

THE ANATOMY OF THE OVERT ACT PART I

A lecture given on
21 January 1952

Justifications

Now, I know it may be a strain, but just become aware of your surroundings, and stop worrying about your own cases for the moment. And all those who are auto running, cease fire. And all those who do not understand the subject of Dianetics get the wax out of your ears. Let's go.

Now, tonight I'm going to talk to you about the anatomy of the overt act. There is quite a bit about this subject that you don't know, mostly because I didn't find out till a few days ago myself. But the anatomy of the overt act is very important to you as an auditor.

You want to knock grief off cases? You want to be able to sit down in a quiet, dark closet and cry, yourself? Well, you have to know something about the anatomy of the overt act to trigger grief. And I am afraid that the expelling of grief from a case is the most important action which you can accomplish. The longer I am at this, the more convinced I am this is the case.

The first thing an auditor has to be able to do is face grief bravely, truly and unswervingly, and not kick the bed when the preclear starts crying!

Most of this is contained in the overt act.

Now, you will want to know how to solve sympathy. Once again, it has to do with overt acts.

You want to know why people act as they act when they are low on the tone scale. Again, we have overt acts. In fact, we are at a central point, when we are discussing this, which is an extremely important one.

Now, a short time ago I gave you a talk on the subject of survival and what is it, and we found out that the individual wants to survive on all dynamics. He isn't trying to survive as himself nearly so much as he is trying to get somebody else to survive. It is the individual's efforts to help and his failures to help. His commission of overt acts stems originally from an effort and failure to help. And the overt act then throws him into a regret-and sympathy state.

All this has to do with a new phenomenon — two new phenomena, really. The overt act brings up one, and there is a second one which I will cover called the shift of control centers, which doesn't have to do with the shift of your own control centers but with the shift of your control centers from you to others and from others to you.

It's all very important stuff I'm going to talk about. I wish I had a great many more hours than these two and a half to discuss it, because it is very possible that you will see a few things about yourself and about others this evening.

Let's take, first, the matter of the overt-act phenomenon. This is a lead-pipe proof of survival on all dynamics. It is one of those black-and-white affairs; I mean, this phenomenon exists, period. Not even a psychoanalyst could argue you out of it — not even that. Even a psychiatrist could look at it and see that it was there; it is that obvious.

Now, the overt-act phenomenon is simply this: That pain which you render on any other dynamic will be mirrored in yourself. It is just as open-and-shut as the fact that if you fired a .45 at that wall, a hole is going to appear in that wall. You shoot somebody through the head, you are going to have a bullet through your own head; you are going to have a somatic of the

bullet through your own skull, just like that. This isn't anything that might be; this isn't anything that is shadowy. This somatic will not be shadowy either. It will be a real crunch.

And that is an odd phenomenon, isn't it? But that is the phenomenon which backs up the theoretical conclusion which I reached about fourteen years ago on survival on all dynamics, and this phenomenon has existed; it has been there all the time. The only somatics which an individual carries are those which he has administered to another one.

Now, you may think that you have got a tooth somatic because your tooth is pulled. No, you haven't! If you have trouble with that tooth after it has been pulled, you have pulled somebody's tooth or blown it out or kicked it out, somewhere. And that was probably why you had that tooth pulled in the first place. Now you are remedying it: you are rendering an overt act all over again. It is a pattern.

Have you ever noticed this strange thing that some individuals can go in and lie down on the operating table, get themselves chewed up, carved up, slashed, gashed and in general have surgery administered, heal up in spite of the surgery, go on living a happy life and functioning organically? The next individual lies down on the table — slash, cut, gash, chew, saw — and he is no good. Same operation. Why?

One individual goes up to the dentist shaking, quivering, scared; sits down in the chair — nervous — gets a considerable shock out of anything done to him. Another individual goes up, they pull out four bicuspids and a couple of cuspids and he is all set. He gets up out of the chair; he isn't even affected in any way.

One individual dines on ground glass and food from a restaurant and develops a terrible case of stomach ulcers. Another individual eats twice as long in the same place and nothing happens to him. Why?

Well, we know why: The individual who is affected by such operations or who is affected by engrams has administered that same punishment, that same pain, on some other dynamic — identical! And he holds on to pain and only holds on to pain which he himself has handed out on another dynamic. And that pain is as sharp and precise a somatic as you will find anywhere. This is the overt-act phenomenon. It is a terrible thing; it is very grim.

You will find in Galatians — one of the last books of the New Testament — Chapter 6, there are several paragraphs there that talk about “each man, his own burden,” “as ye sow, so shall ye reap,” and all that sort of thing. How true! How horribly, gruesomely true!

You have got a constant jaw somatic: All right. Who did you hit? Who did you kick? Because you pick it up and carry it so they won't, because you basically do not want to be guilty of an overt act.

Now, this is the bottom of all the guilt-complex stuff that they have been handing out for many, many years. They didn't know how to solve this, so on. The reason they didn't know is because they didn't know this phenomenon; neither did they know about survival and a few dozen other things.

But the point is that you hand out physical pain or even mental punishment or mental control on another dynamic and you are going to get it back yourself the second you consider it an overt act. Pretty grim.

