended. If one doesn't defend this dynamic against Papa, in this case, one will become Papa. One can't go back up on this "unsympathy" line now, having assumed a "sympathy" line.

So it is very simple. It is just an overt act against a dynamic, which is later followed by sympathy. Then one ever afterwards defends that dynamic against things which will offend against it. You are looking for a time when failure occurred on that defense. There is your computation; there can be several of those computations on a case.

Jed: This would be a beautiful cycle to run just as itself.

It is!

Jed: I mean, this could have all the qualities of a cyclic incident here.

Vera: How is an atheist made? With this new emotional curve and so on, what makes an atheist?

An atheist—"God doesn't exist" or "I hate God" or something of the sort? You figure it out. I have set up the equation, you figure it out. Why does one hate God? Which stage?

Mary: Because he offended against.

Now, think of it: which stage is this? Is this the first step, or is it the second step?

Ann: That's what I'm trying to figure out.

Now, you have your formula: Your formula is an overt act against, and a sympathy towards.

Vera: I think in the particular incident I'm thinking about it could turn out to be Papa.

Now you are getting too complex. That is way too complex; that is way up there in personalities and everything else.

Here is an offense—an offense against something and sympathy for it thereafter. That is the first step. Next is defending the entity which one has offended against from other offenders.

Ann: I'm getting mixed up.

You couldn't possibly! It is too simple. You have said, "Why is an atheist?" You have just said, "Well, this is God over here"—the thing the atheist is defending against. But you haven't given the rest of the equation. What is he defending?

Susan: What did God do?

What did God do, to what? The second you point out to a preclear that there is something being defended, he certainly gets unconfused in an awful hurry.

So, what is an atheist? Who is this person sympathetic toward? What is this person sympathetic toward? How did God offend against this entity?

Only, if we go back early we find out the fellow himself offended against this. We will get that combination any way you want to run it out, but that is its set line. And when you are processing, if you have those steps in mind solidly you can disconnect these incidents and you

can get to the computation on the case. Because that is the computation of all cases, horribly enough.

Betty: Ron, I have a question: When you locate the original incident where the person commits the overt act, how do you accomplish blowing that? In other words, you get down to the point where the person did self-determinedly offend against this other person.

Run the curve. You just run the offense. It is just an “incident-ectomy.” It is just another incident, only what you will get there is very simple. First you will get the person without any care about it. Then all of a sudden you will get a concern, an effort to force something through on it which will degenerate into anger, which will go down the tone scale immediately afterward because the person fails the moment the other dynamic fails. He gets angry and does not accomplish anything by it—he just hurts the other dynamic. What he wants to accomplish is action and what he succeeds in accomplishing is inaction. So immediately he has a failure on his hands and he goes into sympathy. It is just an incident which has that curve.

Now, it will continue to be hung up in sympathy all the way on up the bank. And sympathy will restimulate that overt act.

The church has a beautiful setup. They have the formula of sin and they get paid to forgive you. They are getting paid to relieve you. But you have a much more effective method of handling “sin,” only you are not handling it as such. It is just a crime against the world.

That first one, an individual considers is a crime, so there is regret on it and there is blame of self. That is the first failure, when a person realizes he himself is at fault. Right there he comes down out of the ethereal clouds he was occupying and he comes way down the tone scale. He comes down fast when he recognizes that. And he has an awful struggle getting back up again unless you get this curve. You just get that by running a curve.

Betty: With this incident, for instance, if you were running it clear off, would you simply run the grief off it through the scanning mechanism that you used—begin at the beginning and run through it—and the preclear cries as long as he feels like crying, and you just sit and wait for him to get through it?

Right. You notice various parts of this incident were clipping him before—various parts of it. But the sighs told you that there were parts of it that weren’t force, and the continued posture said the effort was still on. So if the effort was still on, the effort was being pinned there by emotion. So there was still emotion there.

Betty: But you just use the scanning technique to get it off. Is that correct?

That’s right. Don’t bother to verbalize—it takes too much time. You notice how fast he was rolling through that stuff? How long would that take under the standard line of running?

If you don’t get it all off on that incident and he still has some sighs on the incident—he doesn’t seem to want to let go and so forth and he has already handed you several other incidents—you can choose if you want to but I wouldn’t leave an incident until I was fairly sure.

Now, on this case, the only reason the rest of that should be audited is there is still some grief on that line. But it is grief on that line, not necessarily grief on that incident. You could go into this now and just keep on running these similar incidents and change to sympathy and regret. Or you could go and try to find the overt act against Mama. Get this thing unburdened, just by working with these various factors, and it will blow. It doesn’t take very long for it to blow.

The discussion is concluded in the next lecture.