

THE CHART OF ATTITUDES

A lecture given on
28 December 1951

Route to an Ideal State of Being

One of the many interesting phenomena that led up to where we are now is the phenomenon of epicenters and control centers. The fact is, there are many, many control centers. There are probably hundreds of thousands of them.

If you know anything about the theory of the epicenter, you will see how a control center comes into being. The control center is just the organism taking the position of the new counter-effort. Every time you have gone through a failure and come up on the other side you have generally gotten a new epicenter. Actually these are "subposts." Every one of them is a subpost, including the top control center. This may all seem very confusing to you; believe me, it was confusing to me too.

Here you are looking at not an opinion but phenomena, and this phenomena is discoverable. You can trace down, for instance, the control center setup of the right elbow. Where is the control center in the right elbow? Any time you take a little child you are fooling around with and stick your fingers in between those two bones at the right elbow you will find the control center. Every one of these control centers is a nerve-coordination point, which is actually a new switchboard.

We are talking physiologically at this point. Your control nerves come in to certain points in the body. There is one in the stomach area. Evidently man got hit often enough there to eventually have enough counter-effort in that area for him to have to take care of it structurally, so he got a control center setup. You hit somebody there and he gets pretty sick.

There are control centers at the elbow, the wrist and in each finger. It is no joke that a writer starts to think with his hands.

You may have seen a Japanese vaudeville artist write upside down on one line and backwards on another line simultaneously. He has just thrown a "disconnect" into the machinery and he can think independently with one hand or the other. Actually, you could probably carry forward not just one but several thousand simultaneous trains of thought.

These phenomena are discoverable along this genetic line. You start going back along the genetic control-center line and you will find these control centers, one by one, each graduating to a new control center.

Somebody started this nonsense of saying the mind was in the head or something of the sort. That doesn't happen to be true. The mind isn't anyplace; that is the big joke. But there are all sorts of switchboards and each one of these central switchboards has a contact on its own line of experience. These evidently cross-feed data, one to the other, until you get your summations and evaluations of data and they sum up.

Now, if you can ever reach it, there is a control center above all other control centers, and it has been there all the time. And probably when you got that one nicely established and so forth, you would find out you could establish a higher one above it. There seems to be an infinity of control center levels.

But when you are dealing with a preclear, you are dealing with somebody, generally, who is on such a gross point of material-universe being that he is more or less running on the right-side or the left-side control center. People who have strokes just have one control center go on strike; it kicks the bucket. It says, "I don't want to go on living anymore." One half of their

body goes paralyzed and that sort of thing. One control center, in terrific protest, picks up an old facsimile and says to the other control center, "I'm not in there pitching no more!" and that is that. I am talking about phenomena, and this is just something which you will observe.

The dentist has long held the idea that one tooth aches when another tooth aches—that is to say, there is a sympathy of toothache. Tooth A starts aching and its mate starts aching, but there is nothing wrong with its mate—nothing wrong with tooth B. It is tooth A that has—thinks it has—something wrong with it. That is fascinating, because it leads us off into the doggonedest process that you ever heard of. It is the "internal sympathy" process—internal sympathy. Tooth B sees poor old tooth A going by the boards so tooth B actually gets sympathetic, and I mean that on an emotional level. It gets sympathetic.

If you want to run out somebody's toothache, get the individual's sympathy for that tooth and that tooth's desire for sympathy for the individual. You can actually get an emotional-curve line on this; there is actually an emotional interchange amongst organs of the body.

This is very interesting for you to know, because if you were able to do just this and nothing but this, you would have a well preclear. If you could get every organ of the body in full communication with every other organ of the body—if every part of the body were in communication with every other part of the body, if every control center or old epicenter were in contact with the rest of the epicenters—you would have a well preclear.

