

THEORY OF FLOWS, COUNTER - ELASTICITY

SOP-5A

A lecture given in
October 1952

Today we are going to take up in some detail the theory of flows: the single-flow theory and the theory of counter-elasticity, and the first one we will talk about will be counter-elasticity.

This, you understand, may or may not be true of flows in general. There may be such a thing as a pure flow which is actually a single one-way flow. There may be such a thing. That would be, however, this strange thing called a flow with no friction, and that we know is an impossibility because a flow with no friction would simply flow forever.

Small enturbulences present in any flow, no matter what it is doing, are sufficient to put a brake point on that flow. They're sufficient to stop the flow. This seems to be particularly true of very high frequencies such as human thought. Again, we are postulating; we are a little bit beyond our level of knowing when we talk about this. I'm trying to describe the upper range just above what we know we know, when I say the frequency, the friction, the enturbulence, the counter-motion.

Now I'm going to talk about exactly what we know. We know that a flow of energy requires two different potentials. A flow will flow between two different potentials: one potential a little bit higher than the other potential.

We know this is very easy to find in a preclear. You simply rig up an aesthetic flow, watch what happens to it; an aesthetic picture, watch what happens to that aesthetic picture. You'll find that there's a flow to it. And you rig up a horrible picture and look what happens to it. There's a flow around it. And when you get a little bit higher in the handling of this energy—when you get a little bit higher in handling this energy, you will discover that a flow line can be determined by you, simply by setting up potential A and potential B, and you'll get a flow from A to B. And in de-aberrating people, you particularly are interested in the fact that they do not self-determine the direction of flow, nor the potentials of flow, nor the position or the time of incidents.

All of aberration could be said to fall under this category at this time, and that is that a person does not know the time and space of each and every facsimile and ridge which he has. And his sanity and his ability and his horsepower depends utterly upon his ability to do this.

And if you were to draw a scale of relative self-determinism, it would be the scale of ability to put in time and place each and every facsimile and ridge. So that if one were able to put one-thousandth of one percent of his facsimiles and ridges accurately in time and place, he would be a sane man. But if he can put only (very arbitrary figures) a hundred-thousand-billionth of his facsimiles in place, he's in bad shape.

This law tells you. . . This is a law, actually. It's an axiom, I suppose. You have in that the answer to psychosis and its cure. Psychosis is the loss of ability to determine time and place: future time and place for incidents, present time and place for incidents' position, past time and place for facsimiles and ridges. Your psychotic has lost his ability to do this, and he is psychotic in the degree that he's lost his ability to do this.

So how do you cure psychosis? You just persuade him to put things in time and space. The first start on any psychotic is told to you by this observation. You simply let him locate where he is. And if you can't find him where he is and if he can't locate himself where he is, let him locate himself somewhere in the past where he was.

Insanity is past; neurosis would be concern about the present; sanity would be actions in favor of the future. This is a definition. It's an old definition in the subject.

But the psychotic is always, evidently, in the past. He's all mixed up in facsimiles and he's all piled up in them. So you either get present or past locations of time and space.

You can take a psychotic, and if you can make him locate a light switch and know it's a light switch, you have advanced deeply into the morass of insanity. If you make him locate a door and know where the door goes; if you let him locate the fact that you have a ring on your finger. If you can get him to locate you—just say, "You're sitting there in front of me."

"Yes, of course!" He's already on his way to sanity.

"I don't know people. I can't remember people," he says.

You say, "Can you even remember me?"

And he sort of comes out of his fog. "Yeah, you walked in the door a few minutes ago."

Quite often, a person low on the Tone Scale, when you ask them, aLet's see if you can remember somebody who's absolutely real to you."

And he'll think for a moment and he'll look at you and you'll see a smile break out all over his face. "You. Yeah, you're real. Ha-ha!" Triumph. Almost a line charge. And you just go from there, on and on and on.

Locations in time and space, locations of memory. The first process which is a good process to use on Straightwire on a psychotic is "Can you remember something that is absolutely real to you?" The reality of something is the ability to place it in time and space. That's reality; reality is an agreement. And so, "Where did everybody agree that thing was? And did I agree with them? And I knew it was there, too." That's it. A time when he was fully in communication with someone, a communication moment that was absolutely real to him, and a moment when he had an emotion which was real to him. These moments can be sneaked up on. And if you can get him to spot his present time moments . . . You could spot his present time emotion, that is, his affinity—his present time state of affinity, his emotion, whatever it is; his present time agreement or disagreement with his surroundings; and his present time communication with his surroundings—you've brought him up to present time.

If you just walk into a sanitarium sometimes and you say to a patient—you just meet the patients, one after the other, and you just tell them, you smile at them and say, "Come on up to present time," do you know that a certain percentage of them (a low percentage, it's true) but a certain percentage of those people will turn sane that instant? I mean really sane.

