

HOW TO TALK ABOUT DIANETICS

A lecture given on
26 October 1951

Hitting the Right Reality

I have a little datum for you that I just happened to think of; this has been a puzzle to me for many years. Down in Panama and in other parts of the world, they have a large number of insects that have taken on a complete pattern of ferocity or something of the sort, so that you find a butterfly with a ferocious, snarling face painted on his wings or you find some bug that looks just exactly like a poisonous bug, only he isn't poisonous. It is a camouflage of sorts.

I often wondered how on earth this design came about. It plagued me and plagued me, because the patterns are excellent and the amount of duplicity involved in it is tremendous.

You can find these insects in entomology books, and it would be worth your while to take a look. It is unbelievable that life would make a butterfly and then reproduce an animal's face, teeth and all, on its back. And you don't just imagine you see it there. It is there.

How simple can we get? This is merely a counter-effort. It does it by counter-efforts. What has been killing it? Somehow or other it has gotten fixed up on the basis of counter-efforts, and it just takes the counter-effort and builds a new body just like the counter-effort. It doesn't put the sting in or the poison or something like that; it leaves that out because it doesn't have that.

I wonder how many human beings operate that way. Maybe some fellow has been killed by large, tall men with fierce black mustaches, so in the next lifetime he grows tall and wears a black mustache.

We are out into the blue as far as the amount of stuff we can recover is concerned. Actually, though, we have a very finite package at this time. We have answers to an enormous number of hitherto unknowns or "guessedats." "Guessed-ats" are more dangerous than unknowns, because people with "guessed-ats" will defend to the death their guesses, whereas you seldom get into a fight with somebody because he says he doesn't know.

An overall picture of the subject at this time definitely tells us that we have axioms which embrace all the phenomena. But the phenomena do not have to be listed with the Axioms. The Axioms are just as valid without the complete listing of phenomena. We have taken a departure point in this subject.

I imagine that there is an actual reason for a secret society beginning to use some of its rites secretly. It is because the public won't believe them. They get their hands on certain phenomena which the public doesn't believe and they don't just willfully say "Now, we'll use this phenomena to control a large segment of the populace." They don't say this; they just get driven into doing it. The object, however, is not control; the object is simply to know and to use what one has. There is nothing impermissible whatsoever about telling somebody about this material. But the problem of making them believe it is yours.

You have been into this subject up to your elbows; you know what this stuff is about and you know what can happen. You are trying to tell somebody who doesn't even know there

is a time track that once upon a time he was an algae, and that he can remember it! He says, “Gawp.” You can see why.

The funny part of it is that the basic axioms and standard phenomena can be offered, can be backed up, and can be completely believed. Somebody will walk in on it at his peril, because if he starts walking in on it very far and becomes very practiced in it, he is going to run into the rest of the phenomena. It is inevitable that he will.

However, the superficiality of study of subjects may also make it so that, in the immediate confines of the subject, those who have been trained in the subject know how bad it can get or how good it can get. And others, merely studying from the text, find the material very useful, very usable. They go on using it at that depth and with no greater depth.

What I am trying to tell you now is that you have a subject which explains itself without your introduction of any incredibilities to anybody’s mind. You can tell somebody about this. You can get very simple. You can say, “Well, pain is like an energy, and once a person is hurt there’s a sort of storage record of this energy of pain. Then later on, why, this storage file is brought into present time and the person hurts.”

The fellow looks at you and he says, “Gee, that’s a tremendous thought —something new.”

And you say, “And furthermore, we can work it out. You can take this old file of pain and you can work it out in such a way that it doesn’t bother you anymore.” This is very acceptable, no strain at all—particularly when you start running the somatic and he starts to hurt when you tell him to. He may consider this rather odd and peculiar, but after a while he doesn’t hurt so much, and certainly his sinus trouble has been handled and he isn’t worried about what you hit and knocked out. It was his service facsimile and its attendant locks and some of his conclusions. He just feels fine.