You start getting somebody in contact with his liver, if he has some bizarre pain in his liver, and you just get communication to the liver and work on it for a while, and you are liable to turn up with an emotional situation between the individual "I," wherever it is located, and the liver. There is an internal interplay in the body. And why shouldn't there be? The body contains hundreds of thousands of colonial aggregations of cells, and each one of these has joined up with the others. Each one of these has its own genetic background; each one of these has its own thought pattern, its own experience pattern. They are in there pitching just as long as they figure out things are all right and the control center that should be in charge is in charge. But all of a sudden the fellow starts shifting around on control centers, wavering, he gets beaten down into apathy and he is no longer in charge of his own body. When this happens—he goes down to 0.5 or somewhere like that on the tone scale—you get the same interchange from one part of the body to the other that you get from one human being to the other. You actually have the proposition of an individual who feels so sorry for some part of his body that it is in continual trouble.

Actually, every tooth in your head has a potential service facsimile which it will turn on to get sympathy. I am very sorry to have to tell you about that because it means that the human body is, after all, built out of the material universe. I don't think you will ever take it up to static.

I examined this from an engineering viewpoint. I found out that the static is, evidently, at minus 273 degrees centigrade. That is the temperature of the static. It would have to be, because that is the temperature of no-motion. A static has no motion in it.

So I put this to the test: I set an individual down and got him to concentrate on a state of not-beingness. He started to get counter-efforts which he had not handled in the past, because he was slowing down. He was sitting there motionless, relaxed, in a state of not-beingness. These counterefforts kept coming in and hitting him, and I would say, "That's all right. Just calm down." Bang!—another one. The next thing I knew, he began to chill. He started to chill.

Now, this is the sort of a rat race that a person can get into if he starts practicing very great concentration and an abandonment of the physical body. This is all right; there is nothing wrong with practicing it—but he gets into this situation where he goes up the tone scale above 20.0 and starts to travel too slow. When he gets way up at the top, if he can take his body through it, that is all right, but these cells don't stand up very well under a very quick freeze. It is cold. If you don't believe it, put it to test. It might take you some months to get up to speed

again, but if you want to put it to test, go ahead. We did it to a couple of boys, and they are not quite right yet.

People in spiritualism and mysticism have noticed that a great quietness, a lot of going into trance and so forth eventually does something to somebody. And that is evidently what it does.

Understand now, we are not talking in terms of right or wrong—whether it is right or wrong or otherwise to do this. If you want to go out through the top, go! Use complete self-determinism. If you want to go out through the bottom, just keep taking in lots of sympathy and using your service facsimile and it won't be long.

We used to have a skipper the crew was always threatening to mutiny against, and he said, "This gangway is open to all parts of the world." That tone scale sure is.

Now, the tone scale is plotted from 0.0 to 40.0. Tone 0.0 is stop and 40.0 is stop too, actually. At 20.0, theoretically, you get optimum motion.

The human being who is in a state of optimum motion probably doesn't exist. Man is usually way down the line from there. If he gets up to 4.0 he is a heck of a lot higher than normal, and there is a long distance to go and a lot of speed to pick up between 4.0 and 20.0.

The tone scale is a circle. It starts at 0.0 and goes on up through various strange manifestations (including normal) to 4.0; it starts getting up above 4.0, goes on up to 20.0—which is optimum motion, theoretically—and then starts to slow down again through some interesting aspects.

The Chart of Attitudes has a plot across the top of an ideal state of being, but nowhere does this chart say where these ideal states occur, except that they are above about 27.0. They are certainly above 27.0; they are spotted anywhere between 27.0 and 40.0, and where each one is, I don't know. I just happen to know empirically they are all there.

So, it may be that some of these come in at various speeds.

It is certain that there is a band between 38.0 and 40.0 which is as thoroughly insidious as the band between 0.0 and 2.0. It would be a rough deal if somebody got up in there. Yet they do this every once in a while over in India.

Now, every so often somebody who doesn't know what he is talking about says Dianetics has to do with mysticism. I don't wish to be blunt about it—I want to be courteous about the whole thing—but these people sure don't know mysticism.

Mysticism is a channel for discovery. It is not a subject. It is a process, you might say; it is a field of traffic which one uses to discover what might be wholly true. It is an effort to discover that. But it is a channel; it is an activity. Dianetics is a subject. Dianetics is actually in bin three.