You go down here and you spank a little kid — little kid has been naughty. You are all set; you spank this little kid, and all of a sudden you realize you hurt him. He looks pathetic to you. You have stopped him running around and so forth. You say, “I don't want that to happen,” so you turn time back. What is regret? Regret is simply turning time back, that is all. You don't want it to happen. Somewhere in there you tried to stop yourself from doing it.

If you administered a slap to this child's face, it may be years, but one day you start picking up neuralgia or something. You don't know where it comes from. You go back to the times you were kicked in the face and you find 869,000 of them, and you run every one.

Sure, by just running incidents you bring an individual far enough up the tone scale so that he is above what we call the counter-effort band, which is fairly low on the tone scale — it is below 4.0. And just by unburdening the case, you get his tone up above there. But why is he carrying that neuralgia? He slapped a kid sometime. That is all it is.

Now, if you get a double, compound injury — a few days after you slapped this kid, he went out and got himself sick and died — you are going to just be a wonderful case of neuralgia then. Right then, quick! Furthermore, you are going to do a life continuum for him, pick up the ambitions and goals of that kid and try to carry them forward. And there is your source of life continuum: the overt act.

The phenomenon is very precise. You slip a dirk into somebody's midriff. That is much worse than a dirk being slipped into yours — much worse. After all, you are just you. So what? You can handle that piece of MEST fairly well.

If you are afraid of pain, you are afraid of pain because you have caused pain to somebody who was afraid of pain; and you are now being afraid of pain for him or her. You are afraid of grief: you are being afraid of grief for somebody who was afraid of grief and, in each case, against whom you have committed an overt act.

I repeat, this phenomenon is very sharp, very distinctive and very easily located.

Anyone who runs a service facsimile — even runs it poorly — will become immediately aware of the fact that as he punches somebody in the face, as he kicks somebody in the shin — if it is the service facsimile — he gets the somatic in his own face, he gets the somatic in his own shin. It is not the same pain; it is evidently (and this statement is qualified) the individual's own pain that he turns on himself. It isn't a transferred facsimile. So he turns on an engram which will approximate the registry engram.

The individual gets a bad shin, gets a cut shin; immediately the person committing the overt act says, "I'm sorry I did that; I want to make his shin whole again." And so he fixes up his own shin so that he can cure up the other person's shin. You can actually see this. It is an effort to help. You commit an overt act; the next act right after is try to help the guy, if you really hurt him. The effort to help, and that effort to help consists of taking the same cell area, calling up an old injury for it, and trying to heal up his cells by healing up your own. And of course you fail, so you carry the somatic.

It can be stated that any chronic somatic that you have or that a preclear has, has as its source the administration of that pain to the other person, or to another person or to an animal — particularly those. Now, that is pretty grim.

You hurt somebody's eyes, so you wear glasses for him afterwards. You make somebody ill one way or the other, so you go on a diet and get finicky about certain foods for them. Any time you try to impose your control over an individual to your gain and his detriment, you also impose upon yourself all of his liabilities. This is grim stuff, because any time in the past that you committed an overt act, you were in for it.

Physical pain: You can take the fights that a boy is in when he is young and you start running through some of these fights — he doesn't remember ever having been sorry for any of these little devils that he beat up — and all of a sudden you find a real overt act in there someplace.

You find this fellow winning — winning a fight. And he hauls off with his fists and his feet and he really lambasts this other kid — wham! crash! bang! — and the other kid goes down in the dust. And as he stands there, the victor, he looks at the kid and he sees this human being,

and his anger vanishes. And he sees this human being, a human being that is soiled and crumpled and has got some blood on him and has lost his dignity and he is beaten. He has an emotional curve right there. He goes down from anger, triumph, down on a fast, steep curve, recognizing that he has hurt another person. Then he will try, at that moment; he will tell himself he wants the other kid to get up. As a matter of fact, at the very blow that fells the other kid, he will turn on an effort inside himself to hold that kid upright. And the kid falls and he says to himself, "Well, I'll make it up to him somehow," or "I'll do something about this. I'll help him in some way." But because there are other people around and maybe other kids around, he says to himself, "Oh, I'd make a show out of myself if I did that." And there is a sudden feeling of discomfort and shame. Years and years and years afterwards, we find the areas where he punched that little kid tender. We find the blows he administered, on himself. Weird, isn't it? It is almost unbelievable until you see it or until you experience it.

Now, if anybody argues with you about this phenomenon, it is a very simple way of going about it. You say, "Did you ever hit anybody?"

"Oh, no! No, I — no, I never . . . well, yeah, there was a fellow I hit one time."

"Go through the motion of hitting him." Bang, bang — just have him go through the motion of hitting him. All of a sudden he will feel his arm start to get weak. What he has done is turn on the back pull. Even as he struck, there were muscles working and computations working that said "No, no, no, no, no, no, no — another dynamic. We want survival on all dynamics! Pull it back!" And even as that fist travels home, he will feel that back pull.

