RANDOMITY AND EMOTION

A lecture given on
12 October 1951

The Interplay of Motion in Living

What we are going to go into now is the subject of randomity and emotion. I could cover this in a breath, so to speak, or I could cover it through the Axioms. The Axioms compare very closely to the subject; they just codify it a little better. And I think if I give you an overall, broad picture of what we have here, you can certainly fit the Axioms into it without any trouble, because they are very self-explanatory.

One word about the Axioms: they are not numbered according to the number they will take in the university issue. There have been a few shifts of position on them, and the Axioms which cover the identity of life energy are fewer at the beginning of the university issue than what you have. So the numbers on them are going to change. Otherwise, with the addition of statics and the operation of statics, this list of axioms is pretty well complete. They cover, particularly, the aspect of statics and motions.

There is an inner subject to the subject of motion and there is a subject within that one.

The first thing about motion is the vectors of effort. All motion could be said to be, one way or the other, effort, but we don't quite know what starts the effort so we will call it motion. We have motions canceling each other and motions changing each other, and we get a varying pattern of that. First we have a static with no motion, then following that we have a little motion— probably directed—and then we have that motion splitting up, opposing itself and so on, until it gets very, very random. And then it gets into an aligned state so that its vectors are completely parallel and its motion is exactly the same motion over and over, and again we have another static. That is the cycle of motion. We have, also, volume of motion. Let's suppose we have two vectors: one could be traveling the same direction as the other but going at a much faster rate of speed, and there could be much more there to go into motion. So, you can see there is degree of volume of motion. There could be just a little bit of motion or a lot of motion, both aligned the same way. In other words, two motions which apparently have the same alignment would not necessarily have the same volume. You would have a little bit of motion and a lot of motion.

Now, it is the same way when we talk about degrees of randomity. They start at a static.

With volume of motion, we start with a static and move up into a little motion, and then more motion. This would be more volume of the same motion—increasing volume of the same motion. This is not change of motion. You could theoretically say it would come up in volume until all of a sudden it started to paralyze itself, and it would get over into another static. It would do that with volume on the same motion; it could get to such a volume that it would shatter itself, at which moment it would become a static. This would be degrees of motion in terms of volume.

We are interested in randomity of motion; we are interested in the picture of a vector—the vector system.

Again, we start with a static. Then we have a motion, which doesn't emanate from that static but is controlled by the static. So we have two factors involved here. If the vectors of

that motion are very closely aligned, it is very close to being a static. But it is not quite aligned so it is not a static.

Then, when we have two vectors traveling in slightly different directions, there is a slight bit of randomness to these motions.
The motion continues to get more random, and after a bit the vectors start breaking up. The vectors themselves start to wobble out of line. Here we have further randomness, but we have more or less a force in the same direction. We would still at this point be getting something like aligned or orderly motion, because all the force is more or less traveling in the same direction.

Next, the vectors start to cancel each other out. Then, there would still be a little randomity but it would be getting close to what you could call a static again, because the motion is the same motion—it is just breaking in opposite directions.

You can keep breaking down these vectors till they go in opposite directions. Let's take this even further now. If they break down even more finely they break down to dots. They break themselves down in motion and you just get a series of dots. And when you have a series of dots, they vanish away and become a static again.

Now, when you start getting motions doing this in volume, it gets to be a pretty jumbled-up mess. You have looked at engrams. An engram is a facsimile where all the vectors are splitting up and going in opposite directions, canceling each other, reinforcing each other, stopping each other, changing each other and so on. If you do that in volume to the individual, look what starts to break down: He has the harmonic motion of his heart—a steady beat, so steady it is almost a static. All of a sudden it is confronted by a variety of vectors going in all directions which are interrupting and reinforcing each other and so forth in the vicinity of his heart. That would be an engram, if the randomness were such and the volume were high enough to back up into the very seat of consciousness of the body and cancel the aligned motions there and?" enrando?" them. Notice that any time you send a series of random vectors into an aligned field it enrandoms, or makes random, the field which was aligned.