This happened in a place up in Michigan. A fellow auditor walked down the hall—this is the most spectacular one that's been reported, because it had everybody in a spin up in the whole sanitarium. The staff spun in, practically. Auditor went down the hall—he told somebody this. I'd mentioned this several times, and this auditor thought he'd try it out. So these psychiatrists were being very—sort of dull about the whole thing, so he said, "Well, I can go down the hall," and he said, "I can cure somebody just by walking down the hall."

"Oh, yes, well! Ha-ha. Poof! You know, we've been walking up and down the hall here for the last hundred years, and we've never cured anybody. Huh! Yet you say you can. Well, show us."

So, he just walked down the hall and—the whole gibe here is toward American psychiatrists; I know British psychiatrists are much more reasonable. (audience laughter)

Now, walking up and down the hall, he simply stopped three or four people and he told a girl, “Come on up to present time.”

She looked at him, looked around, sort of—(sigh). Boy, she was glad to be there. And that night . . . This girl hadn’t had a word to say for about three years. Nobody could get her to talk or anything else for about three years. And she had a terrible case of acne on the face. That night, the whole—all the patients and everybody had a party, and she got up and she made a speech about how glad she was to be there. Three days later, the acne on her face was gone, she behaved very sanely thereafter, remained stable and was discharged from the sanitarium. Total therapy time: “Come up to present time.”

Now, you see that that could be quite effective, that could be quite effective. You don’t expect very many people to respond to just those phrases. If you’ve ever had a preclear on the couch, you’ve run them back down the track, you tell them to come up to present time, there’s always a lag if they’re really coming up to present time. They just open up their eyes, you know they’re stuck on the track. But they—little lag, and you know, they always kind of expect a little bit to have you say “Hello,” or something like they’ve been away and they’re back again, and they want to be greeted.

So, I used to greet the preclear every time I’d tell them to come up to present time; little lag and he’d open his eyes and I would say, “Well, how are you?” He’d be very pleased; he never saw anything strange about this at all. It was as though he’d suddenly gotten off the train or just arrived for dinner or something. And it cheered him up and it had the effect of making him want to stay in present time, because present time was pleasant; he was accepted in present time.

All right. This should tell you, then, that any technique which orients . . . With this definition, you see, of self-determinism—what is self-determinism? Self-determinism is the ability to place in space and time. What is self-determinism? It’s the ability to place in space and time. That tells you, tells you right away, as a definition, the answer to how to bring people up to present time. If they don’t respond, you just say, “Come up to present time.” And they don’t respond to it, they don’t come up to present time and they still seem a little bit foggy and unreal, you get them to place present time carefully in time and space.

And they’ll think this is awfully silly sometimes. Somebody who is quite sane—this, by the way, is not just a technique for the insane—somebody who is quite sane, you can pull this on with considerable effect. You say, “Where are you?”

And the fellow says, “Durba. No! I’m not in Durban, am I? Huh! This is London!”

“Okay, okay. London. What’s the address?”

“So-and-so, so-and so, Randolph Avenue.”

“Oh? Now what body are you in?”

Fellow says, “I’m in a body called Jones. Hm!” He’ll say, “Everything’s getting a little bit brighter to me.”

And you say, “Now, what room is this?”

Of course he knows where he is. He can tell you he knows where he is. And sometimes he’ll tell you with considerable annoyance, “Well, I know where I am! I’m in Durban—I mean London.”

So, he says—oh, he just goes through it. “I’m on the second floor, it’s a front room, the time is about midafternoon. Yes, yes, and uh . . .”

And you ask him, “Well now, what clothes have you got on?”

Don’t bother running him back in the past, because that’s only relationship. He’ll immediately think, you see, “Clothes I’ve got on; well, yes, I’ve just got on clothes.” And he’ll try to bring himself up to present time on each article of clothing, if you’ll let him.

“Let’s see, I put on these shoes this morning; they were under the bed, and I had to look and find one. And yeah, the coat was in a . . . Oh, no! The cat slept on the coat last night, yeah. Yeah, was I mad this morning and so on. Yeah, yeah.” You find out he was stuck on the track about his coat; mad at the cat for sleeping on it.

He’ll say, “Yes, and I spilled some egg on my tie at breakfast. Yeah.” He’ll maunder along like this for some time. You just let him maunder, he’ll all of a sudden get around to the point of “Got a tie on! Ha, well, what do you know, I got a tie on!” It’ll actually come to a very sane person sometimes with that much of a shock. “This is a neck and it has a collar and there’s a tie,” just like that. “There’s a tie and the touch of the tie is so-and-so.”