I have talked about this before, but let's take a look at this proposition of three bins. Everything in bin one may or may not be known, but if anything in bin one can be experienced, felt or measured by any process at all by a human being or life in any form, then it is knowable. Furthermore, this is the bin of near-absolute truths.

This is the mysterious, this is the unknown, but it is not the unknowable. The unknowable is over someplace else. That is where they buried Spencer; that is where they buried Kant. Hegel is buried lower down—that is closer to hell!

Everything in bin one is potentially knowable, one way or the other. But how do you find out about it? We can call that bin two; it is actually a series of tracks and there are a lot of them there. Religion is one of them, mysticism is one of them, magic is one of them—I mean old-time magic, which was a highly codified thing. Even science is one of them. Science is a sort

of a limited—and I do mean limited—methodology, because science insists upon observation without inductive jumping to the conclusion and then trying to ride back on it. We actually expanded, in Book 1, the definition and activity of the general scientist.

It caused quite an activity at Bell Labs, by the way, at the time this was going forward. There were several engineers over at Bell Labs who were perfectly delighted to sit down and try to figure out “What is this thing called scientific logic?” The interesting thing was they came up with a brand-new idea on it, and it was a better one. I imagine everybody believes this has been science now for a long time. It is not true.

The scientist goes from an enormous number of observations to what he considers to be a conclusion that is a super conclusion; no other conclusion can be made from this data but that conclusion. And that is the way science has worked.

But they have actually evolved in the field of electronics and physics and so forth a new level of activity. They call it mathematics. That is a swell new name for inductive logic. In mathematics you take a lot of symbols and you throw them into a hat and scramble them up and you bring out an answer and say it is absolutely true because it came from the field of mathematics. (Oh, yeah? Have you ever read an income tax return?)

The point is that science joined to mathematics makes an inductive deductive type of methodology by which you recover data. But what is it? It is one of these tracks in bin two. There have been tracks in there for a long time. They had them in India and Persia and China and all over the place.

Men have been trying for many ages to recover data out of bin one and get it into bin three. And what is in bin three? That is usable, relative truths. That is what we think we know.

Now, Dianetics is a channel which is at once a composite of any usable channels into an outlined method of exploration of bin one. And that quite bluntly contains anything that is workable, anything that is useful, as a method of discovery. What are these methods? They have been a lot of things; I don't care what they are. Practically any channel known has some part of this. It is a broad track, but don't think that there aren't other methods outside of Dianetics that can discover what is in bin one. That would be a very limited scope. Undoubtedly these methods exist, and Dianetics has done the rather horrible thing of picking up as part of its channels the practices of hypnotism, mysticism, spiritualism, magic, science, mathematics and so on—anything and everything which man thought man knew—and looking these things over, in trying to get into bin one. And believe me, any one of those tracks is a valid effort, a valid channel of discovery. As a result we have pinned down in bin three and located a very large number of phenomena about knowledge and about the human mind. They are in bin three.

Where do you want to study Dianetics? Do you want to study it in bin three—relative, workable truths which, by their application, can resolve a great many of the ills, aberrations, misunderstandings and conflicts of men? There is a lot of that pinned down in bin three. And you can take a Cook's tour through the phenomena of Dianetics and leave somebody mighty shaken at the other end of it—mighty shaken. There are about two hundred new phenomena you can show them.

But Dianetics still goes on as a channel. Only it is not narrow-minded: it decided that any route you can get anything out of bin one on, travel it!

And anybody that says Dianetics is mysticism is insulting neither mysticism nor Dianetics, particularly, because how do you think man got up high enough to get science? This person is overlooking the fact that there are concrete, positive phenomena that are as real and as easy to locate and as invariable as “you have to pick up the pitcher and pour it into a glass in order to have a glass of water.” Let's not be sloppy with our thinking on this. We have these phenomena. I don't care what else is discovered, these phenomena will continue and remain.

By the way, the science of physics is no better off than that. And as a matter of fact we may at this moment be just a little bit better off than the science of physics, because the science of physics is doing mathematics along in this line: c plus 30284 divided by 1 over infinity plus 6297 equals 1 —quantum mechanics. (Of course, that is a very slap-happy rendition of quantum mechanics.)