Take a medical doctor and bring him into Dianetics. He enturbulates Dianetics and Dianetics enturbulates him, because they are going in opposite directions; there is almost a 100 percent vector change all the way around. This is an upsetting picture. He comes around with his statics, his orientations and his past conclusions and he doesn't know that these things are pretty random. Medicine is almost a static because it is an authoritarian field. And he comes around and he tells you about this and it doesn't make sense to you. According to him, you are very random because you are not lining up with his vectors. So you get a collision; you get enturbulence.

Therefore, it is difficult to talk about Dianetics to anyone who has an orientation in the field of medicine, until you go back and pick up his conclusions.

There is a trick you can play on anybody in that field, by the way. All you do is go back and pick up his agreements to go to school, his agreements to obey the teacher, and if you pick all these things up well, his medical education will collapse. He won't realize it, either, until it has collapsed, and then of course he won't worry about it because it has collapsed.

So, we have these two things: the volume of motion and the randomness of motion. Any individual is in motion; he is in constant, continuous motion. Most of his motions are fairly well aligned. As a result, when a randomness of motion which is contrary to his alignment of motion hits suddenly, his motions go out of line. And if the volume of this randomness

hitting him is such, he goes anaten. This randomness simply backs right straight up the nerve channels, hits the control vented and knocks it out. The control center waits to be taken over by another control venter.

On the epicenter theory, that is what happens. The control center is just nullified. It quits, it doesn't even record, and it waits to be taken over by the new epicenter. So people standing around an unconscious person can actually be operating as his brain center. Evolution sets it up this way. It is a good way to evolve an organism but it is a very poor way to live as a human being.

Randomness is really the opposition of vectors of effort. An automobile running down the road has its vectors all aligned in one direction. If another automobile comes down the road and there is a collision, it looks awfully random afterwards.

Now, this concept has considerable use to you because it tells you that a society without random motion would be motionless, because a completely aligned motion is a static. It is really not going in any direction at all. But you could put a point on the air and say, "Well, it potentially could go in this direction" It is a static.

Optimum randomity would be at a bearable volume and not completely unsusceptible to alignment. It would lie somewhere in the middle band.

Music and aesthetics depend on randomity. The mind follows along a sound wave in music where it believes this sound wave is a static. For example, take Sousa's band: It goes over and over for several notes, and the mind says, "Ah! Nice static." The person sits down to relax about this thing, then all of a sudden the sousaphone kicks in—or the clarinet or something— and adds a new vector or a new series of vectors. So promptly the person is alerted, and he keeps following it. Then the music falls off into what appears to be going toward a static, and then something else happens.

Youngsters who are traveling at a high rate of speed can stand a considerable amount of randomity in their music. They are going at a high rate of speed, they take music at about the same speed and they are intolerant of even the static of five or six notes following one right after the other on the same level. They are actually intolerant of it. They are even intolerant of a chord like C major: "That's church music?" they say, or something like that. C major is not something they want around. So they throw in a couple of C flats and sharps and then chop in sideways on the rhythm. Instead of a regular boom, boom, boom, boom, boom on a base drum, they throw in a fast boombity-boom-boom-boom-boom—boom!—?" Ah, boy, that's music?" That may be music to them; it is not music to somebody else.

You can actually take rhythm—monotonous rhythm—and do things to individuals with it, because you are giving them a static tone. You are giving them a static, so they go into a sort of hypnotic trance. They see a static, so they are willing to turn themselves over to that static because their emanation point is evidently, as postulated in Dianetics, a static. A monotonous tone and a static is God, to a primitive mind. So if you introduce just enough action to convince somebody that there is an action happening, and then introduce enough sameness in the action to tell them that there is no action happening, that it is not random at all, that it is monotonous, and then add enough volume to it to impress them with a shock wave, they will turn themselves over to it.