And we get off to the second stage of it. You’ve got him oriented now; let’s orient him perceptically. The color of the wall. Optical sight: color of a wall, the color of a picture, this and that—optical sight. The touch of this, the feel of his shirt, the feel of his undershirt, the feel of his shorts, the feel of his socks, the feel of his shoes, the feel of his belt. You get him all oriented MESTwise. He’s perfectly willing to orient MESTwise.

What do you know! The next thing you do, if you really want him in present time, is orient him thetawise. “Let’s get the feel of the wall.”

“Oh, I can’t feel the wall from here!”

“Now, feel the wall.”

“You know I can’t do that.”

“Well, go ahead. Just try it.”

“Oh, it feels like plaster. I did feel the wall. You know, that’s very strange, but I did feel the wall. Yeah. I wonder if I could do that again. Uh, a little doubtful that time,” and so forth, “but—but I can feel that picture. I can feel that picture. I can feel that girl’s lipstick. Hey, what do you know! Ha-ha. New horizons open!” (audience laughter)

You can get a theta perceptic orientation by making him see to depth, then—see to various depths, feel to various depths and, what do you know, hear to various depths. You’re all of a sudden liable to find him completely bogged, as you do this. You’ve run him into present time and then thetawise he’s stuck somewhere on the time track. Well, at least orient him and find out where he’s stuck, thetawise, on the time track. You see how you could do that?

So you could bring him up with all the MEST body perceptics, and that seems fairly real to him, and now bring his theta perceptics up to present time.

You want a therapy? Well, the truth be told, you could sit in an office and become famous beyond fame for the magic of your healing by just knowing that axiom, or whatever it is, and definition of self determinism, and ways and means of establishing the person’s whereabouts for him. That’s all you’d have to do—just get the variations on it—and the darnedest things would happen.

The second you start to play with Miss Q on the subject of this— she’s had a terrible backache, and every time she starts to orient herself as sitting in your chair, she gets a twinge in her back. And instead of insisting she come to present time or anything like that, you just wander off onto some other perceptic into present time. And then all of a sudden there’s

another twinge in her back and another twinge in her back. And all of a sudden—wouldn't happen all the time, but occasionally you'd get almost a horrible explosion in her back. Bang! And disorient her again and then reorient her again. And she hasn't got a backache anymore that she's had all those years. Orientation in present time.

Now, how could you carry this out further? One of your therapies is orientation in the past. That works very well on psychotics and neurotics—extremely well—and works very well on people who are quite sane. Because in the past you will discover incidents of considerable aberrative magnitude by just Straightwire—which is to say, orientation of the incident in the past with relationship to the future—you have established a considerable release of the incident. Your pc, however, is even further burdened and he is being subjected to forces by incidents which occurred in the past which he cannot identify. And the reason why the force is bad and the reason why it upsets him and the reason why it hurts him is because he can't orient it or identify it.

Well, just identification of it on an E-Meter occasionally will sort of make it diminish—just identification by an E-Meter. An E-Meter process is even more than an auditor's process; therefore, although my old pal Volney will tell you “Never let the preclear look at the E-Meter,” he always comes over and—whenever he watches me processing—and finds the E-Meter facing the preclear. Always gets uncomfortable about it, and then says, “Well, Ron can get away with anything.” Yeah, obvious.

The truth of the matter is and only at that moment when the preclear starts asking the E-Meter for confirmation—he'll say, “It was a hundred years ago? It was five hundred years ago? About six hundred years ago?” and so on, so on, so on, so on, waiting for that bop. And when the E-Meter bops, he'll say, “Okay.”

He's fed the E-Meter in as a circuit, and he takes its memory instead of his. And he'll start doing this on everything that happens. That's bad, but you notice when it happens with a preclear.

The preclear all of a sudden says, “Well, I know very well I was—ahem, I came to Earth here a long time back.” Tsk. The E-Meter does a bob and that's a confirmation. It pats him on the back; it says, “That's right, old boy.” He'll proceed with a little more confidence. “Oh, I came to Earth here quite a while back,” and—all of a sudden he can recall it. But unless you as an auditor step in there and make him recall it—not just recall what the E-Meter said, but recall what the E-Meter said. You get the double-stage process: The E-Meter flicks, runs and so forth and he varies the figures, then you get him to recall it straight. The incident is there; he can recall it. There's no trick to that. But secondarily, make him recall the incident. That is to say, orient it in time and space.

It occurred on Alpha Centauri 8,283 years ago. The E-Meter says so, his recall says so; all of a sudden, his recall gets a little bit better on the thing. He'll come up the line markedly.

Now, you start running out facsimiles and chewing into facsimiles only when they won't budge. You can't get them oriented in time and space. Run them out at such a time. Use Black and White Aesthetic Processing and a few other things and run them out. Spot them, knock them flat.