You ask, “Hey, hey! What are those odd numbers you’ve got in there? We know what c is—that’s the speed of light.”

The subject of nuclear physics is being regulated by a mathematics which requires what we call “bugger factors” to balance. You say, “What are these things?”

“Well, it doesn’t balance unless you put them in.”

And you say, “Is this the way you’re figuring out those atomic piles?”

“Yes.”

So we are better off than that; our preclears don’t explode.

We have two levels, then, in Dianetics. Actually, they should be differentiated by two names. This channel should probably be called something like Scientology (a new coined word); it probably should be. What is it? It is a route—the study of science or the study of truth or the study of knowledge—because it is “the study of”; it is not an -etic, meaning “science of.” And in bin three should be Dianetics.

Regardless of what we use to compose our Scientology, when we nail down these phenomena with tenpenny spikes, we have recovered data to the field of useful, relative truth. It is useful, relative truth: You can take an individual and do this and do that. You don’t just take one individual and do this and do that, you can take all individuals and do this and do that. Of course, sometimes you have to do something to the individual before you can do these things, but you will find the phenomena go on from individual to individual.

It must be a pretty good track, this track of Scientology, because it has sure been producing an awful lot of stuff. As a matter of fact, sometimes I think maybe we ought to get some concrete and kind of seal that channel off for a few minutes. But it is going so fast, actually, that it is resolving cases before you get a chance to resolve them with the earlier techniques. It resolves them with a faster technique. So you are saving time anyhow.

The codification of the Axioms and Logic’s made it possible, however, to lay out a form.

Some of the things I will be going over are in the stage of workability—high workability—but what explanation is assigned to the phenomena belongs temporarily in bin two; it is still in process. So you have the phenomena and you have the technique of how you resolve it, and then there is this wide-open channel that tells you there is probably more to be learned. And there is a horrible, insidious fact about all this: Bin one never empties into bin three; it is inexhaustible, utterly inexhaustible.

But upon the alertness and the ability to know of the individual depends how well he can use bin two and how much he can drag for himself out of bin one. Because in bin one is everything: Here is life eternal, here is happiness, the basic truths behind Freemasonry, the Catholic Church and so on—all of these things have some basic truths behind them. Whether they have attained those truths or not is beside the point. There are a tremendous number of answers; theoretically, there are answers to everything under the sun.

What I am giving you here is the basic idea of how I have been working in order to get enough data into the field of useful, relative truth to resolve cases.

We can perform some miracles with this stuff. But I don't say that a miracle has to be performed in every case as it comes along. The devil with that; let's just say that it performs miracles. I call to your attention that it has been an awfully long time since anybody was producing any assembly line miracles—quite a while. That doesn't make either thee or me a citizen of Nazareth, but it certainly makes us interesting.

Now, on motion, I can tell you what lies out in advance. It is fairly easy to figure out. There is something on the motion line, some sort of a central governor that we are all running on; and if you could just somehow or other hit this button and speed up, none of your engrams would bother you. This has something to do with the speed of running. Unfortunately it doesn't have anything to do with human memory. It is something else.

This is quite an advance—being able to take a 200-inch telescope and look ahead a little bit and see that there is an end of track. There is an answer up there someplace. Of course, the second we get there, we will see that there is another end of track visible by a 400-inch telescope. But the point is that I have been looking in advance toward this thing now for some months, and it doesn't seem to be very much closer, so we just might as well bow our heads and get to work on what we have. I am not apologizing to you for not having discovered this, but it is certainly there. It has the same shape as every other discovery in evolution.

A discovery in evolution is an interesting thing. It is first used to play around with—just to say “Well, maybe ...” and think happy, fuddled thoughts. The second somebody finds out something about it, they find out the black side of it and then somebody comes along and says you shouldn't do this anymore and picks it up and carries it on to a high degree of workability. That happened to gunpowder and atomic physics. Gunpowder was first used to make noise—celebrations and so forth—and then somebody said, “It'll kill people. Gimme!” Then they started fixing it up and later on, not too long ago, they said, “You know, this stuff is handy in mining,” and they started to build dams and mines and use gunpowder all over the place.