The formulation of the laws of aesthetics is not too difficult now. For instance, stories follow a curve, they follow the interplay of the tone scale. A story gets its randomness

from 1.5 hitting 3.0, usually. So you have the interplay of 1.5 and 3.0, and of course, in a comedy 3.0 wins and in a tragedy 1.5 wins.

This present school of literature isn't operating quite that way; they operate between 0.2 and 0.9, and everybody is afraid that 0.9 is not going to win, that 0.2 is going to win. When it finally winds up, everybody is very gratified to find out that 0.2 won—the tremendous popularity of 1984, for instance.

If you want to write a great novel, a really great novel for this society at this present time, start it off as though somewhere or other you are going to get into a good, solid 1.5, and about the time people are shocked by having read that the 1.5 is in existence, you start to trail them off. Then at the end of it, don't chop it off with death, because death has a certain drama. What you do is bring it down to the end of the line at 0.5 and then just indicate that from here on it trails off unbearably for years and years and years, and maybe won't ever reach death.

You can sketch any novel on the tone scale against the time of its plot. You can take the tone scale and set it up with a left or right tone vector and you can sketch the plot, and you can see the interplay of the tone scale on it. There is also an interplay of the dynamics. The artist, the writer of the thing, simply injects a randomness so that it doesn't get too monotonous, and there it is.

Of course, the artist is always thinking that he is writing to please himself or some such thing (though I notice they all like to eat), but he writes for the society. Writers will go out of style and they never realize why they go out of style, but the society shifts on the tone scale so that the interplay of the two points on the tone scale, high and low, changes. The writer may be writing from an era where it was fairly high, and the society slips out from under him. As a result, he sits there with a beautiful plot that would have sold just fine in 1910, trying to sell it in 1951.

Now, a writer will write the same plot over and overr and it will become a static to him; he will become bored with it and he will go around and tell people how he doesn't like writing. All he has got to do is go back and pick up his conclusions that this was the right plot—remember his conclusions—and then figure out a new plot that plots against the society. Then get in there and murder them. There is nothing very difficult about it.

In painting it is the same way. It used to be Maxfield Parrish and now it is Salvador Dali. He is great. I like his skeletons and things; they please me very much—but only when I am at the bottom of the time track in an engram, I am afraid.

If you wanted to make a precision science out of the arts, you would not decrease the amount of randomity you could introduce and you would not decrease the amount of effectiveness. What people think would happen if you introduced laws of aesthetics is that all aesthetics would then become static, and they just abhor the idea. So they keep aesthetics in a somewhat authoritarian field. This would not be the case if you went along this line with randomity; you would just study the randomities and calculate them very, very nicely.

Who knows—this twentieth century might even yet produce a fiction story. There have been two or three fiction stories produced in the past, but a certain anxiety has come into the publishing field of fiction and into the field of painting. Nobody has been able to hit the right degree of randomity to match their audience. There is the sheriff on the doorstep and there are a lot of other minor complications incident to the field of the arts, so individuals get anxious about it and they start shooting wildly all over the place. You get cubist

painting, modernism—so-called—and all these other schools. These are really anxieties, they are neuroses, they are randomnesses which aren't matched up even against themselves.

I went to a Picasso show one day with a fellow from Greenwich Village. He was wearing a turtleneck sweater and I was wearing a business suit, and everybody who was coming to the Picasso show was dressed in tails and ermine wraps and evening gowns. This was really swell, it was really upstage. Picasso is so thoroughly random that you have to have money to appreciate him.

This other fellow was an artist, and he and I went in there and we didn't notice until we were quite deep into the thing that this was really a swell gathering. But there were two or three Greenwich Village longhairs around there, so he and I went around and we just got oblivious to the crowd because they seemed to be milling around somewhat like cattle do when they haven't had anything to eat or drink for a number of days. There were three floors of Picasso, and this artist and I would stop in front of each display. I was interested in the neurosis from which Picasso was probably suffering, but more importantly, in why he was doing it. I was coming to the conclusion that it was just a big experiment, as far as he was concerned, whereby he was testing color and design lines.