That's actually when you run a facsimile. That answers a question. You could ask the question, “When should you audit a facsimile?” When? The answer is: when the preclear cannot locate the incident in time and space and feel that he has located it with affinity, reality and communication. He has ARC on this incident—it seems real to him, it was there, it did happen at that time. In other words, you get it with a good level of knowingness.

When he doesn't respond with a good level of knowingness on an incident, there is an incident that's blocking back there. You can do this incident, then, two ways: You can locate minor things—minor things—leading back to that incident and just sort of dig it out. By the

You can feed a person like that, then, just words. You can say, “Well, let’s not laugh about that anymore. Think about taxicabs, instead, something serious like taxicabs”—oh, totally unrelated to the subject.

And he’ll say, “Taxicabs?” Brrrrrrr! Every taxicab that he’s ever seen is suddenly oriented in time and space. They’re going by so fast, he can’t even see them, and he gets a terrific charge out of it. And he suddenly starts to bog on that and he isn’t laughing about taxicabs anymore, and you say, “Newspaper stories about children being run over.”

“Ha-ha-ha!” Silly.

You say, “All the mean things you’ve done—all the mean things you did to your mother.” Actually, you can spot them on anything you want to feed him, if you get him going on spotting things. It’s sort of build, build, build, build, build; more and more and more and more and more things will build up on the whole thing.

Okay? That’s orientation in time and space. Now, what does this have to do with flows, the theory of a single flow? All flows contain in them some friction. The fellow who insists on speaking with reservations: He doesn’t come up to you and say, “You know, I just cured somebody and they’re going to stay cured. I know they are, and I know—I’ve figured this all out. And boy, do they feel good and did I do a good job of auditing!”

How many people do you find do that? Not very many. Boy, he’d be awfully—one, to be that explosive about it, he wouldn’t be as well as he could be, but he’d be way up above normal on that.

What is reservation? Reservation is introducing into an outgoing flow an impedance to make it flow less hard and hit less hard. So your fellow comes up to you and he says, “Well,” he said, “I just had a preclear and of course he—he said that he felt better. As a matter of fact, he did show some signs of looking better, but one always has to take into account that these things usually don’t. . . And I don’t know, I probably could have done a much better job of auditing. Thought of it afterwards, probably could have and. . .” He thinks he’s done a wonderful job, but that’s the way he lets you in on it. That’s a heck of a note. That’s what’s known as reservation.

Now, you could see, reservation in conversation can have a picture drawn of it. [marking on blackboard] Here’s your pc and here’s your outgoing flow. Now, here would be your flow going out from the pc perfectly straight, and he actually will monitor it by putting an enturbulence into the flow; he’s checking it all the way. He’s holding it from going out. He does this conceptually—outgoing flow is very conceptual on the thing. And he checks it by being reserved and conservative about what he is saying. And if this is the accepted way to talk and if one is expected to modulate in this fashion, why, that is conforming. But nevertheless, it’s restraining a flow. Single flow.

Now, let’s come down to what are flows and what aren’t flows.

Action is one thing. Action consists of energy outputs and inputs. Action is energy interchanges on a gross MEST level—energy changes on a gross MEST level. That’s action.

All right. Action and thinking are two different things, a little bit. Thinking is—consists of energy interchanges on a much milder, smaller wave level. And the strange part of a being is—the strange part of a being is that when he is no longer capable of action, he

But thinking is a shadow of action. An action which is beneficial and forward and optimum-solution action, stems from thinking. So you get an interaction between them.

But remember that the last end of any person’s existence is thinking. The last end is thinking. That’s why you get introspection, extrospection,³ so forth, as being regarded rather

aberrative. And also why some person who does thinking is regarded, actually, with a little bit of distrust. They think he must be in pretty bad shape. Right away, they think he must be. They think he must be out of action.

Well, the funny part of it is, is this can be a gradient scale, and it's like anything else can be a gradient scale. Here's the action level he's capable of; here's the thinking level he's capable of. That would be pretty well balanced, isn't it? He could think; he could put into action what he's thought about. Or he goes into action when he's thought about it. And understand that the thinking can be quite swift; that would mean he'd go into action with fairly good judgment. He would go into action with—doing things.

All right. There would be the action-thinking ratio. And believe me, if a person does an awful lot of thinking—if he would be fairly well balanced and even—you would see whether or not he went into a lot of action, too. You can't judge one of these points by itself, you understand, because there's an interrelationship. So if a person does a lot of thinking and no action, what you're observing, then, is a defeat and a backup from action. He has failed enough times in action so that now he just thinks about it.