They are doing the same thing with atomic fission. They never learn by these cycles; it just seems to go by a cycle.

So right now, this little discovery I am talking about—which we will call the “governor” for lack of a better term—can be used on the black side. There are several of these little gimmicks that can be used on the black side today.

You could have somebody sit down and you could say, “Well, now, just concentrate on not being. That's right, just sit there. Sit there quietly and concentrate on not being.” You can do this to anybody, and after he has sat there for a little while, you begin to get your results.

In spiritualism they used to think these were idle spirits slapping people. People sit there in a state of not-beingness or something of the sort, concentrating, waiting to hear something from the environment.

By the way, I don't say there aren't such things as idle spirits. There is no reason to cut off these communication lines, any more than I would cut off any other communication line: spiritualism, medical-doctoring, witch doctoring or any of these things; it doesn't matter. You want to keep those channels open; don't close them just because you are mad.

I have seen a medium get a bruised cheek from a slap from an “idle spirit.” It's quite interesting. The person sits there, there is a jolt and then you turn on the lights and you see finger marks or something on the cheek. (Boy, does that sell the suckers!) But this was done in honest experimental endeavor to find out if there was anything there, and we got these finger marks.

Not very long ago, I just had somebody sit down in a state of nonbeingness—knowing very well that such a thing as a counter-effort existed in a facsimile—and this person got a black eye! You can do that to people.

Now, that demonstrates that we can slow down a governor. You are not dealing with a facsimile when you make a person do this. It is just a mechanical action: you take his MEST body and make it sit still, and you have persuaded him to slow his governor down. How to speed it up is what we want to know—the devil with slowing it down. A person will sit there and get black and blue, get chilled and so forth, and he will go around pretty wobbly for quite a little while. He will have an awful time speeding up again.

What is the gimmick that lets him speed up again? Evidently, if you could get this little gimmick that makes a person speed up again, if you could find in yourself the state of beingness—how do you “be”?—all of these low-tone facsimiles wouldn’t stand a chance, because you would merely reach out and assimilate every last counter-effort that you haven’t used in the past and just promptly take them and use them. They do have a certain value. In other words, you could theoretically speed up above the level of these facsimiles. This little gimmick has something to do with motion, it has something to do with speed. A person gets down below a certain level and the rate of speed of the facsimile counter-efforts is greater than the rate of speed of the individual, so they have force against the individual.

How slow can you get? Dead! It comes way down. Or, how slow can you get? Out through the top. You could get that slow—where you just sort of step off in body—but it would be a pretty chilly business, I am afraid.

The people who practice this out in the Orient demonstrate, evidently, that there is a separation of the theta and MEST as you go on up the line too high. You get up at the top and they are completely separated. These people don’t seem to go through the top complete with body. They are not in good health; they just don’t pay any attention to the fact that they are completely disintegrated. You never saw such detached, disinterested, spiritual, aoristic people in your life. And they are fascinating. What they are doing is going out from the top.

What the great American public does, and the public of the rest of the world, is decay out through the bottom. It is practically the same thing, but on one the theta is self-determinedly separating from the MEST, and on the other route the MEST is falling apart and kicking out the theta. It just depends on which is boss; the end result is no-motion in the static.

There is the distinct possibility that the reason you go on living and dying and living and dying and the genetic line keeps rolling and everything else is that people keep going out through the bottom. There may be some distinct difference between going out through the bottom and going out through the top. I am talking, now, about phenomena, not about anything else. You have seen people decaying and going out through the bottom. You may not have seen somebody going out through the top. But if you wanted to go look, I could sure tell you where to look.

These people have enormous presence when they start going out through the top. It is fascinating. There is terrific volume to the atmosphere around these people. They are very wise too; they are up there around “I know,” and they really do. But of course they don’t know and do anything about it; that is the difference. They are fully responsible.

Your idea of full responsibility might be “Well, I’m fully responsible and I’m going to do something about it.” That is way down the tone scale from the real thing. These boys are fully responsible—they really are—but they don’t do anything about it. There is no action, in other words, as they start up.