What I am asking you to do is forbear on educating and concentrate simply on doing things for people, because you can wave the magic wand with this subject. You can do things for people. Not until now were we completely beyond depth, because in order to communicate the subject, you put yourself somewhat on the order of a geometry teacher taking a five-year-old child and teaching him geometry. You have to estimate how much the five-year-old child can understand.

“Geometry? Well, geometry is very interesting. You know there are such things as angles.”

The five-year-old child looks up—“What’s an angle?”

“Well, that’s an angle. Now, it can be a narrow angle, it can be a wide angle.”

He says, “Gee, that’s right! I never thought of that before. Tremendous.”

Then you say, “There are circles. There are big circles and little circles. And you look all around the world about you and you’ll find circles—big circles, little circles—angles.”

This child is tremendously edified. He will immediately go out and tell the other children that he knows geometry now. But he won’t know geometry.

People come around to you to work out a problem. You have the mathematics with which to work their problem, you have the data necessary to resolve their problem and you are a scientist to that degree; you have the data. You have to decide whether you are going to act

with your information or teach your information. And even if you decide you are going to teach your information to someone, you have to decide how much.

Never, never try to teach somebody more than he can absorb, because you will just leave him confused. You tell somebody, “Well, a person’s lifetime is very full of pain. They’ve been hurt lots of times, so if you could get rid of all this pain or get rid of the reason to have any of this pain, a person would feel a lot better, wouldn’t he?”

The fellow would be perfectly agreeable.

So you say, “Well, it so happens that there’s a way this pain is stored, and we can knock it out. Now, you just remember this, and you can remember that,” and so on. That is about all the explanation you actually need in order to execute processing on somebody—about all you need to tell them. Don’t tell them anything more; you are wasting your time doing so, because they are not going to understand you unless they go to the beginning of the subject, start in where you did and study all the distance that you have studied—and that is quite a distance.

They haven’t spent the time you have sitting around the couch trying to make a preclear well while realizing that your techniques are not quite adequate, knowing that there are things which you don’t know, wondering whether or not you are doing it all right, looking straight down the barrel of phenomena and trying to make it operate according to your dictates, being triumphant at your small successes and being way down in the depths at your failures, and so on. This is a different kind of attitude than anybody else will really have on it.

But just the same, if you are going to teach this subject, there are two ways to go about it. Somebody says he wants to know all about this subject. You can go about the whole proposition as in a class of actually teaching him the subject by the Axioms, demonstrating each time that you give him an axiom that there is phenomena to back up this axiom. You demonstrate it very quietly and go on.

Or you can teach him in such a way as to simply snow him under, and that has its uses. You could take the book of Axioms and hand it to him and say, “Now I’ll take Axiom One. Of course you are acquainted with physics.” (He flunked this in school, so you have already snowed him under a little bit.) “In the general practice of mathematics, geometry and so forth, we find it necessary to set up an orderly array of data which coordinates. Now, this has been accomplished in this fashion.” (Don’t let him get off on to anything simple enough to argue with—and throw him double talk!)

But don’t be bothered to throw yourself into question and your knowledge—which is very, very good and very wide—into question by trying to talk to somebody who knows nothing about it and trying to unload the whole package on him simultaneously. You can’t do it! And you will wind up by being invalidated or something.

So fix yourself up a little package by which you relay what it is, in order to do processing. If somebody asks you, “What is this?” you simply tell them according to their ability to know the subject. Or you conduct a full class and teach them from beginning to end. Those are your choices.

It is much easier to say “It can do” than it is to say “Well, its intentions in the future are to . . .” You say, “It can do.”

You actually can pull this trick at this time. I tried to tell an attorney one time what this subject was all about. He didn't click on any part of the discussion until I suddenly said to him, "Well, what if you had a sentence that you could issue to an individual with a snap of your fingers and have him roll up in a ball on the floor?"

"Well, that would have some use." (This gives you the point where he was on the tone scale.)

You can actually do that. Somebody starts to tell you something about Dianetics, and you can take a look at him and you can see he obviously has a chronic somatic, that he is disposed to argue with you, and that he is going to be combative and skeptical about the whole thing. Just tell him, "If your head were being pushed, which direction would it be moved?" and make him jockey himself around like that until he finally says, "I've got a headache!"