And when you get an awful lot of action and no thinking about it at all, you know that that's equally bad. You know that that's occasioned by other-determinism, other-determinism. He doesn't think much about it, but goes into an awful lot of action. He obeys his impulses of action.

Here's your teenager. He's driving down the road and all of a sudden he throws the car up to 60 miles an hour—residential area and a school district. He wants to drive the car fast and he wants to do it at that moment when he wants to do it, and he drives the car fast— swoosh. This child is operating solely because of other-determinism. He has a desire for action and his ability to think about action and exercise his own judgment has been squashed and repressed, so he's out of balance, very badly out of balance.

There's nothing wrong with a sixteen-year-old or a sixty-year-old person going into action of 60 miles an hour. If he wants to go into action at 60 miles an hour, I can assure you it's much more fun to go out on the race course and turn it loose at 120 miles an hour. There you can really hit some good speed. And if you want to really have a good time, you can pile up a lot of broken bottles and so forth in little heaps and mounds at irregular places and drive through them at 100 miles an hour. That's fun because, you see, if you want the element of danger to come in on it, and risk, and make it spicy and all that sort of thing, fix it up so that if you drive wrong you get a blown-out tire and that'll wreck you. And you can do things like this. It sounds idiotic, but you put up your own impedances.

Or, more rationally, you could just set up a series of flags and things like that and learn to drive amongst and between these flags. And that is quite a lot of skill required in something like that. You find out that that could be a hobby all by itself. He wants to go 120 miles an hour.

If he's driving an automobile, however, and his yearning is to go 480 miles an hour, he's in the wrong vehicle. An automobile just won't go that fast, that's all. What he wants is a jet plane. And if he hasn't got a jet plane, well, must be something wrong with him if he can't work himself up into a position where he's a jet-plane jockey.

So action and thought, you see, could interlock. But when they go out of balance at 60 miles an hour through a school zone with a lot of little kids in there, that's just stupid; But it's action.

And conversely, a fellow who sits down introspectively and extrospectively and just thinks and thinks and thinks—if he doesn't have an impulse to go into action with that thinking, he's awfully bad off. So what you want to examine when you're diagnosing (word

used very advisedly)—assessing—a preclear, is to find out whether or not he is in a parity level between action and thought.

The fellow says, “I’m worried about myself All I do is think.”

You know, you have a therapy you can give him? You can say, “Well, why don’t you go out and act?”

He’s liable to say (just like “Come up to present time”), “You know, I never thought of that? Hah! Yeah, I think I will. Here’s a guinea. Goodbye.” Perfectly happy. Brand-new thought: go into action.

There’s another therapy. He says, “All I do is sit and think and I just introspect and brood, and I just never get anyplace,” and so forth and so on.

And you say, “Well, why don’t you put some of it into action?”

“Oh, I couldn’t do that.”

“Well, who’s stopping you?”

Oh, the thought that somebody might be stopping him in present time suddenly occurs to him. And he says, “Why, there isn’t anybody much stopping me. Say, what do you know! There isn’t anybody in present time stopping me. You know, my mother and father used to stop everything I did, though. They wouldn’t let me do a thing. Well, I’ll be a son of a gun! There isn’t anybody stopping me in present time. I think I’ll so-and-so and so-and-so,” and he goes into action. And it could be—it could be that idiotically, stupidly simple to solve his problem.

Well, what you’re doing in this case is trying to establish a parity between action and thinking. And remember that there is a capacitance from being to being for action and energy—I mean, action and thinking. There’s a capacity—a person has one and then the other.

If a person has a capacity for being able to think a thought and then move a teapot, and that would be about the parity level on the thing, he’s either terribly down Tone Scale or he just doesn’t have any power—one or the other. He might be all the way up the Tone Scale and might be perfectly happy and cheerful to think that thought and then move the teapot. Strikes you as strange.

But here’s somebody else who thinks the thought. Well, here’s Tesla: He says, “Let me see. You do so-and-so and so-and-so, and you work out the circuit this way and you work it out that way and you work it out this way and work it out that way and you work it out the other way.” Then he goes out to Colorado and he establishes a ground wave and he puts a hundred-horsepower motor to going and he builds some standing waves and he lights a light bulb a few hundred yards away with no wires connected to it. And he says, “Well, that’s perfectly good. All right. I’ll figure it this way; I’ll figure it that way.” And he goes over to Long Island and starts to build the first transatlantic what you would have called today, radio—communication tower. Death caught him before he finished it.

But he wasn’t any guy just sat and thought; here was a fellow—he would think a thought through and then he’d go into action. Then he’d think another thought through and he’d go into action. He was a formidable man, really. Frightening fellow to be around, absolutely frightening. Or at least, so did everybody else working in the field of electricity think that knew him—very frightening. He kept going into action! And Lord knows what he’d think of next! He’d go into action with it; that’s horrible!

