

THE ANATOMY OF A SERVICE FACSIMILE

A lecture given on
28 January 1952

Preventing Further Overt Acts

We were trying to resolve the problems of the world down here in a board meeting, and unfortunately there are two or three problems which are not yet solved on the basis of the world at large. One of these: we were trying to figure out whether or not Truman should be reelected. We decided that if he didn't let the Defense Department come through with a two- or three-billion dollar air-force contract whereby we make pilots out of these characters they are putting in airplanes — why, if he would come through with that we would let him go in the election!

That's a joke — some of you people are sitting there surly!

This talk may be found to be a little bit technical. I hope not. The title of it is "The Anatomy of a Service Facsimile." I am going to give the whole subject a rundown. And actually, it gives all of Dianetics a rundown too, but perhaps on a little more technical basis than some would care for.

I have had a little present made up here for you: "The Processing of Auditors." If you run this on every auditor that you run into, what do you know, he will turn out to be human underneath it all.

Once upon a time, man got born into the world, one fashion or another, and everything went along fine for the first three or four hundred thousand years. And then he evolved into Homo Sapiens. Well, this wasn't so bad until after Homo Sapiens had been at it for a few thousand years. And even that wasn't so bad until finally they settled here in America and we began to get a Democratic administration, we invented atom bombs....

One out of eight people walking in the society today couldn't pass Dianometry as anything else but psychotic. The doctors complain because they only received 1.1 billion dollars last year for their services. But nevertheless, this means that most of the people didn't pay them. And the people that didn't go to them knew that it was no use, which was the rest of the population.

There isn't an industry or a group or a home that is not being hit solidly and continually by what is laughingly called "psychosomatic illnesses." These are not psychosomatic. Your level of need in this community of America for something efficient is so great that as you sit there, I do not believe you could imagine it. I know I can't.

Every once in a while I throw out my ring of imagination and I get the thought of a whole country without illnesses and without insanity and incapable of being driven by incapables into the overt acts of war, and I can't quite manage it. It is a goal and I can say it in so many words, but that is a pretty big goal. So I think in terms of one community where there would be no illness, where everybody would be very alert, which was a functioning, healthy, happy state. My imagination doesn't go that far. Who knows what a community would be like?

Let's take bacteria that the late Pasteur looked over, discovered, "microscopificated." We find out that bacteria requires three levels: The body must be predisposed to illness before bacteria can come along and precipitate the illness. And then if the body doesn't get well there must be factors there which continue that illness. These three factors happen to be necessary in about 99 percent of the bacteria. Of course, you could take a healthy individual, you could probably take some kind of a germ, virus, and inject him with it and have him die on you — something like the way bubonic plague hit England back in the eighteenth century.

Nobody had ever had anything to do with any bacilli like the bubonic plague, and so the second that it hit, it wiped out tremendous sections of the population.

But you notice there were a lot of people came through it. There were people walking out there and handling the corpses, and — you know, it's carried by fleas — handling people whose clothing contained fleas, people who were bitten by them and so forth, and they lived through it.

The first time this hit — about the thirteenth century, something like that — practically depopulated England. England was depopulated to the extent that it became a pastoral country rather than an agrarian country. In other words, they just knocked off farming — there weren't enough people to handle it — and they invented sheep-raising because it only took one man to handle an awful lot of sheep over a lot of ground. Here was the effect of this disease.

But you notice there were people who lived through it and these people were exposed to it, so we don't even know for sure if such a bacteria as bubonic plague is carried by would have any real effect on a completely well man. We don't even have any concept of what a real "well man" is. So we are working in virgin territory. There is no lack of fodder. Auditors are not going to run out of preclears for a long time — a long, long while.

We have started out on a line in Dianetics that is so new at this point that there are very few auditors who know how to do Dianetics today. There are very few. I know, at the outside, about five, including me.