I am sorry if this leads you into the belief that we are investigating anything but human beings and phenomena, because that is exactly what we are doing. In the past it was customary to cut off and say “Verboten, bar sinister, mustn’t touch, wrong fraternity” to a lot of these lines of

research. One of the principle reasons why we have made so much progress in Dianetics is that we just opened up all the channels; we took the various blocks off and let it flow.

Now, somebody comes around and tells you, “You know, Dianetics is really spiritualism.”

You look at him and say, “I’ll let you in on a little secret: It’s not spiritualism—not very much, anyway. It’s actually ancient magic from 632 A.D., Persia. Of course, we wouldn’t let many people know this. Oddly enough, it is also modern psychiatry.” Don’t let anybody get you into an argument on this basis, because it takes in all of it, across the boards.

The discoveries of (pardon me while I snicker) modern psychiatry have been examined in this field and they have definite negative value. You have found out just as I did that human beings can’t be electrocuted and made sane, nor can they be carved up and served for roast beef or scrambled brains on toast or something of the sort and made sane. So these things have negative value; there has been a tremendous amount of experimentation. They have also demonstrated that the handling of people by shooting drugs into the body doesn’t work either. Of course, I must say they certainly took long enough on this subject, since it was used quite a bit and abandoned by the practical Romans about 2300 years ago.

The Greeks were doing it with hellebore—convulsive shock; they broke people’s spines and did interesting things to them, just like today. The Romans came over and looked at the Aesculapian methods and decided “Well, we’ll keep on praying to the goddess Febris. We’re all set.”

Remember, the Roman was practical; he was an engineer. He built very good roads, and he wouldn’t listen to something that was highly impractical. I just don’t see quite what has happened in this society. The same thing does not obtain.

These techniques have all been thoroughly investigated. Down in Ecuador, many, many hundreds of years ago—maybe thousands (I didn’t ask the fellow I was talking to at the Explorers Club how old the last skull he found was)—they evidently were treating insanity by brain operations amongst the ancient Incas. Only they had sense enough to know what they were doing. What they would do was take some fellow who had had his head bashed in with a stone ax or something like that, and they would trepan and relieve the brain pressure. They didn’t go in and try to cut out the medulla oblongata or something just to find out if he would bleed. They had sense back in those days, in other words.

The Romans knocked off from shock therapy and the Incas did no more than trepanning with the brain. Of course, people were getting pretty desperate as the middle of the twentieth century approached, to the point of doing almost anything. And they did.

Now, I have given you this as background, not to supply you with idle chatter. All of this data is the background of the Chart of Attitudes. This chart is a very workable chart. It had two origins: One was the origin of derivation; it was derived from the Axioms. Its other origin was empirical testing, trying to find out what the ideal conditions of well-being, health and happiness are. What is an ideal condition for man? No matter if it isn’t a practical condition, what is an ideal condition? From this we can get a gradient scale between survival and death; we can get a gradient scale between right and wrong.

We have known these things a long time. But what are the buttons? We went looking for these buttons and we found that they lie on these gradient scales. We have an ideal state of being at the top and we have along the bottom a state of being which may or may not be ideal, according to your lights. In between we have gradient scales from each one to the other.

These twelve buttons are very inclusive. There may be some more buttons someplace, but every time I find a new button and I say “Yeah, a new button. Three cheers,” I find out it is just a rephrasing of one of these twelve.

We look at this chart and we see 27.0 to 40.0 is the top band. To give you an idea of it, look at “fully responsible.” In that top band, fully responsible is just that—fully responsible. A little bit lower than that, to get motion out of it, it would have to be “I’m fully responsible and I’ll do something about it.” And a little bit lower than that is “I’m fully responsible for everything but that.” And at that moment you have selected a counter-effort or a counter thought or a counter-emotion to give yourself some activity.

Do you get the idea? At 20.0 a person has picked up an awful lot of things about which he can do things. He can have action. There is a great deal of motion at 20.0, but a person at 20.0 is able to align or misalign motion at will without getting it snarled up. He is very well in control of this motion. Way down the scale, the motion is manhandling him. At 4.0 he is still being manhandled by motion. But up in the higher levels he is handling motion.