Well, that's perfectly all right if you're goofy enough just to sit around and dream up the circuit. "Don't build the circuit. Don't ever mock it up and build it and so forth. Just think about it. That's best. Now, (sigh) we got you under control!"

You'll find the person who is busy trying to write, the artist . . . The rehabilitation of the artist comes right into this field. And you're going to be asked to rehabilitate the artist. There are many ways to rehabilitate the artist: you could rehabilitate his aesthetics simply by picking up the maybes on his aesthetics; that's all—the maybes on beauty and ugliness. That's about all there is to it. When you rehabilitate the artist, you can put him back in action again.

But what is his action? His action is not of a magnitude with his thinking. He sits there and he writes a play and the play consists of terrible human emotions that go pounding around all over the place and empires being blown up and falling apart and so forth. And what is his level of action? Pushing a pen across a piece of paper. No. He'll go mad eventually, just like that. He just—it's not comparable. And he'll get the thought eventually that "When I think of empires going this way and that way and so forth, I know that the greatest amount of action that will occur will be a pencil going across a piece of paper, or somebody picking up a copy of the magazine and turning the pages." Lots of action there, isn't there? Furious action.

The most furious action there is on anyplace—and it does a—oh, boy, does this do a writer a lot of good: take him down to the printing plant when a story is going through. And you'll find out it'll make a considerable difference in his viewpoint.

Here sits the machine—big machines—and they're going whir, crash! crash! crash! And there's magazines coming out all over the place and there's paper coming out, and people are charging around all over the place—on what subject? His story. He'll be enormously braced up. "Look at all the action I caused. I did all that thinking and there's some action. Ha!" He feels pretty good about the whole thing. Before, he looked at it very quietly.

And in any case, your writer—printing presses or no—is going to run down. If you want to rehabilitate an artist, you say, "What did you used to write about?"

"Oh, I used to write about, urn—used to write a lot of flying stories."

"How long has it been since you've done any flying?"

"Oh, not for twenty years."

"Why don't you go out and fly?"

"You know, that's an idea. That's an idea."

It'll work automatically. If you can persuade this writer who is interested in writing flying stories to go out and fly, he'll write a story about flying. Because your theory of flow—thinking to action, action to thinking—is a difference of Tone Scale. It's the band between effort and emotion, and aesthetics and reason—a double band. Aesthetics, reason; emotion, effort. Aesthetics, reason; emotion, effort. And you can get a four-way interchange there; they go into action.

Rehabilitation of an artist is simply rehabilitating him. And the way to really process an artist is by the physical universe. Make him go out and get some incoming motion, some incoming action, which will engage him in action. And now he can have an interchange of flows between.

Now, he's gone ahead and he's gone toward effort and emotion, effort and emotion—from aesthetics and reason toward effort and emotion, toward effort and emotion, toward effort and emotion. Single flow, single flow. And of course, eventually, all the potentials on it are uncharged. He just overbuilt it. And on the theory of single flow—this business of

conservatism, stopping it from going out, sort of apologizing for doing it—will eventually lock the whole flow up, and he won't be able to flow in that direction anymore.

Now, the way to shake the thing loose in present time is simply to get effort and emotion slugging back on the same track, and it will actually shake loose the reason and aesthetics. It'll shake him loose. But you can't make every artist go out and drive racing cars or bum a trip down to Africa and get lions to bite him. You can't do this. Although you will find that the successful artist, the world around—whether it is in the field of music, whether painting or anything else—is the fellow who is continually out on the other side engaging in action.

The writers, the painters, the musicians who have lasted a long time have lived fantastically active lives. It's very well to think of the artist up there in his ivory tower, never moving. Take Ernest Hemingway. He puts out more consistent material—whether you consider it bad or good, it's very consistent. He has an enormous public. And that man never spends a year without going into action. When he was mixed up in writing *For Whom the Bell Tolls*, he was knee-deep in the Spanish revolution. And he wasn't just sitting around twiddling his thumbs in the Spanish revolution, he was throwing back hand grenades. He knew the boys that were fighting the revolution, and he was taking a hand in it himself. And he was having quite a time for himself. He almost never got out of Spain alive a dozen times.

Now, you could unbalance this. This artist can go ahead and work in the field of action, action, action, action, until action becomes the goal. And there again you have got another potential. What you're doing is exchanging between effort and emotion without ever getting into reason. So you could go action, action, action. And that's what happens to your workman, your longshoreman, what happens to your doctor and so forth. Their action is just action, action, action—of one kind. They're—just go on and work, and the work is its own resort.