A lot of these auditors — in the past I would keep coming up with something new; they considered that this was new to the theory of Dianetics. This was new to the technique of application, not to the theory of Dianetics. Dianetics has been so confoundedly consistent since two years ago that every time something new that seems to be new in theory comes up, it swings right around and a new paragraph in the first book comes true with a little different evaluation. As we go, these things we learn.

So what we are dealing with right now is a package of application which does not much change basic theory, but which certainly causes basic theory to be reevaluated here and there. But it is a package of application which unfortunately does not happen to be open to a lot of speculation. It is based on phenomena. If it is done right, the case resolves. If it is done wrong, the case does not resolve. Very simple — open and shut.

Now, Dianetics has never been in this state whereby you could say "Here is the technique of application, and this is what you do and this is what you get." And so it is rather hard for people, perhaps, to recognize that there is such an animal as this giraffe, but there it is. It is no first cousin to mysticism. It is Dianetics. It is it all by itself.

The technique by which Dianetics is done is the technique which I am going to explain to you tonight, and there is no other Dianetic technique! Now, that is a heck of a statement for me to make after all these years telling everybody "Think for yourself" and "Be self-determined." Well, you can be as self-determined as you want to with this technique, as long as you do exactly this way.

In the first book we learned something. Phenomena: An individual receives an injury. He later on will take this moment of injury and he will dramatize it. That technique is fully explained in the first book. That is it!

The combination of this first engram (this moment of injury which is then dramatized by the individual) and the dramatization — these two things together are the service facsimile. Let's make no mistake about this. This is a technique: You can open up the first book and it tells you about what a person will do with one of these engrams, and it says the more he dramatizes it, the more it charges up, and the more the dramatization is broken, the more that engram comes into restimulation.

If that engram includes an injury, at first the individual will dramatize the thought of it. And later on, it will be so broken on him that he will be dramatizing the somatic — that is, the injury itself.

Somebody walked up to him when he was two years of age and punched him in the nose and said, “You’re no good.” So later on in life he punches somebody in the nose and he says, “You’re no good” — just like that: a record (like a phonograph record) dramatization. All right?

The first one — the being punched in the nose — is one part of the service facsimile, and punching somebody in the nose is the other part of the service facsimile. And these two together make the service facsimile. And the whole service facsimile, of course, is actually a chain of incidents, because incidents will fly off of this first service facsimile; they will fly off of it like mad. Now, there we have the mechanism of dramatization. You see how this could be?

We take a fellow whose father spansks him every day: he is five years of age; his father spansks him and says certain things to him. This fellow, in various ways, dramatizes being spanked. If he is unable to dramatize being spanked, he will start demonstrating somatics of spanking — only spanking is much too mild an engram to be much considered an engram. But you get the idea?

A dramatization launched at “optimum” would be that this individual would spank his kids and say the same things to them that his father said. In other words, a piano-player roller starts going around in this person’s mind; early in his life certain things happen to him, and later on in his life he will make these things happen to others.

Now, you can see this in processing people. If you want to look at any child, you can see that he is demonstrating some of the characteristics of his parents or grandparents. In other words, he is dramatizing and these characteristics were included in an injury. Now, actually, it is just as valid as it ever was. There is your basic proposition of Dianetics: An individual records injury and then uses this injury.

The processing of a service facsimile — which merely means the combination of these two things, the person being injured and the person injuring — is done by the techniques of thought, emotion and effort, just standard techniques.

This first, basic injury we will call the motivator; the injury to the individual himself is — we introduce a new term there — the motivator; it motivates his later dramatization.

Sometime during this individual’s lifetime he dramatizes this and he injures another in doing so. When he does this, an emotion of regret will ensue and the individual can be said to have committed an overt act. When he commits this overt act there may show up upon his body the bruises he inflicted to his victim. Only they are not transferred from the victim: they come out of the motivator. The person dramatizes the motivator so exactly that he actually will bruise his victim only — or injure or wound his victim only — as he was wounded or injured, on the comparative mirror image side.