Now, in order to have any action whatsoever he would have to select something out—move it out of his sphere of responsibility—in order to make it better. Furthermore, he would have to care whether or not it was better. And he would also have to care whether he was anybody or whether it would do anything to him or anything he had in order to make it better. There is reasoning.

In order to get motion, you have got to have action; you have got to have protagonists and antagonists. There has got to be counter-effort and effort. You go up the scale from that point and it all becomes effort—”So what?”

Something may happen to upset this rather upsetting picture, and I hope it does. It looks, by the way, as if there may be a whole new universe on the other side of that static and that is a fascinating one.

I was doing some work one day on the possible number of spheres of action, and all of a sudden it turned out that there was an infinity of universes and that time was three-dimensional! If you don’t think this doesn’t make randomness, I don’t know what does, but it is interesting. Don’t ever misinterpret me; I am not saying, “Well, now, I know everything there is to know in bin one; I’m going to let you guys in on it.” I am not a psychiatrist.

Now, the Chart of Attitudes is an extrapolation from the first tone scale chart in Dianetics: The Modern Science of Mental Health. That chart has infinite survival as its top; it has a gradient geometric scale. The Chart of Attitudes is the same as the first chart, except that it has more data on it. That is all it has—more data. It gives an ideal state of being and an optimum-motion band, and down at the bottom are the lower levels that you are trying to cure.

If you were to take the buttons on this chart and apply them to each and every dynamic and not do anything but that, you would have very nearly every possible combination of the things that could be wrong with a case.

So this chart is quite a chart. It is nothing more than the first chart refined by empirical observation, as done in the Chart of Human Evaluation in Science of Survival, and then computation from the Axioms in order to derive the chronic attitudes.

Nobody says this chart is finished, but where it is not finished is in how many attitudes are derivable from top to bottom.

The first thing that you should know about this chart is that it is a prediction chart; it will predict what a person’s attitude will be on one of these buttons in response to something.

It is also a character-index chart; you can take this chart and spot the individual on it and then look for his behavior on the Chart of Human Evaluation. This is very good, because this chart will analyze where the individual is much more rapidly than the Science of Survival chart. You may have had trouble with that chart. So this chart is necessary to it. You look on this chart and

you can spot a person's position more easily, and then you can go over into the Science of Survival chart and find out what he is going to do in terms of behavior.

But its foremost use is in processing because it will tell you everything that has to be hit in a case, everything that must be hit in a case, before you can be completely at ease about the individual being back to battery— up to 20.0. You have to run these things. It doesn't take much running and it is very fascinating how much you can get on a case.

You could take this chart, a knowledge of the life-continuum theory (which is covered later) and a knowledge of shame, regret, blame and the emotional curve, and you wouldn't have to run any engrams and you actually wouldn't have to run any secondaries.

All this brings us down to the important points today in bin three. Data in bin three is always under new evaluation. Don't ever think that it is otherwise. The second it stops being under evaluation a stagnation sets in which is very unhealthy, just as sometimes too much motion, too much change, too much reevaluation, is also unhealthy.

So let me go over those points again with you: A knowledge of the Chart of Attitudes, a knowledge of shame, regret, blame, the life continuum and the emotional curve, will enable you to button up your cases. There is not a case around that will not resolve that way. I know; I have been working with this.

There is a codified method of using those which I put out in Hand book for Preclears that takes it up more or less consecutively the way it should be. But you as auditors had better know what there is to know about the basic theory here. Additionally you must understand Effort Processing; that is in addition to those items. You can resolve cases—when I say “resolve cases” I mean make them wide open so that anything can be run on them—by these first processes I announced. But if you are going to run everything on them that should be run, you have got to know Effort Processing.

If you know those things you can be like Izaak Walton's Compleat Angler; you can be the “compleat auditor.”

Now, every once in a while you see somebody around dabbling at a case, monkeying with it and so forth, but nothing is happening. There is only one reason nothing is happening: they just aren't using an up-to-date procedure; that is all.

An auditor had to be awfully clever a year ago to get the computation on a case.