So, you've got a closed circuit there. And they just go on working and they go on working and they work some more. And your law of single flow will catch up with them. Your workman eventually works himself out, he eventually gets tired; he eventually gets to a point where he cannot, at the crack of the whip, pick up those two hundred pounds and run like a racehorse up the gangplank with them. He can't do this anymore. Single flow has caught up with him. He is engaging in one set of potentials without another set of potentials, to the degree that his set of potentials become inactive.

Now, I don't mean to stress that overly, but I don't think I could stress it too much. I really don't think I could overstress it to you, because it tells you immediately what you do in order to bring a person up into a level of activity again. It isn't enough to simply say we're trying to bring people into action. It isn't enough to say we're trying to bring people into some thinking, some thoughtfulness, about existence. Neither one of those things would give you a therapy. We are not trying to discharge energy out of people, either. Very limited viewpoints. You see that an optimum solution would be an interchange between reason, aesthetics, effort and emotion. And you've got to get that interchange going.

So you look at your doctor, and your doctor—you can—be the dirty trick to pull on a doctor and say, "Well, Doctor, what you need is a vacation. You need a rest." Now, this is practically the only medicine he knows, which says "change environment, change environment, change environment." He knows it, and he knows it works. It has a percentage of workability which is very high—percentage of workability of maybe 20, 30 percent of the people he gives this advice to, when they take the advice, improve.

Well, now let's get it down to refining law so it won't work just 20 percent, and so that the improvement will be very large. Here's your doctor. He's been cutting people up and cutting people up and cutting people up and cutting people up, and he's been applying knowledge and applying it and applying it in skills and applying it in skills—one-way traffic, strictly one-way traffic. He's been applying it.

Now, you don't have to vary the potential very much to get a flow. You just say to him, "Doctor"—let's say he's been working on Park Avenue. You say to him, "Doctor, why don't you go over—Ninth Street, and work over there in the free clinic for children they have over there?"

This doctor has been working with Mrs. Gotbucks. And all of a sudden he's working with these little kids, and the highest pay he gets is one day a little kid that he's helped to walk, by some operation or something, comes in and she's got a flower that she's picked out of somebody's flowerpot, and she gives him this flower. And all of a sudden he sees that that doesn't compare with some other things, and you've got some action, some interchange.

You can throw him over there—if you throw him over into the clinic on that cheap, poor neighborhood very solidly in terms of action, you'd better be careful, because he may have treated Mrs. Gotbucks so long and so arduously that all of a sudden, on just the suggestion of such an advice, he becomes obsessed with Ninth Avenue. And there he is over on Ninth Avenue. And even if he has to live in misery and squalor or something like that, all he's going to do is charity work.

Well now, all you say about Mrs. Gotbucks may be true, but she still deserves some doctoring. And only by treating Mrs. Gotbucks once in a while can he go on and eat, himself, while he treats all these kids. But he needs two levels of activity, at least two levels of activity, which are reciprocal.

Now, Mrs. Gotbucks, for prescribing for histamines histamine, histamine, histamine, histamine, all he has to do is scribble something on a paper and say, "Yes, yes, yes," and scribble it on a prescription blank, and his secretary sends a bill. That's all he's been doing. He receives from Mrs. Gotbucks an enormous—and from that whole practice—what's practically an inflow. He'll really be treating people who don't much need treatment. You get which way that line is flowing? The line he will feel is flowing from the patient to him.

The auditor in the States who has tied himself down to Mr Rich gets to be an apologetic and a sorry case, I don't care what state his case is in, because his present time is no good. And if you, in auditing, neglect the single-flow aspect of present time, you'll fail with preclears; because you may patch them all up in wonderful condition, and then set them back into an environment which they'll be able to charge along on just because you patched them up, but they're going to go the same route. They'll go exactly the same route that they went before.

Now, you see all that is necessary for you to do on a one-way flow: MEST from Mrs. Gotbucks to the doctor—you've got that one-way flow. Well, you just process that as a one-way flow. Spot and assess your case on the lines of what is the one-way flow of the current lifetime. If you want to do just an office patch-up on this individual, assess him on the grounds of what is the one-way flow of the present lifetime.

You'll find some girl, married, whose husband does nothing but talk to her. Talks to her all the time, he never gives her a chance to say a word, and she goes down, down, down, down. She is receiving an incoming flow, and the incoming flow is a one-way flow, you see? A one-way flow can be incoming or outgoing. She's got a one-way flow and a one-way flow and a one way flow and a one-way flow and a one-way flow. It's very funny what she will do if she is suddenly given somebody she can talk at. You'd think, well, she won't talk at this. It'd be your job to find out what she could talk at. And by the way, you can find that on an E-Meter.

You could say, "What do you feel you could talk to? Men?"