We were going hot and heavy. This artist would say, "Oh, but no! There is so much soul! There's this! There's that."
And I would say, "No, it just merely looks to me like he's got a libido complex or something."

We got up to the second floor, and he and I had such a falling-out about one of the paintings that we reached a static, and we were silent for a moment. We happened to look around and we had about fifty people following us along the line of pictures and listening to us. Some of them were trying hard to look very edified.

So I got very interested in the people who were watching the Picasso show and took a series of notes. I wrote an article for the New Yorker on it. There was one old man whose wife had obviously dragged him there—he was more interested in textiles or something of the sort—and he was going along and looking at each picture very, very carefully. Finally he turned around at the end of the line—I was standing there kind of handy—and he said to me, "You know, he signed every one?"

This shows you the difficulties of art appreciation if you don't have any kind of a knowledge of randomity.

Now, Picasso is random enough (not as random as many of them) to almost be an engram. And people will pay attention to engrams.

What you should know about this, then, is that it is the interplay of motion in the business of living which makes it possible for an individual to conceive that he is in motion. And when you do not have an interplay of motion but have a monotony of motion, the individual conceives that he is not in motion, that he is a static. Being a static is being two things: it is being dead, and it is obeying the highest static. So it could be at the same time being dead and obeying "Survive" The two things can get confused. And they do get confused with preclears.

You will find that individuals have almost uniformly confused the staticness of being dead with the staticness of God, to the extent that to believe or think about or have anything to do with God is to be dead. They will go into apathy on this and you can resolve quite a few

apathy cases simply by going back to the time when they were little children and somebody really chopped in this concept on them. It put them in apathy.

That is not what religion really was supposed to do, I guess, but the point is that here you have a pair of statics, God and death, and the person just merges the two together. He says, "Let's see, God is death. And how wrong can I be? That is dead. So therefore I am wrong to believe in God and the only solution to this is to be an atheist and to go around saying all the time, "There is no God" To deny the thing is at least to go into communication with it. You will get some very interesting confusions with regard to this whole thing.

Religion has recognized this many times in the past, and they try to spark up religion by talking about light and other things. For instance, take Lucifer: Lucifer was the god in Europe before they moved in another god on him, and he then became the devil, or demon, which means "little god" Nevertheless, the cult of Lucifer, the religion of Lucifer, was trying to overcome this static by saying that it was the motion of flame. They did this also in Persia. They worked pretty hard to give people a static and then a symbol that wasn't static, so that people would get into randomness with the religion to the degree that they would move (and be able to pay their collection plates!).

Now, if you are going to deal with statics, you have to oppose them with motions or use the static as a means of effecting motion and then give at least as much time to motion as you do to the static.

Professors of history, for instance, have all agreed on what one historian called "the Mississippi of falsehood" and there is no randomness about it. Everybody agrees that Napoleon did this and Napoleon did that, and Alexander did this and did that; I don't know that they did.

In World War II, I noticed in one battle that the first reports that were coming in ran on this order: "Over there on the left we're smashed to bits?" "We're advancing in the center; we're advancing on the right?" "But no, the right has had a very bad setback?" "Well, I just came from a company on the right, and as a matter of fact they didn't have a setback, they were advancing?" "No?" another guy says, "they were standing still?" "Well, we had a very bad skirmish around that farmhouse up there on Hill 133?" "That farmhouse isn't on Hill 133, it's over there a little bit further I know—I was in that action myself and we were licked."

These good, solid reports come in from all directions.

And then the battle is all over—at least the enemy is gone, you aren't sending forward any more troops, people are bringing out casualties, and so on. Three days go by. The regimental commanders turn in their reports. These reports do not compare one with another—not worth a darn. So a higher echelon gets together and looks over these reports and decides on what happened. They decide what happened and this is the story which is issued to the press and this is the story which will go down in history. But it hasn't anything to do with what happened.