You run shame, blame and regret on a case—just those. The preclear has a visio: make him run shame on it, make him run regret on it. He has this visio and you just say, “Well, can you feel regret on it? Feel it a few times. All right, feel it again; feel it again; feel it again.”

“Well, this reminds me of the time I drowned all of my grandmother's kittens, and my little brother got sick with the measles and I was on the other side and they kicked me down. And, my God, I'd forgotten all about that, and that's horrible, and that—that's why I'm in the shape I'm in today! My, you're a clever auditor!”

It is interesting that you can do that.

As far as locating the engram necessary to resolve the case, file clerks are sometimes terrible to work with on getting this thing. They usually hand it up to you, but they generally give you the engram necessary to resolve the engram necessary to resolve the engram by early Standard Procedure, which exhausted the perceptics out of engrams so that they couldn't be restimulated. That is perfectly fine; it is perfectly good procedure to exhaust the perceptics out of the engram so the engram can't be restimulated anymore. The trouble is, the perceptics are not always lying on top; sometimes the effort is.

Now, if you want a technique, I can invent a few techniques for you (there will be a lot of them coming in from the field—there are all the time). Here is one: “Give us the engram necessary to resolve the case. What’s the first phrase of this engram?” The preclear says so-and-so. “All right. What’s your effort to have that phrase?” and you just run him on effort through the rest of the engram.

That is worthless technique number one.

Next one: “Give us the engram necessary to resolve the case. Give us a flash: How do you feel emotionally?” He tells you. “All right, reexperience that emotion. Go on, experience it; experience it.”

The fellow says, “But I got a somatic!”

“That’s all right. Experience the emotion. Experience the emotion through it.”

“The emotion changes.”

“Well, all right, let it change. Experience the emotion. Where’s the somatic?”

“It’s gone.”

Another one: “All right. Give us the engram necessary to resolve the case. When did you decide to use that?”

The fellow says, “Well, just then. Just then.”

“No, I mean when did you used to hand this thing up?”

“Well, I don’t even know what it is!”

“Well, that’s all right. What do you think it was? Just imagine how you would use this engram.”

“Well, I would use it to get eggnogs. (What am I saying?)”

“Well, when was the first time you decided to be sick so you could have an eggnog?”

And he says, “Why, that’s right. I used to decide . . . Isn’t that funny? Tee-hee.” And the engram is gone.

These are the levels of processing. Any one of them would supplant early Standard Procedure—any one of them. They are very valid, because the fellow is holding on to his engram by thought, actually, but it can be separated from him and thrown away forevermore by running the emotion off of it, because that is how he holds it in. He can’t get hold of it to get the emotion off it—good joke on him. Or you could run the effort out of it and he would have nothing left to get hold of. So there are three levels you can hit on this. Those are the ways you could hit cases. When you talk about resolving cases and getting cases open and making cases run, this is certainly what you have to know.

Don’t dilly-dally about using it. You have a lot of cases around and you haven’t got much time. Just look them over and scan a few buttons off them and straighten them up. You can take any case you may have messed up and get them back to battery this way.

Of course, I know you have never messed up a case; but you know the time that fellow charged out of that fear secondary you tried to get him into? You can get him out of it with this. You just figure out about what tone level he was in when he came out. He has probably been saying

you were responsible ever since, and that gives you continued control over that engram. Only he hasn't got control over it anymore because he said you were responsible for doing it.

Now get him to figure out that you were responsible and get him to run that feeling, and then get him to run the feeling on the fear engram of who was responsible in it, and it will come back under his control. He will just park it under file 864B972A and skip it. That is about the way it works.

But don't under any circumstances underestimate a technique just because it isn't spectacular. You have to ask yourself—and answer yourself truthfully—the question “Do I process people because I like to see them four feet off the couch? Do I process people because I like to embarrass the neighbors by their screaming? Or do I process people because I want them to be self-determined individuals?” If the last is the right answer, you go on processing. If it isn't the right answer, you straightwire yourself with this chart until you can give the right answer. A

At this point in the lecture a gap exists in the available recordings. The tape recording resumes immediately after a break taken by Ron and the audience and the second half of the lecture is contained in the next chapter. We have been unable to find any recording or transcript for the missing section.