Then you say, "Well, so you've got a headache. I can turn it off for you," and you turn it off for him. In other words, what I am recommending to you is that you avoid so-called reasoning on the subject and specialize in action, even when you are trying to demonstrate, even when you are trying to teach. Stress action.

You don't realize, because it has happened gradually, the degree to which you have entered a complex and technical subject, and the degree to which you have succeeded in orienting your knowledge of that subject. And you are apt not to realize that it took quite a while, and that the people around you may not be able to come up to the same level you are at in five minutes.

But you can certainly demonstrate that you have considerable force and power if you just say, "Well, now, let's move your head in that direction," and so on.

They become very convinced. They say there is something to it.

We have been talking about handling arthritis. It has perhaps escaped you (I hope not) that arthritis is at 1.5—not 1.4 or 1.6, but 1.5. It is always at 1.5. The fellow might be a 1.5 who is in a momentary, just a twenty-four- or forty-eight-hour, apathy about something, but he is a 1.5. His arthritis will go away when he goes down the tone scale below 1.5, and it will go away when he goes up the tone scale above 1.5.

We have had considerable discussion about holders—the holding and damping out of pain. That is what happens at 1.5. It takes a 1.5 to damp it out and hold a deposit. It is quite a remarkable facsimile that will cause an individual actually to take a deposit of calcium and hold it in suspension in his body. That is quite a holder. That is really a wide aberration; it is physical and it is very bad.

So let's realize, then, that if we are treating an arthritic, we are treating a 1.5. And 1.5s are pretty easy to treat! They are rancorous and cantankerous and they will find a lot of fault with you and so forth at the beginning, but you know exactly what they are doing and you know exactly how to resolve what they are doing.

Neuralgia—so-called—would not be as easy as arthritis because it can be below, above or all around; it is not necessarily in one spot. It is usually, however, down the tone scale to a point where the individual is surrendering to emotion. You go over the category of psychosomatic illnesses and you will find that sinusitis, for instance, does not spot itself, so far as I know, inevitably upon the tone scale. It could be several places because it is just sort of a generalized part of the major syndrome.

A scale of illnesses has not been completed. But you will find that on the Chart of Human Evaluation, in the column on behavior and physiology, depository ills come in at 1.5.

There are other depository ills besides arthritis—many others. There is the fellow suffering from kidney calculi, and lots of them. I am not quite sure where a duodenal ulcer lies, but I think it is just a little bit down the tone scale from arthritis.

Now, you can estimate how long you are going to have to process an individual by estimating how much effort there is left in him to fight the efforts that are hitting him. A fellow in apathy, of course, is pretty close to zero residual personal effort with which to kick back against the efforts which have almost overcome him, so he is kind of rough. At 0.5 he has a little more, but not enough to make a smooth case for you. But at 1.5 the fellow has a lot of personal effort with which to combat the incursion efforts. He takes an incoming force and he holds it and damps it out. That is what he is doing with it. He is not very hard to treat, and the treatment of it is done by rote.

The thing will be a service facsimile and it will have to do with holding or stopping, not changing. So what kind of locks do we look for all the way across the tone scale? If we want to get the entheta locks, we just shoot out all the times when he has tried to hold on to something—particularly times when he has tried to hold on to something and failed—all up and down the track. Those are the entheta locks.

The validation lock is when he succeeded in holding on to something—when he succeeded in stopping, in other words—and not just holding on to something, but stopping. When has he stopped his car? When was he able to stop somebody from moving? When did he stop somebody from talking? When did he stop somebody from walking? When did he stop a clock from running? There is pleasure in that, by the way; this guy busted something—he stopped it, broke it so that it would not move. Locks of this character are what you look for.

And you look for a computation whereby the individual is not permitted to hold on to something.

The service facsimile has demanded a surrender and has caused him to hold on to something, so he is holding on to something to spite somebody. Or he is persisting in a course of action to spite somebody. As he goes down the tone scale he will then refuse changes of action to spite. There is a pattern here. In the service facsimile he is holding on to something. The service facsimile makes him hold on to something and he has accepted this facsimile. But the facsimile came about because he was not permitted to hold on to something.