And as you are working this thing out by Effort Processing, you will eventually hang the guy's hand clear up here and he won't be able to move it. The second you get the forward thrust out of it, this other thrust will kick in. So you want to work out the back thrust, the holding-back thrust.

If he doesn't remember ever having fought, just have him strike somebody anyhow, and have him punch somebody for a little while, until all of a sudden he will get a visio turning on of something, somebody. He has got that on, and he will start to feel kind of strange about the thing. And then he will hit him again and he will say, "Why, I'm hitting him in the mouth." And it is his own mouth that hurts!

Yes, this is very easily demonstrated phenomena. It is not turning the preclear into the counter-effort against himself. He can stand up to any quantity of counter-effort. All a man is, is a series of counter-efforts which he has turned into his own efforts. But those efforts which he has used to injure, impede or cause nonsurvival on any other dynamic are the injuries which he himself will suffer from.

For instance, running an individual, we have in many, many cases turned on an elusive somatic. And we have tried and tried and tried in working that person to get this somatic. Finally, we just brought him up the tone scale willy-nilly and the somatic disappeared — or maybe it didn't disappear. We keep on trying to run the somatic as though it happened to this individual, and it didn't. It was a somatic this individual administered and was sorry for.

Being sorry for, or regretting, is the action of trying to turn back time, and it puts the individual straight back into the incident and connects him up with the moment he tried to stop himself. And you will find him stopped right in the middle of this incident — stopped while he is standing there — and by some physical, psychic force, trying to keep somebody from falling or trying to hold back a knife from thrusting or trying to hold back a fist. He stopped himself. That is regret, and that is consequent to almost any overt act.

So that is what you are fooling with — this phenomenon. You solve that phenomenon completely in a case and you have got something a lot better than was ever envisioned in Dianetics in the first place. And it doesn't take long to solve it, but in the solving of it you will

find that there is grief on overt acts. Unless you spill that grief, the overt act will not deintensify — not worth a nickel, a little bit.

Fortunately, the power and force of overt acts are such and the grief lying upon a proper service facsimile is such that once you have tried to turn off a very few emotional physical-effort shut-offs on the case, you have worked the case for a little while to get the reasons why this person can't spill grief and get the effort they use to spill grief, and you have gone through several overt acts with them that they have done, one way or the other, you will hit one and it will be the loaded incident.

Somewhere on the track, in any case, is an incident which is so loaded with grief that you can't clip it without it spilling. Maybe he can hold back on this incident and on that incident and the other incident, but if you hit dead center on the service facsimile, you get a spill; that's all there is to it. A person just starts crying; they just can't stop. Fortunate, isn't it — particularly for you auditors that see grief and immediately kick the bed or something. (No remark is intended there; it's just, nearly everybody has done that here.)

The overt-act proposition has a great deal of technology along with it. And if you understand this technology, you will understand Dianetics. You will also understand life, more importantly, and you will understand what individuals are trying to do to you, or what you are trying to do to individuals. I am not here to tell you that "thou shalt not commit an overt act." I am just telling you how to solve them. And I am telling you why people commit overt acts against you, and why people want sympathy and why they have to have it. Now we have those answers.

We have the Chart of Attitudes. There's a thirteenth button. (There are twelve there; now there is a thirteenth button.) The top of that column is "win" and the bottom of that column is "lose." There is also a unit facsimile. In other words, there is a complete memory package. As you go down the whole list, you will find everything in position in relationship to this.

And what is wrong with your preclear is simply this: Where is he between winning and losing on that overt act — that facsimile? Where has he coasted to? Sometime, somewhere or other, he committed an overt act — a very bad one. It had an emotional curve, and that emotional curve was maybe from anger down to regret. And this curve was the shift from win to lose. The bottom is lose, and actually way up above is win — up above anger.

There is the curve, the emotional curve on this act. And life starts working on him, other people start working on him and the years go by and people start dropping curves on him.

I talked to you in the last lecture about people who broke your curve and people who boosted up your curved. In other words, there are people who come around and if you are happy, they will break you off and try to make you sad. And there are people around who, when you are mediumly this way or that, they will try to make you happy.

Well, every time your curve goes down, this is the curve. Every time, in the business of living, analytically, people start dropping your curve on you, they are starting to approximate this position. And you may start out in life fairly high on this curve, but every time somebody breaks a curve on you, it cuts in and restimulates this curve so that you start down the line. When you get down there, you are dead.

It evidently takes an average of about fifty-nine years to cut one of these curves in completely — completely. When it is all cut in, the individual is dead. I don't believe it has anything to do with cellular growth at all. How do you like that?

Now, the ability of an individual to recall is intimate with this curve, because when a person gets down to a point where he is practically solid regret, he is just trying to grind those drivers back on time all the way. "Back up," he is saying, "back up, back up." And his track starts

crowding in together till there is no time. Regret — mechanical. In fact, this is very gruesomely mechanical.

Now, the individual starts out in life up here somewhere. The first thing you know, off he goes. Overt acts: he commits this overt act, that overt act — little things, don't amount to anything. People drop tone on him. All of a sudden he gets sorry for what he is doing; he feels regret on some of the things he has done. He begins to find himself at fault and hold himself accountable for every death and every incident occurring around him. And the next thing you know, he is way down the tone scale.