Here is an effort to bring randomness into alignment by an authoritative utterance ". . . it's mud from there on down"

You may find an individual pining away, saying something like "Well, I want to leave vaudeville and go and buy me a little chicken farm and settle down and be contented for the rest of my life."

God help him if he ever acquires the chicken farm, because it hasn't got enough randomness in it. The fellow is using a static goal with which to oppose a life which has too much randomness in it: "You're on now, Mr. Smith?" "Curtain!" "Pack your trunks and leave for Ohio" and that sort of a thing. The fellow has a lot of motion, he is going in all directions, his goals aren't defined, vaudeville is liable to fold up some day (he says he didn't know about television) and so on, so he says, "Ah, for a nice static—for a nice chicken farm"

One sailor says, "I'm going to put an oar over my shoulder and start walking inland"

The other sailor says, "Why?" "Well, when I get to a place where somebody asks me 'What's that thing on your shoulder?' I'm going to settle down for the rest of my life."

Sailors have done this, or degrees of it, and they have settled down. But after a month or two or three or four, they find themselves back at sea again. Why? Ships are miserable; the sea is a miserable place to be—there is no doubt about this. Ship's officers are at best severe. Yet the fellow goes back to sea. This is an odd thing. The sea poses, much like the Kansas prairie, a randomness of weather and mood which never lets one get very bored. You don't quite know what is going to happen next in the way of weather. That introduces a randomness. Furthermore, destinations can be shifted and all sorts of things can happen. This is action!

Individuals, by the way, who will seek physical action as an outlet for a desire for randomness are generally fairly healthy. But people back up to a point where they will only read about looking for it, and they go to the office at nine and get off at five, and in to the office at nine and off at five, day after day. There is no randomness about it at all.

People might say, "I wish I could go down to the South Seas and sit on a small island for the rest of my life and do nothing but eat coconuts" or something like that. That is one response.

There is another response to exactly the same thing, and this response has its source in a static existence: The fellow says, "I wish I was dead" There is no difference.

It is very easy, then, for a paradise to consist of a static which is a point where there is unending and unendurable pleasure, as in Mohammedanism, and for a fellow to be dead when he is there. Do you see how this thing figures out? It is a static, so they pose everything that has to do with a static on it.

A fellow can go into a static by doing the same action too many times over.

Randomness starts from a static.

Then there is volume. A low volume of randomness gets into interplays, and people will enjoy it. When one gets into high volume of motion it is an engram. So it isn't motion that makes the engram, it is volume of motion. Do you get the idea?

For instance, a fellow stands up and all of a sudden a bullet hits him or something like that. He has struck too much randomness to support.

Now, the whole subject of randomity would be incomplete without understanding that it is nothing more nor less than randomity which is pain. Pain is randomity; it is a variety of randomity. It has volume and it damps out aligned motion. Anything which has volume

and damps out an aligned motion is pain. Therefore people talk about mental pain as well as physical pain.

A fellow puts his hand on a hot stove—the stove is vibrating at such and such a rate and the cells in his fingers are vibrating at a much slower rate—and he withdraws his hand because the randomity of the stove has cut down the motion of his fingers. It has speeded it up to zero or it has slowed it down to zero; it doesn't matter which way you go, you reach zero on randomity—zero motion or a static.

Pain is always loss of aligned motion. The loss of aligned motion is always pain. The effort of the individual to hold on to an aligned motion causes him to hold on to the pain. He will actually hold on to the randomity because he doesn't want it to go.

What life does with motion in general it also does with pain, because pain is merely an intensified and more random motion. The first thing that life does about pain is to throw it back and employ it as conquered, converted effort. It gets motion coming in and it throws it right on out again.