This is the essence of simplicity. What kind of locks do you look for? Stops! What kind of a service facsimile are you looking for? Where he wasn't permitted to hold on to something. He is fighting somebody; he is holding on to it anyhow on a sub-level. Only now it is arthritis!

So, you get your computation into view and you will find out when he wasn't permitted to hold on to something and so on. You just work it out. It should resolve fairly rapidly.

The reason I have been mentioning arthritis is that it happens, with other depository somatics, to be at a point on the tone scale which can almost invariably be worked. So your resolution of the ill becomes a leadpipe cinch. This person will hold on to his engrams to spite you, but you only want one engram. That is the service facsimile. He will be doing a

lot of dodging with you and it will get worse if you don't process the case the way it ought to be processed, but the processing of it is the essence of simplicity.

Now, when I say "holding," I mean holding on at the 1.5 band.

But do you realize that there are psychotic manifestations of a person not being able to give up any motion? This person can't tolerate any kind of motion at all. His nontolerance of motion is because he is just a tiny bit alive and he is opposing tremendous amounts of motion. You try to give this person any change, any start, any stop, anything, and it is dangerous. He is really holding on, and the motion which is opposed in the service facsimile is just sweeping, destructively and devastatingly, across the individual. It is just going through and by and around. You want to try to address "I," but you only have a tiny little bit to address. The individual tries to come back and he is working against this fact that he can't let go of anything and he can't do anything.

But with a 1.5 there is enough of the fellow there; he has a lot of force.

The arthritic, by the way, is quite ordinarily a fairly forceful individual; ordinarily he is pretty well endowed. It takes a lot of horsepower to hold on to calcium to that extent. So you see the type of person that you are going up against?

Now, an auditor has to be very facile in the way he handles a case. He has to estimate how much counter-effort is sweeping across his preclear, being stopped by his preclear, or being shunted back by his preclear, and operate accordingly, because that gives him an immediate index of how much preclear there is left for him to work on. So he has to adjust his methods accordingly.

But you can take an arthritic and practically bang his head in; you can't upset him very much. The only way that you could really upset an arthritis case is to go lower on the tone scale—go into sympathy. That is going lower on the tone scale than the case. The case then says, "I've got him, so I don't have to do anything." You want to stay higher on the tone scale. Antagonism toward the arthritic does not hurt; that is higher on the tone scale.

The fellow says, "Well, I don't feel like working today."
"Well, that's up to you. It's a nice day—I'd rather go out playing golf anyhow." He will change his attitude right away. "Well, you don't seem to be in the mood to run anything or cooperate today; I think I'll go for a drive." That gets him.

One thing that is interesting about an arthritic at that level of the tone scale is that just the act of somebody walking off or driving off is an enttheta lock because they didn't hold the person, they didn't stop the person. Somebody goes to the grocery store and the 1.5 understands clearly that this individual has to go to the grocery store, yet he will get mad. Then this 1.5 has to have a lot of fancy reasons why he had to get mad; none of them are valid. The only reason that he had to get mad is that something left him.

He is holding solidly on to an antagonistic motion, so he considers all motions antagonistic, actually. He will try to keep anybody from moving, but the way you keep things from moving is by not letting them get out from under—don't let them move out from under.

It is not too bad to have something out there moving in. But something starting in close and going out—no! And once something moves in, he won't let it get out again.

If you have a friend who is an arthritic, you will find that this individual gets unhappy if, for instance, you say “Good night” and walk down the steps. He will hold you in conversation. Of course, that is quite a human trait because people are interested in people, but this individual will go through all sorts of machinations and so forth in order to keep you from leaving. It isn’t that your company is so precious or anything else; it is just that you are something that is not to leave. You are a potential moving-away motion, and therefore you must not move away.