Now he has gotten into the counter-effort band, and when he has gotten into the counter-effort band very thoroughly, he starts picking up chronic somatics. And then, as life drifts away on him, he may drop down below that till he can't feel any pain.

This is the overt act and its phenomena.

Win-lose — the tone of your preclear is established by his position on the whole curve. And it is established by this: Does he dare win? Because it will get to a point, at last, where any time he wins he has lost, if he is too low on the tone scale. And as he goes down this tone scale he says, "I've got to lose." More and more and more he says, "I've got to lose," until he plays it to lose.

An auditor low in tone will not resolve the case. He doesn't dare because he would win, and "if he wins something else will die." And he gets it mixed up with his preclear and he is afraid if he resolves the case the preclear will die, so he rigs it to lose. He knows that if he loses, the preclear will live — he thinks. So he just sets himself up to lose. That is all there is to it. Simple, isn't it?

You get the business of responsibility: An individual down here doesn't dare accept any responsibility. If he did he would win, and he mustn't win, because if he wins something is going to die. That is what the curve says. Any time he finds himself in a winning position something else will die. He is convinced of this.

So, what the tone scale is, amongst other things, is a shift from win to lose. A person very high on the tone scale wins, wins, wins. Of course, there are gradient scales of winning here. As you go on down the line between those two points, a person starts to lose for himself.

Life enforces this with pain. It is painful to win, to individuals, because of overt acts.

That is the package of the service facsimile. Somewhere or other there is a crime — there is an overt act on the case, of magnitude — which resulted in death on some other dynamic. This package is a service facsimile. Until you have solved that package as a service facsimile the case of the preclear is not solved, and that is all there is to it. It isn't even vaguely solved, either. It is unburdened.

That is why we were struggling so to get somebody up to 4.0. It was a big struggle to get somebody up to 4.0. Sure, you could run all the engrams off the case and so forth. And then it was rather puzzling because an individual somehow or other didn't quite want to give up some string of engrams. In fact, the auditor wouldn't even know they were there. Well, they were the engrams that were straight on top of the service facsimile.

The gruesome ferocity with which life enforces this law — survival shall be upon all dynamics — consists of inflicting upon the offender the somatic which he inflicts on another dynamic. Grim! Because I am not talking about

any guess, now. You want to go out here and polish somebody off, that is your business, but you can be prepared, sooner or later, to carry the exact somatic administered to that other person. Go out and cut somebody's throat — too bad.

Now, the funny part of it is that the genetic blueprint, the entire package of the individual's memory, is on file. The service facsimile cannot be resolved completely in this lifetime. There is no more outstanding proof of the consecutiveness of existence or the packages of facsimiles or memories which make up the blueprint of the human body itself.

I have set out, in the past week or so, to run an individual in this life only and not let him slide on through to anything else. Let's fool around with the time he drowned Grandma's kittens and so forth — let's monkey around with this case — and let's make this person well. A couple of cases, those that spilled grief in this life — spilled a lot of grief in this life — got better. They didn't get well; they just got better. But those cases where I have slashed on through and regardless of teachings, training's, beliefs or anything else just crowded the person right on down the time track into the overt act . . . It's no wonder that people don't want to believe they ever lived before! My God!

I crowd them down the line into some other existence someplace else and all of a sudden they hit one of these things, and that case just goes boom! — like you had turned on a couple of fire hoses.

And unless that service facsimile is hit, as itself, as the service facsimile, where it belongs, with full attention to the reality of the phenomena I am giving you right now and full attention to this reality across the boards — unless that is treated in that fashion — you can't resolve cases. And that is all there is to it. I am giving you a black-and-white statement.

We have walked into the grim bear trap rigged by the gods that be. But we had better accept the evidence of a real universe and not a bunch of guesses from individuals who are too scared to go back and find out what they did.

You see, no proof exists that we live only one life, but, believe me, this proof tells you that you have lived many lives. I am sorry if this conflicts with any religious beliefs, teachings, or if anybody confuses this with reincarnation — which this is not — or transmigration or hallucination or delusion or imagination or anything else. That is a matter of opinion.

They want an opinion on that score? All right. I haven't anything to sell by telling you you lived before except swamped cases. I like to see them swamped up. Peculiarity of mine: I like to see people happy.

So, here is the overt act. Where are you going to find it? The big, real overt act on the case — where does it exist? Now or three hundred thousand years ago?

Well, wherever it exists, you work a service facsimile on a case — that is to say, that unit memory, that memory — and you will find tumbling off the case immediately afterwards all of its computations that are in error. They just fly off the case. They roll off with alarming speed, there is great velocity on the thing — very easy thing to do if audited properly.

Your service facsimile is a basic package — and I'll cover that. But it is a basic incident, and lying on top of this basic incident are duplicate incidents. And there are just duplicate incidents by the thousands — not by the hundreds but just by the thousands. And if you had to run every one of those, each one by itself, you would be now till doomsday. But you hit the center of this package, which is the service facsimile, and the rest of these things blow to pieces like you have thrown an atom bomb down the fellow's gullet. That is no kidding. Ten, fifteen, twenty lives suddenly will jump into view on an individual, just like that.