Very simple. This little boy is hit in the nose when he is three years of age. He goes on in life and one day hits somebody in the nose. He realizes that he hit somebody in the nose; he is sorry for it. That sorrow is the time lapse between the two incidents brought together as a justification.

In other words, the individual says, “I had a perfectly good reason to hit you in the nose because somebody hit me in the nose! That is the way people act and that is the way I am acting, and I received the injury so therefore I am perfectly at liberty to hand it out.”

Only society doesn't look at it this way, and people break that dramatization. They say, "You mustn't hit people in the nose anymore!"

The next time he hits somebody in the nose, he develops sinusitis on himself. But what is the sinusitis from, and what somatic relieves this sinusitis?

The motivator. The time he was hit in the nose appears in the dramatization, and apparently what happens (and it happens at such a precise moment, it looks like), as the individual strikes the other individual he gets the somatic back again himself.

What actually happens is the motivator comes up into present time, because he is using it. The facsimile, the memory, contains all physical action necessary for this act. And so the individual has it right there in present time and he hits this other individual and says, "Oh, I'm sorry — I shouldn't have hit you," or something of the sort, and his own facsimile comes right back and hits him. So there is his nose hurting as he has hit the other person's nose.

So apparently you get a transfer of somatics, a transfer of injury.

You will see this manifestation in faith healing. People will transfer, in an effort to cure, injury from one person to themselves and then bear that injury. The joke of it is, they are not bearing the injury of the other person: they are bearing their own comparative injury.

There is an injury in your standard memory bank for every possible injury you may inflict. There are just millions of them. Just take the injuries, bumps, falls, trips, slams and bangs of one lifetime. There are lots of them. You take the somatics of birth: they can be dubbed in for almost anything.

But it is much worse than that, because the injuries that are available to the individual are the injuries that are available down the whole evolutionary channel.

Now, our good friend Freud used to talk about "primordial instincts" that the individual in this civilized world yet suppressed below that level of civilization, that veneer — savage, brutal and bestial instincts which he didn't quite dare let come to the surface. And there was a little man in there named the "censor" who jumped around and prevented these things from coming to the surface. And all the analyst had to do — well, the solution he got was silly, but that far he was right.

It happens that all of these instincts are present. Only they are not instincts: they are memories, complete packages; they contain all the effort there was. How do you think you get a blueprint for your body? How did man get to be man? Well, you have got everything on file that ever happened to that whole line that is you. It is all on file.

So, when an individual has been injured, he is then susceptible to injuring somebody else.

Well, why would these things hang up? What is very special about this service facsimile? It is the fact that the service facsimile means he was injured all right, and there was something upsetting about this injury; it didn't quite add up. He shouldn't have been injured from the quarter he was injured in, or what injured him he doesn't know, or various other factors enter in, and it makes this motivator kind of cloudy to him. He was unconscious at the time — various things happen.

And all of a sudden one day he finds himself misapplying this action.

What injured him was a man, and one day he hauls loose and he hits a little kid — hits him hard, breaks the little kid's face all up, maybe blinds the little kid, something like that. This is wrong. Wrong — wrong release of motion; he did it wrong. And he says, "That belongs over here because it's my motivator, but I don't know, really, what's in the motivator. And this

overt act I have just made against this child — that's wrong," so he feels he had better go back and find out what was right. So he starts back down the time track. That is regret.

Regret merely means wish it hadn't happened — "I will have to back up time. I will have to get ahead of this incident so I can make out that it hasn't happened." That is regret. It is an emotion.

So he starts to slide a little bit on this, and the second he does he runs into his own somatics and he can't get rid of them. And there he is. He is then carrying a service facsimile. Now this will gather locks. Every time he does an overt act in the direction of a child, he will acquire a lock on this incident. And he will become worse off and worse off and worse off.