You will find that such people very often are ready to complain that you haven’t treated them right, that you are wrong, and all this sort of thing— “You shouldn’t think things like that,” “You mustn’t move.” And when engaging such a preclear, it is very wise to get the preclear’s medical record and perhaps even X-rays which demonstrate the existence of the condition, and then get the X-rays to demonstrate that the condition has disappeared.

We have ample precedent for the disappearance of arthritis in processing—even when, as I occasionally suspect, it has disappeared because the person has been moved down the tone scale.

You can succeed in changing this fellow by picking up locks and so forth; you can certainly clean up his difficulties.

Now, I would not feel any such security or certainty with sinus conditions, although they are fairly easy to resolve in Dianetics. It is just that you don’t get a pattern package; it is not the same road to process.

There is some possibility that cancer may lie along that line. The individual with cancer is probably in conception or mitosis as an engram. The one he is in depends on the kind of cancer he has. Embryonic cancer is mitosis in restimulation and malignant cancer is conception, merely because the fluids of the body at that time of generation were such-and-so and such-and-so, and this gets into restimulation. Then the cell starts growing madly or you start getting mitosis all over the place and so on. It is a fascinating business.

Have you noticed the “birth wax” on people’s hands occasionally when they are stuck in birth? I can tell a person who is stuck in birth very easily just by the amount of this waxy substance on his hands.

Similarly, cancer introduces certain fluids into the system. At the moment of conception there is a certain generation of nutritional growth balances—growth catalysts—and at mitosis there is another set of them to produce another effect, so that in a case stuck in either one of these areas you would get a type of cellular malgrowth, or misgrowth. The whole body starts to produce these catalysts and some germ cell left around starts to go wild. That at least is a theory behind cancer.

But cancer is of little moment to us. There aren’t anywhere near the cancer patients in the United States as there are some others. When I say it is of little moment to us, I mean this is not a big goal. A lot of good people go by the boards because of cancer, but it is not a major point; this is not a major answer. All I am doing is bringing in the fact that cancer may lie along this 1.5 band, and it would be interesting for you as auditors to see whether or not that holds true. I know arthritis does.

Now, just above this level of arthritis you get minor dampings on motion, and the person gets minor diseases on holding. The minor depository diseases are just a little higher on the tone scale than arthritis. Kidney calculus is not at 1.5, but at about 1.7, 1.8, or even at 2.0, depending on its severity.

So you can feel fairly confident when you tackle a case which is displaying a depository ill that you are tackling something that you can resolve.

But I don't think you should feel the same amount of confidence in tackling somebody who is about 0.2 or something like that. Trying to find enough motion left in them to rehabilitate is a rough deal. That is a real rough one.

You as an auditor, however, might have the tendency to consider the arthritis case tough because the arthritic is combative, and consider the lowtone-scale case easy because it is not combative, it is so placid. So you might have a tendency to give less serious attention to the apathy band, merely because it doesn't give you trouble.

The resolution of the arthritis case is a lead-pipe cinch with present techniques. But what care it requires on the part of an auditor to pick up the little grain of effort that is left in this great mass of counter-effort which is the apathy preclear, and somehow or other build it up in order to get back at some of this other effort and handle it. I point out that this is the case which requires skill in handling—tremendous skill.

Your greatest forbearance as an auditor, of course, is called for at 1.1. Some of these 1.1s will start tearing you up; it is gruesome. They lie on the couch and start to snarl at you, then they pretend that they are being very friendly just so they can get around and chew at you again.

I have had preclears at that level so insulting that I wonder I just didn't bust the couch over their heads. I had one who, every time he would sit down, would say, "You pompous jackass," and start off from there. I would give him just about so long along that line—let him ride just about so long—and I wouldn't say anything; I would be producing an opposite effect. Then he would come around to propitiation, and everything would be nice and quiet.

This fellow was once forbidden to have any more processing by somebody that was working for me. They got mad at him. They said, "No more processing for you."

"Oh," he said, "look, I'll be good. I won't do this anymore—I won't do these mean things, I won't say these mean things anymore, and everything else—but don't do that to me."

He came back, sat down in the chair—"You pompous jackass."