You ask an individual to scan all the girls that reminded him of this service facsimile: faces pop into view — including Bessie, in this life.

He thinks that his life is all awry because of Bessie. She left him, she ran off with the chauffeur, she did him mean, and he has been blaming Bessie left and right, and so forth. Only

you find out it was a girl by the name of Bethesda back in — oh, I don't know — 1295 B.C., or something like that. She kept going off with Joe who lived in the next cave, so he fixed her clock one day.

By the way, I think every man has got this on his case — trying to keep one of these wild women in a cave. They keep running off! So men have tried almost everything: they have hamstrung them and they have busted up their legs and they have tied them up and they have done almost anything you could think of. They have even tried to reason with them; they have tried to make them feel affection. And man's final conclusion on the subject, as represented in all of his literature, is the fact that you can't hold on to a woman, period!

You'll find somebody who is very jealous, for instance. You will find that, very possibly, at least some of the locks on his service facsimile will consist of just this action of trying to keep Mrs. Oop home.

The overt act should never be confused with drinking somebody's beer while he is gone from the table. It is murder, blood, sudden death, agony . . .

Another thing you can do for a pc is — this is an awful mean one — just tell him to sit there and feel the counter-emotion of agony. And he says, "Well, somebody would be in pain. No, that wouldn't be it. Agony. Let's see, what would be the counter-emotion of agony?"

You know, you say, "Well, just shrill, screaming agony of the kind that you see that the organism enduring it just can't endure it. You know, that kind of agony. Now, just feel how that would feel to you."

"Eeeyow! "

Because if you sit and concentrate on it very long, you're going to get the agony of something you have killed.

You administered a sudden stroke and it was not fatal. And the point you will get the agony will be the point where you administered the stroke.

You busted a rabbit's head in, something like that. And you'd say "Win for myself" is up above that. And you say, "Well, get the feeling of agony from that rabbit. Get the counter-emotion of agony."

The guy can't do it, can't do it, can't — "Ow!"

It is just about like that. But this effort of the overt act buries the emotion and, actually, will often bury this phenomenon. So you get him to go through some such an effort. You get him to go through the effort, you get him to go through the effort, and the first thing you know, he will start to feel — I don't care who he is, or whether you have explained this to him or not — the act being performed to him, he thinks. He isn't quite sure how this is.

You get him to go through that, and he is puzzled if he doesn't know what you are doing. Foolishly, he will keep on grinding in the rabbit's head, see, something like that. "Now, why does . . . ?" He will say, "What's going on here?" He hasn't become aware of the phenomenon. You can get this with anyone.

Now, a case can be done these days in — oh, I'd say, with a lousy auditor — fifty hours. A good auditor ought to be able to resolve a case and knock it to pieces and square it all up in about twenty-five hours — knowing about overt acts.

What is an overt act? It is the administration of pain — non survival, destruction — on another dynamic, and the recognition that one has caused that pain.

I know a company of soldiers one time whose tone probably dropped through the bottom. Over in the Sicilian theater of war — the bombers and the artillery and these infantrymen had been at work upon a small Sicilian town, and they had been shooting it to pieces for a long time. The infantrymen had been hanging outside and just sending machine-gun bullets through the area to make sure it was cleared and cleaned of Germans and Italians. And they kept shooting into the area and ordering more bombs into the area, and then this company — the one that had been most active with its artillery — moved into the town. And they found one little girl sitting there on a curb trying to keep her blood in where her arm had been blown off by their shells. This was the total enemy.

If you traced that company and its personnel at this time, you would find out that most of those boys wound up in veterans' hospitals, or at the very next opportunity they stepped out and got themselves killed. Because they went to here — lose — which means die, quick.

You want to know why an individual gets himself knocked off, or why he rigs himself as the subject of an accident: He has slipped through all stages of his service facsimile down to a point where he has to lose.

Most people are hanging around 2.3, 2.4, or something like that. And you'd say "win for myself" is up above that. And down along this line — 2.4, something like that — the individual will never quite win; he will come short.

But he will never quite lose. He will just hang in that jockey; he will go ahead working at Boeing or something. He will somehow or other fix himself up so that he can't really succeed but he doesn't really lose. Below that point, why, he has slipped.

Now, I want to show you the anatomy of the service facsimile which goes to make up an overt act. You will find this very interesting. Here is your initial incident. This is incident one, now, on the time track, and it consists of a rock hitting this animal on the head and killing him. That animal is you, way back someplace, see? Rock hits animal; animal killed by skull crushed. The animal learns a lesson: Death results by the crushing of a skull — lesson.

The next stage on the service-facsimile line (this may come Lord knows how long later): All of a sudden this animal here is confronted with what he conceives to be a threat to his own survival, and he goes far enough out of hand to jump over into the winning position and picks up a rock and hits the other organism — crush! Or just takes his fist or claw or paw or something of the sort and squashes the other organism's head. First use.

Now, first use may be basic on the chain, but it is not necessarily the service facsimile.