Man is pretty good. He can post his mind out someplace, and he has learned to handle machines and things, so when some motion comes along he can change the direction of this motion. Something comes in and touches him and he rediverts it or redirects it as his first effort. His first effort is to catch it and throw it away.

This is very important, what I am telling you now, because you are going to be looking for just this point above other points as you are running Effort Processing.

In comes pain with volume, and his first effort is to throw it away. If it comes in a little more deeply than that—he feels it a little more intensely— he says to himself, "I can't use this but I'll damp its action and throw it away" There must be too much randomity in it for him to handle its action and throw it away, so he will bring it in and damp its action and throw it away. But the dampening of the action permits him to throw it away, get rid of it—push the stove away, do something with this effort.

The next step is to hold it and dampen it in the hope that he will then be able to throw it away. In comes a pain source and the fellow damps it out. He knocks off the motion on it. He is using his motion to counter its motion. The mind will actually direct an impulse toward doing each one of these steps, and you will be able to find that impulse in Effort Processing.

Next, the pain comes in and is too much for him. He holds it, all right, to damp it out as a motion, but it overwhelms his control center. The control center at this moment says, "I have been superseded. The war department has just sent in a new general" and - it sort of, out of randomity, waits for the new order to take over.

Now, if unconsciousness takes place, the control center is to some slight degree superseded. People making statements and doing other things around this individual are then in control of him. This is the evolution of epicenters; each epicenter came into being in just this fashion. A great number of these pains came in and overwhelmed the individual—they took over.

On the next step down, if the individual is trying to hold this pain and he finds out he can't do anything about it to dampen it out, he tries to speed up or slow down in some fashion to equalize with it. This is the source of change of position on the tone scale: his effort to equalize with these counterefforts.

He may also adopt this course: He may take a local effort area and hold the pain and then go out of contact with the area of the pain. The pain will come in, then he will go out of contact with the area while it holds the pain. Therefore a fellow can go out of contact, for instance, with his knees: his knees hurt severely and he goes out of contact with them. But the blood flow through them is now cut off of a supply line; they are just being denied by the control center. The control center says, "I'm still damping out the pain in that area" and it cuts off the flow, so the fellow gets arthritis or something like that.

And the last thing that the person does with this incoming pain, this incoming vibration (we can use those words interchangeably: pain, vibration, randomity with volume)—when he has found out he can't throw it back, he can't hold it and damp it, he can't localize off the area and he can't equalize with it by cutting its vibration down a little bit and raising his own a little bit and so live with it—is that his own organism goes into the vibration rate and the randomity rate of that pain. That is succumb.

The next step down is apathy. That is where a new control center can really be thrown in. That is a really good engram. The command center is out; the body has succumbed to a new rate of motion, it is overwhelmed, it cannot persist against this, so immediately down the tone scale goes the individual's belief in his effort to control his environment, because he cannot handle—start and stop—the motion in that environment. He can't do this and therefore his tone comes down.

A person's tone goes down in direct ratio to his belief in his ability to handle motion. You could also say this: A person must be dangerous to motions. Any motion that comes in his direction will either be used or kicked straight away; that is being dangerous. A person considers he has good self-confidence when he feels this way. It doesn't matter what motions of a hostile nature come into his environ, he will immediately be able to damp them out, convert them or get rid of them. He can handle them.

Only when those motions have swamped him a few times does the command center say, "Well, we had high hopes that this life would be the one, but it obviously isn't. We have to evolve a newer form"

Now, let's go over those rapidly: (1) he tries to throw it back and employ it as a conquered, converted effort; (2) he throws it back with its action damped; (3) he holds it and dampens it, lets it in but channels it; (4) he tries to equalize with it, to endure; (5) he suffers it localized and lets it destroy that localized area; (6) he succumbs to its vibration rate—agrees to the counter-effort motion. It has taken over; it is now the thing, and he "believes" on this level.