Well, you get kind of a sag and she says, "No! No, no, I couldn't talk to men."

"Well, can you talk to other women?"

"No."

“Can you talk to tradespeople? Servants? Well, how about—how about cats? Can you talk to cats?”

New thought: “I could talk to cats. I sure could! Yes sir!” It’ll show up on the E-Meter. It’ll tell you very definitely that talking to cats is not at all disturbing to her, but on the contrary, gives the upsurge of “Gee, that’d be nice.” Think of having a cat. Call up her husband and tell him to bring home a kitten. You think that’s silly, but by golly, it’ll cure more people.

One-way flow. You know the secret behind this thing, and so you can spot it.

This works out again. The psychotic has flowed in one direction until he’s stuck. And he’ll actually stick himself on the time track by flowing in one direction too long and too consistently without anything ever flowing back at him. He gets in horrible shape if he does this, and he’ll become—if you carry it to the ultimate—he’ll become pretty psycho.

Now, let’s take the psycho who tries to help and fails, tries to help and fails; he can’t get a flow. He wants to help his wife—let’s take a case with which we may have a little conversance, which is the same as many, many cases. He wants to help his wife; he wants to help some women in his vicinity. He wants to help them. He can’t. He can’t flow in that direction; they won’t let him. He tries and fails, he tries and fails, he tries . . . They’re showing him all the time, very proudly, “You’re not flowing in my direction. Ha-ha.” All of a sudden the guy gets more and more frantic, more and more frantic, more and more frantic, and he practically spins in.

Well now, you can process it, sure. You can process it; you can put in a lot of hours and pick up all the times that he tried to help women and couldn’t. And then you will find why he’s trying to help women—if you want to go at it on a long session of processing—why he tried to help women, and you’ll find out that that was an overt act of some sort that he performed. You can audit that out, and it will relieve this anxiety about helping women. And quite often when a guy has gone that bad, the only thing to do is locate that overt act.

Whatever he is trying to help, he’s hurt. And you can put that down as a law: Whatever he’s trying to help, he has hurt. And that, of course, is modified by the fact—by the word anxiously. Whatever he is trying to help anxiously, he has hurt. And you better write it down that way, because it’ll—might make you feel or it might make somebody feel, hearing that, that anybody who is trying to help something or is trying to do something or get something done is obviously very guilty.

And, actually, your psychoanalyst sort of underneath it believes this, so that he believes in no motion, you see, if he believes that. He believes nobody should help anybody if he believes that any help is the result of an aberration. It’s not, because get the rest of this law: Whatever he’s trying to help anxiously, he has hurt. And to cure that, you pick up the action and chain of his hurting it, and the times it has hurt him. You get the overt act and the motivator, the DEDs and the DEDEXes off of that channel; just work it back and forth, back and forth, back and forth, back and forth, back and forth.

Flows. And you want to process flows on this. You don’t want to process words; you don’t want to process a lot of odds and ends. You want to process flows.

“Get the outflow of trying to help women—and get it white.”

And the fellow says, “I can’t get it white.”

“All right. Get the outflow of trying to—of not being able to help women.” And of course that’s a sort of an enturbulated backflow, and he can get that white. That’s help and not-help. He can get that white.

You process that until it's white. "Now, get trying to hurt women." Can't. "Trying not to hurt women." Ah, that's the side of the flow you can get.

That flows for a little while, and then you try to get him "trying to hurt women." And you get that flow, that flow is white. "Now, trying not to hurt women." "Now, women trying to hurt you." "Now, women trying not to hurt you." "Now, you trying to hurt women." "Now, you trying not to hurt women." "Now, women trying to hurt you." "Women trying not to hurt you." And the darnedest messes of garbage will come up off of this case, but it's just on the level of white flows, white flows. Get them white.

What's he trying to help? Well, you can get it, then, by trying to help it, being unable to help it. It's trying to help him, being unable to help him. And hurt—his trying to hurt this thing that he's trying to help, and this thing that he is trying to help hurting him. And you get those by dichotomy—positive, negative—each one. Hurting him, him hurting it; him helping it, its helping him. You get the idea?

So that that little axiom or whatever you call it there—that is a process. And that little process—whatever he is trying to anxiously help he has hurt—process the help, process the hurt. And the "anxiously" will come up just as a matter of course. And you'll find that he'll hang for quite a little while, and everything will turn white after he's run this for a little while, on just the subject—"Get the idea of anxiousness." And now, "Get the idea of anxiousness about," let's say, "birds." (He's been trying to help birds, and so forth.) And "Get the anxiousness about birds." "Now, get birds' anxiousness about you." You can process the emotion. But it will turn up automatically; you really don't have to process that.

Okay. Before we go on with single flows, let's take a break.