This just tells him "Ha! Why, do that and you win. Nothing to it." So he goes ahead — win-lose. So, he takes this thing and kills another one.

The centuries or the thousands of years go by — various packages. You get what's happening here? Because each time he recognizes, just a little bit, it isn't right; he is not supposed to do that.

I don't know how life was supposed to work itself out. But there is some proviso in there someplace that killing for food doesn't hang one up with one, for some reason or other. Early on the track, particularly, there is sort of a mutual consent on the subject of food: "Today I'm food and tomorrow you are," or something of the sort — something weird — because you will get the strangest emotion early on the track about a person being eaten. They don't care. It is when they are eaten with trimmings that they start to object.

One day this individual (and this is the fatal step and this is your service facsimile), not for food, not for any survival purposes, not for any practicality, but only because number one has been offended — reasonlessly almost, so that he has got a maybe now, "Should I have done it or shouldn't I have done it?" — suddenly picks up his claw or paw or picks up a rock or

something like that and wantonly smashes in the head of another organism, for no good reason. And you get this curve: smash! And then he suddenly says, "Oh-oh! Why did I do that? I shouldn't have done that. There isn't any reason for this; there's no good cause for it. Come back to life!" Nothing happens. There is the service facsimile.

Don't bother to try to solve it on how often the person got killed or how often the environment hurt him or something of the sort. That doesn't matter. He likes these. He will run all of these you want him to run! He will run them by the thousands. They are all accurate, and none of them will resolve his case. As a matter of fact, he will start going down in tone, and the reason why is he considers all these times he has lost as justification for the times he made another dynamic lose. And if you take away from him all the times he lost, he hasn't any reason to make the other dynamics lose.

An individual always looks for an overt act before he administers one himself, and then he rationalizes, he justifies. And this is justification and rationalization: "All right, they did it to me, so therefore I'm justified in doing it to them."

The person which you despise, for instance, is the person who acts without justification: The thief walks down the street, and there is an old lady sitting there in a wheelchair and he sticks a gun in her ribs and says, "Gimme your purse!" and bang! You say, "Oh! Horrible!" Why? Why is it horrible? It is just horrible simply because you know he didn't have any justification for doing it.

Now, if a fellow were walking down the street and this dear old lady pulled out a sub-Thompson and blew a leg off of him or something of the sort, and he managed at the last moment to get over and upset her wheelchair and crack her skull, you would say, "Well, it sure served her right!" Now, that is a silly one, isn't it? They both result in the death of an old lady.

In other words, is a person justified in having committed the overt act? And this is what we worry about. "Was I justified in doing this? Did I have a reason? Had I been hurt, injured, maligned, kicked around, enough to have had this happen? If so, then I need not feel guilty or regret this overt act which I am about to commit, or which I am just committing, or which I have committed."

You will find every time an individual is operating on a maybe that he is trying to tell you how justified he is. And any time he starts telling you how justified he is, you know that he knows he wasn't. "Well, the reason all this happened to me and so forth was because of yakety-yakety-yakety-yak, and they did this to me," and so on. Well, maybe they did that to him, but nevertheless he knows this: There is no justification for any overt act. Grim, but there is just no justification.

You can't live without committing minor overt acts. That is all right. Commit as many as you want — minor overt acts — but don't causelessly, or for your own aggrandizement, injure another dynamic, because the second you do, you will get the whole thing kicked right back at you. You will suffer what you have caused in suffering — hideous but awfully true.

There is no justification for an overt act, but an overt act — a real overt act — is with magnitude, and this you shouldn't neglect. If you have a service facsimile in place, and you go down here and bawl out the old man who sells papers down on the corner because he short-changed you one penny, you are going to walk up the street feeling pretty bad.

You have got a service facsimile of this fellow in place and your little kid runs up to you and hands something to you, you say "Go away, go away!" and you watch his face fall: you are going to sit there for a while.

The more little ones that you commit, the more this thing is going to come into play. And as long as this is in existence, you will actually conceive needlessly that you are committing overt acts all the time, until your whole life seems to be an overt act. You will get to a point where

you are careful of what you eat, you are careful of what you accept as favors, you are careful of what you wear, you are careful to be very socially exact in your dealings. Why? Because any one of these factors may cause you to commit a little lock on your service facsimile. And when you have committed enough overt acts, this goes into full play and you die, and that is the end of it.

Nearly everyone out there in the society is riding right now about there. This civilization was ready for a complete wash-up, if you want to know my opinion — and that is just an opinion on my part. I think they invented the atom bomb just so they could have it, because the atom bomb would cause an overt act of such terrific magnitude, everybody would have his sins forgiven at that instant because everybody would be dead — dead with violence.

Now, handling this service facsimile puts a person back into a position where he can be rational.

This sort of thing has happened in this society, this culture, with these people: Way back here, hundreds, thousands of years ago, the individual committed an overt act of magnitude. It was in a day when he was not a reasonable being; he was a reacting being — very reactive. He committed that act and thereafter began to use the facsimile. First he chose a cause-of-death facsimile by some way he had been killed and used it against another, and then he was off to the races. And then he used it senselessly.