It is interesting that an individual's operation and action in life with thought and with the activities of other people around him compare on this tone scale. If a fellow is fairly well up the tone scale and somebody comes along with a lot of chit chat, he chucks it back in their teeth, very cheerfully sometimes. If he is way up the tone scale, you can tell him almost anything, call him almost anything, and you will find yourself rocked back on your heels. Smart cracks or something like that, he will hand back to you at four or five times the smart-crack volume. It is dangerous to chitterchat around with an individual like that if one has a thin skin, because he doesn't care much what he turns back. Anything that will come at him he will throw back if it is even faintly on a too-much-randomity basis. He can handle a lot of randomity. This individual will also aid and assist an aligned effort; he is good at that. But anything that threatens to be or would ever become pain, whether verbal or in action in his environ or in actual physical contact, he will handle it in that fashion.

On the next level, he would have a tendency to become antagonistic, angry. In comes the pain and he damps it and throws it back. Only there is no great lift to it. He says, "You're not so hot either" and that sort of thing.

The next step down the tone scale is endure. That is below 1.5, but endurance—because there is randomity as long as a person is alive—has these occasional resurgences. So he tries to flick back a little bit of this pain. That is covert hostility.

Down a little lower the person just goes into grief.

And when he hits (6) he succumbs to its vibration rate; he is in apathy.

Compare the hypnotic band with this scale, and more importantly, compare emotion with motion.

Emotion and motion are interdependent. Emotion is nothing more than the rate and randomness of the motion. It has a mechanical aspect depending upon glands and physical structure. It has an aspect of muscular tension or lack of tension. So you can add a couple or three new columns on the tone scale. One of them is muscular tension.

The individual in the process of throwing it back has resilience; his muscles will have a resilience. They can still operate on a more or less optimum basis.

The next point is where he is damping it a little bit and sending it back—conservatism. There is a little more tension needed in the muscles to do that.

As the motion comes in and is held and damped, you have depository illnesses—tone 1.5: anger, destruction. What he is trying to do is destroy a motion and his emotion to destroy it is manifested as anger. Get the muscular tension; it is clamped down on this sort of thing. It is the musclebound sort of reaction. You could never get a high 1.5 elan of destruction. A person doesn't go out all loose-muscled and lace things up. No. Destruction, when accomplished out of an emotional band at 1.5, is mostly a musclebound proposition. It is blunt, ineffective, inefficient, and so on, because the muscular reaction isn't loose; it can't even let go its motion.

If you had realized this when you were a child and got in a flock of fights, you really could have fixed people up. All you would have had to do was not get mad and get the other fellow very mad, and if you got him mad enough he wouldn't even be able to hit you so the blow would sting, because if you get a person mad enough he will congeal. He will just freeze. What he is trying to do is dampen motion with his own muscles.

The next level down is to equalize with it. Here there is resilience. You tell this person so-and-so and he agrees with you quickly. There is no reason, no real ARC, in it. You say, "Blackberries are red when they are green" and he says, "Yes, yes. Oh, absolutely. You're wonderful" You start vibrating on the rate of "Oh, I'm so sad" and he says, "I'm so sad" In other words, his motion will go into your motion rate, because thought is merely extensional motion. Thought is formed by earlier actions.

A person can be punished down to this line of belief in just one thing— belief that he has to agree. Belief in having to agree comes about by being put at a vibration rate in life where one has to vibrate to any motion that comes along.

Some fellow with a psychosomatic illness comes along to an individual at 1.1 and the 1.1 gets it, because he has to go along on this same emotional rate.

The emotion merely denotes the degree and ability of the individual to handle motion. That is all. And if you want to put anybody on the tone scale, any place you want to put them, you just give them that kind of motion. Start giving them the kinds of motion they have to dampen and you will make a 1.5. Give them the kind of motion they have to agree to and you will make a 1.1. Give them the kind of motion which has to be localized, where they have to chop off communication to various parts of their body, and they will come down to about 0.8. And if you fix it up so that when they get a motion they have to vibrate to it, you get a 0.5.