This character, by the way, was stuck in a very, very nasty mumps engram at nine. If I had had Effort Processing at that time I could have saved myself an awful lot of work, because he was right there in that mumps engram. The second he got disturbed the least bit in that motion, he became bad off. He was not convinced that he could handle the counter-effort, but he was still thinking he ought to try.

You will find that the easy cases to do are those that are above 2.0, of course. Hardly anybody above 2.0 gets sick to any great degree; some of them wear glasses.

By the way, do you know how to take somebody's glasses off? Let me tell you that. It is very easy.

Any time you affect one dynamic, you affect them all. Isn't that so? So let's get the locks of stopping anybody from looking on any dynamic, including self. Get all these locks about

stopping people from looking. They exist, though they are a little bit hard to find in most preclears.

Then get, particularly, conclusions that one has to have assistance to look, and I don't mean just glasses. You want conclusions that one has to have assistance to look, and this includes going and getting a flashlight or any time one admits that one needs assistance to see something.

After you have unburdened this for a short time—you have gotten these locks more or less off—you want the effort not to communicate. And you clean up communication setups here and there: the effort to communicate, the effort not to communicate and so on, specializing on this. Of course you will run square into the service-facsimile engram for the glasses. And that is how you get there. Then you just process it out by effort.

Now, you will find that a rape or sexual attack may result in glasses, because this is refusal to communicate. And after all, what is a dental operation but a sort of rape, if you really think about it that way? Somebody is trying to take something away from an only partially reasoning individual who is under drugs. And what does the patient want? He wants to get away—not communicate. Do you get the idea? “Don't communicate with me, don't touch me, don't hurt me.”

So you start up and down the track and you will find incidents here and there, and particularly locks are what you want; you don't want to process a thousand engrams just to get off a pair of glasses. You get the times when the individual didn't want to touch, feel, see, hear, or any of the rest of the package of communication, because that is what you are looking for.

Also, falling out of love with somebody is a decision to break affinity, which can cause bad eyesight. How? Because you have affected C by a break of A—a break of affinity causes a break of communication.

So, run Conclusion Processing on affinity, reality and communication and you will start moving in toward more locks on not letting people look, not wanting people to see, and so on.

It is wonderful how many teachers wear glasses. It is really wonderful how many teachers wear glasses, because regardless of what they think about it, until they get rid of the glasses they will have a slight impulse not to let the pupil see what they are talking about. They won't communicate all they know by a long way.

Now, it is an odd thing that the holding of a secret or the promise not to tell, when picked up, can result in an almost spontaneous remission on glasses.

Do you see why that is? The person has promised not to communicate. And if he was scared or little or something when he made this promise, or if the secret is very big or very dreadful, all of his communication channels get affected to some degree. It is only that it is more popular to wear glasses in this society than it is to be deaf that causes him suddenly to pick up glasses. If it became popular to be deaf, everybody would go around with ear trumpets and their eyes would be all right.

Promises not to communicate, promises not to tell—you will find them effective even when they are in the form of a game played with the big sister or with Auntie—”Now, when Mama comes home we won't tell her what we did, will we?”

“Oh, no, we won’t!”

And the funny thing is that this ties them both to glasses.

That is a handy one for you to get up as an auditor anyhow. There are chains of these doggone things—“I won’t tell, I’ll keep it secret,” and so on.

Take somebody who has been operating very long in intelligence work and you will find he starts to hang glasses on his nose. Take anybody who has been in the armed services, and you will find that some part of his perception will be affected very definitely if he is handling classified material. This is not supposed to be communicated, so it is not supposed to be communicated on that dynamic.

Now, let him get to a moment where he suddenly communicates unlawfully against the decision of the big sister or something of the sort—where he communicated unlawfully and is made to realize that he has broken his promise, where he has failed his own conclusion on the subject of communication—and you have such things as glasses and deafness as a lead-pipe certainty, right there.

So this is the kind of thing you look for in order to take people’s glasses off. And, believe me, you are not going to effort-process off a person’s glasses unless you pick up at least some of the reasons why he has to have the service facsimile of those glasses. So get some of those reasons up.