What are illnesses? They are ways and means of you reminding you that you have committed one. The most severely handicapped have, by computation, committed the most severe overt acts. A person will go to the point of paralyzing his right arm rather than ever strike again. A person will paralyze a leg so that he will never kick again. A person goes down into apathy and paralyzes his whole body so that he won't be able to move again with an overt act. Of course, it is within his range of opinion of what an overt act is — according to his judgment — but it is never light.

You want to know what illnesses are, what psychosomatic illnesses are and that sort of thing? They are “I must not and I will not, and in case I do, I have already rendered myself unable to commit it.” Try and imagine taking a three-month-old baby and hitting it as hard as you can with your fist. Just try and imagine it. Just try and imagine it again — hit this three-month-old baby with your fist.

You ask this individual, “Go on and strike him.” The next thing you know, his hand will start going — shaking. “I can't understand what's wrong with it. That's all. I just can't understand what's wrong with my hand. I — I can't hit him.”

You say, “Well, it's just imaginary. Go ahead, hit him. Hit him in the face.”

It is very interesting phenomena, isn't it?

And the second line of defense is, when they're hit, they get it back themselves. In other words, they fix themselves up. And self-determinism, postulate, everything else is there, but they weaken the offending member.

How many people do you think in his lifetime a man has bitten? There's one for you. How many things do you think the individual has bitten? Let's take the last two hundred thousand years.

Once upon a time he wasn't very offensive with his teeth, and then he finally got to a point where — big jaw. Then what happened? No jaw; recessive jaw. Man's jaw has receded from clear out here — boy, what a set of choppers he had! — on back till he not only now has small teeth but he will also get them pulled at no provocation. That is interesting, isn't it? You can read the overt act about his mouth and his teeth.

It is pretty hard, by the way, to persuade somebody to bite. You take a little kid. This little kid will come around someday and bite at you, something like that, if you get him in a fight. You don't have to scold that kid. Watch him. He will bite you. And just act suddenly as though you have been hurt. (This is a dirty trick, because it will fix his clock for him.) Just act as though it's been hurt and don't strike back, and you just watch him go down the scale. Why? Some part of his service facsimile has to do with teeth. There is some earlier lock that has to do with teeth.

You get out the service facsimile; that hasn't got enough strength to do you any harm anymore.

Do you see how it works? The individual weakens or makes smaller the offending member and will pick up the somatic he administers. And the crime which consists of a service facsimile is so enormous and it is so inconclusive — there are no decisions in it — that it is right in present time. An individual walks with it in present time all the time.

The mind, when it can't solve a problem, automatically picks up facsimiles. Well, it never solved this problem: Was he right or was he wrong? Should he have or shouldn't he have? And this he can't answer. As a consequence, it stays in constant restimulation. And with practically no provocation whatsoever, he will penalize his body or even die to keep from administering that overt act again.

Now, just as a little additional comment on it: You know why they want sympathy? They want to demonstrate that they are losing. They want to be over on the losing side of the ledger because they don't dare stay on the winning side of the ledger.

There is hardly a little boy alive that hasn't worried about whether or not he was a coward. He has found himself going out into a fight; he has found himself unable to strike. At some fight or another he is unable to strike — and he figures out "I must be a coward." Well, I don't know, frankly, what a coward is, all of a sudden, because he is saying "I mustn't hit him; I'll kill him. And it's much better for me to be in terrible condition and to believe all sorts of bad things about myself than to administer pain to that other one, regardless of how worthless I think he is."

The action of a criminal, the action of a low-tone-scale person who tries to antagonize you, who tries to get you all riled up, who gives you bad news, who does all sorts of things to you, is inviting an overt act. He wants you to commit an overt act against him and he will do anything to get you to commit this overt act. He isn't happy unless you are committing overt acts against him. This, by the way, is basic masochism.

Now, he has to be justified for going on living. This person is so unbalanced, he feels that his overt acts in this life or in others are so tremendous, that he has got to have overt acts committed against him in order to justify his continual existence. You get the idea? He has got to have justification. He has done things that were so thoroughly unjustified in his mind that now he has got to pile up self-punishment just to keep on living.

Why does a criminal, with only a ten-day charge for vagrancy facing him, suddenly haul off and shoot a cop to death when the cop comes near him? Why? The police have a hard time trying to figure this one out. No wonder. This criminal, just to go on being a being, invites overt acts, but he is so squirreled up that he commits these overt acts to invite overt acts so he can get punished — so he can really get punished, so he can even get sent to an electric chair. He needs justification, such as being electrocuted.

Now, there is the rather interesting lineup of the sympathy interchange. You think individuals who go down on the losing end of the line want sympathy: No, all they want, really, is the recognition of the fact that they have lost. If you recognize they have lost, then to some degree they are forgiven.

And just to cap all this, every individual wears upon him — his body and his physiology — his service facsimile, as plain and as bare as a signboard. You can look at anybody and tell exactly what he has done. That is pretty horrible, isn't it? You know what he has killed; you know what he has maimed.