All you have to do is take a little child and every time he tries to initiate a motion, don't let him, and you will make him succumb. As long as he wiggles, hold him. Any effort he tries to put forward—wiggle, get out from under, anything else—squash it, dampen it right there. You can tailor-make a 0.5 just by doing that. Simply keep that up for a few months. The child wants to go somewhere, stop him. He still tries to go there, you really brace him back and give him a counter-motion for every motion he tries to make. You will eventually get him to a point where all you have to do is say "Jump" and he will jump. You can get him to a point where he is "normal"

You can put this child down on a 0.4, 0.33 level by just knocking him out every time he makes a move that you don't like, or that appears to be a free motion on his part. He makes a motion, you knock him out—simple. He will wind up in pretended death because you have approximated death so often.

All death is, is succumbing to a motion rate; everything starts vibrating in agreement with the motion which is assaulting the individual. When an individual goes into death throes, he is ordinarily merely dramatising a past death where his limbs were actually moved, just exactly as they are moving in those death throes. You could make a study of that sometime; it is a nice cheerful subject. You as auditors may be making a study of it whether you like it or not. So, there is emotion. It is quite by accident that these two words— motion and emotion—match up; it is just a fluke. But somebody, someplace back down the track of the English language, said, "You know, there is something similar between these two things?" It doesn't compare that way in other languages that I know about. But there is the key to the problem.

Now, if you want to find an individual's position on the tone scale, test his muscles. They will be above or below optimum, either on the fast or the slow side, so as to denote what he is trying to do with motion.

You can also pick out where a fellow is stuck, because the whole band of the tone scale is not really a summation of what happens to the individual overall so much as an indicator of where he is stuck, in what. You can pick out whether or not he has already succumbed to the motion or what point of the engram he is in by the residual tension in his muscles.

Evidently the muscular reaction is what monitors glands. I made a study of glands for about a year and found some very interesting things about them. They won't buck the mind; they won't even begin to. You give a fellow big shots of adrenalin or something like that and you get a funny kind of a reaction: you give him the same amount of adrenalin in sequence over many days, and it very shortly goes down below normal and then equalises on his residual muscular tension—over, under, flat. This works out with testosterone, it works out with estrogen, it works out with pituitary extract —everything. It is fascinating. You have just about as much chance of monitoring a human being with glandular extract as you have of flying to the moon on a washboard.

But when you cut off this glandular extract it gets grim; you can practically kill a man that way. If you just give him heavy quantities of glandular extract until he equalises on a heavy quantity of it, what he is doing is cutting down his own secretion from that gland, and he is also inhibiting the intake and doing things with that.
By the way, glandular-extract-injections make cysts more often than not; the body just walls the stuff up—it doesn't want anything to do with it.

Then when you all of a sudden take the person off the extract, he has stopped making it and that hits him—hard! But the body gradually comes back and recovers.

You can do almost anything you want with glandular extract, but only over a very short period of time. What evidently happens with the glands is there are two monitor systems: The pituitary evidently has catalysts that are thrown into the bloodstream by the mind, by thought or something of the sort, and they trigger the glands. The other system is simply body tension. You get enough tension on the body and it will squirt out so much adrenalin. It is probably as simple and elementary as that.

If the second one were true, you should be able to massage a glandular area and increase the amount of glandular secretion in the area. I don't know that anybody ever tried it. What you would do is just try to get a person with diabetes, for instance, to get well simply by massaging the pancreas. Who knows? Doctors don't.

Anyway, I want you to put five stars on this motion-and-emotion proposition for this excellent reason: This is the way you take apart the effort in an engram. The key to it, the key to the emotion of the individual, the key to the whole process, is motion, emotion and the interplay of epicenters. When you get those three items down pat, you start to take an engram apart and there is nothing to it. This is all you are shooting for, really, in engrams.