An individual will not do a life continuum unless he conceives himself to have been guilty of the death. How is he guilty of the death? Well, he didn't go out and get water for the sick person every time the sick person asked. There were two times when he slept through the bell ring. The sick person hardly even noticed this, but that was an overt act. This person is so burdened by a service facsimile that this is an overt act. The sick person dies and the person has to make it up for him.

How does an individual repay on an overt act? He killed somebody. He regrets it — stops himself in time — and he will try to go on living as that other person and try to heal up that other person, try to restore life to him — try to solve their problems, carry out their goals — anything!

And what is the difference on this win-lose scale, win to lose? As he begins life, he is the winner, and as he gets it keyed in, he goes down the line — less and less and less and less the winner — until there he is, lying there stone-dead as the loser.

You see them on the couch: the coffin case. The funny part of the coffin case is the coffin case killed that person and now is that person. And this case will die or will live a life which is little better than a sort of a shadow of death.

But your progress through existence (the average individual) is the progress from the winning to the losing valence. And the basic winning and losing valences are the offender and the victim. And this drama we see in all of our literature, our religion — everywhere we look. In the doctors' offices, we find individuals putting themselves down on the operating table to have done to them, if possible, what they did to somebody else.

Why does somebody want an operation on his gallbladder? There is a pain there. He insists on his being operated on; he insists on that shiv being slid into him (called a scalpel in the medical profession, to be technical), and he gets it! And the funny part of it is, afterwards he may feel a lot better. Actually the doctor would say "Oh, you have a pain in your gallbladder?" Well, the doctor would break out an assortment of knives and say, "Which one of these knives do you like best?" They would be from various centuries and things. The fellow would look down the line and say, "Well, I think that poniard is about it." The doctor would say, "Okay," and slip it into him right there, see, and let him fall over, and then patch up the wound and give him some penicillin and send him home — why, the fellow would be happy. Doing it with a scalpel and ether and those trimmings and so forth, they don't improve the condition particularly. And when you try to close out all the pain, that is no fun — I mean, it's not convincing to the individual.

That is why people get well on operations.

Overt act: Why do people commit overt acts against you? They consider you to be powerful, to be strong. That isn't so much a contest. They say, "Here's somebody that's powerful and strong. Boy, they can really knock me for a loop." So they start monkeying around: "I heard today — I heard a story about you. Tsk! The fellow said you were no good, and of course I had to agree with him, and . . ." Finally, they will pick out this guy who is strong, and this guy who is strong will go bang! That is what they want. Then they will say, "See what he did to me? See what he did to me? Now I'm justified in going on living."

And with this we discover the fourth method theta takes through time. Theta takes a fourth method. It is a little, shadowy method.

One of the methods is through the MEST which has been used by theta in bodies — in other words, almost through the cemeteries; you will find a little bit of theta hanging around on that track. You will find the theta-body line, which is the individual as a personality straight on through the generations.

And you will find the protoplasm line — protoplasm, the unending stream of protoplasm they talk about in biology and so forth — which is the method of procreating, creating new bodies and so forth.

Well, life goes along this track, and it goes along the fourth track. And the fourth track is by inviting a life continuum for self. This may not come home to you until tomorrow sometime, but it's inviting a life continuum for self.

Now, how does it do this? Here we find little Bessie is busy doing a life continuum for Grandpa. Well, she did an overt act against Grandpa in order to feel sorry for Grandpa, in order to do an overt act to feel sorry for him again, and then Grandpa dies and Bessie does a life continuum. That is theta's little method of carrying along Grandpa. Quite in addition to carrying Grandpa, Bessie is also carrying her own actual theta-body line, she is carrying her protoplasm line, she is carrying this dead-MEST line. Interesting.

You can find all these if you want to look cases over. This is phenomena I am talking to you about, not air.

Life continuum: an individual who is down tone scale is not only trying to knock off so that he can get a new body and maybe a new start but he is inviting everybody to do a life continuum for him. So he invites you to do an overt act against him so that you will do a life continuum for him. And what is the mechanism? Jab, jab, jab, jab, jab; then when the stronger person finally goes pow! then, "I'm hurt. Oh, you killed me. Oh!" They look very pathetic. The stronger person all of a sudden regrets it — overt act, has his own service facsimile in restimulation. He will pick up the habits and individualities of the person he has offended and to some small degree carry these on along the time track. And this is another method of life continuum.

It is like name immortality: Why should an individual want his name around for the next thousand years on a book or something? He is dead. In the last life he had another name and in the next life he is going to have another name.

A name. Well, here is a life continuum that is just about as light as this continuum. It has this actual factor associated with it: An individual gets you to offend against him so that you will continue life for him.

So that you have individuals continually who are inviting overt acts against themselves, not only to justify their further existence — not only to justify their own service facsimile and their own conduct and existence — but to get you to go on living for them. They feel they cannot live as themselves; they are already clear over on the bottom side of the facsimile — they are almost dead anyway — so they want you to go on living for them. Now, you get that mechanism?

I have found it to be a very interesting mechanism because it resolves cases very rapidly.

Okay. The second half of the talk tonight, I'll talk about the shifted control center, which you may find a little less esoteric, a little more practical.