Two things will happen: (1) he will know it is-wrong, and on his self-determinism attempt in every way possible to restrain himself from using this motion; but (2) he has an unresolvable problem, and the only way he feels he can resolve it is to get rid of the motion contained in it. So he is hung up on a beautiful maybe. What is he going to do with this maybe?

Well, it is very interesting; he will even pick up other somatics and paralyze, by his own volition, the hand he used to smack the child. And yet this is a very simple, mechanical affair too.

When he was injured what did he do? He said, "No!" and put up his hands, and his hands failed to block the blow coming in — whatever it was. And when he dramatized it and did this action (and he knew it was wrong at the time he did it — that is to say, it didn't fit the facts) — he brought his hand up and went smash! — he restimulated his own action of defending himself. He all of a sudden identifies himself with the child. He is sort of smacking himself; he is all confused.

Well, the next time he hits a child this arm sort of starts feeling floppy. Why? Because it is a defensive failed action that is keyed in. And actually his whole side will go that course. What is paralysis? Computationally, it is just an effort of restraining oneself from committing an overt act.

What is bad teeth? Just that — restraining oneself from biting. If your teeth get bad enough, you won't bite. You take anybody with bad teeth — his teeth are falling out — and you ask him to start biting.

He will say, "Start biting what?"

And you say, "Just go on and bite."

"But bite what?"

"Well, just bite."

And the fellow will say, "Well, all right.... I don't know what this is all about, but I sure got an awful pain in the back of my neck." And the first thing you know, "I feel terrible!"

Well, a person shouldn't feel terrible. What do you use your teeth to do? I mean, you just use them to eat with — "obviously" there is nothing on the genetic line.

Once upon a time man had awfully large choppers. And when he bit, things stood there and got bitten and it did a lot of damage. Your teeth have receded so you can't bite that way anymore. You fixed yourself up. You were too dangerous, because the more you used this facsimile of biting, why, the more misapplied it became, so the more you got the somatic.

It is very mechanical. It is in terms of statics and motion, actually — this whole thing is — but I am explaining it on a humanized basis of the fact that the person realizes he did wrong and he

wishes he hadn't done it, and he says, "Oh, well, I shouldn't have done this." And the more he regrets it, the more he comes down tone scale. And the more he comes down tone scale, the closer he gets into the physical condition he was in when he received the motivator, which is of course down around 0.0 on the tone scale — if not at 0.0, death. And so he is in apathy and he has gone back into the point of being the victim.

Now, two things he has a choice between: He has got this terrific motivator; something was done to him sometime in his lifetime. The only way he can possibly get rid of this motion is to do it himself; he has still got that motion hanging up in his memory, and it worries him because it is on a maybe.

Did you ever hear of the abreaction of hostilities? Well, if a person can be as mean as people have been mean to him, he is healthy. But the second something blocks him from being mean, he starts getting sick. This is why sergeants are so healthy.

Now, when it comes to this problem, it is the simplest possible problem in terms of differentiation and identification. The individual has been hit, so he hits somebody: Justification is "Well, I was hit, so therefore I can hit" — like "Well, you did it to me first! I have every right to do something to you, because look what you did to me." That is the argument you always get in justification. Well, it is this same argument that goes inside the fellow; he says, "Well, I was hit; therefore I can hit!" And he tries to go around explaining it, but he doesn't explain it lucidly like this. He says, "Well, she was mean to me, and Oscar Zilch did this," and yak, yak. He hasn't got any explanation.

Society objects to what he does with this overt act. Society does object and people object to individuals who walk down the street, suddenly grab them by their throat, throw them down against the pavement and pound their brains out on the curb. The police have been known to object to this.

Well, the society will make him regret it if he doesn't. And of course the second he realizes "I shouldn't have done that," why, then he goes back to find the reason why he shouldn't have done that. And what does he develop? Migraine headaches. It takes that severe an engram to make a migraine headache, by the way.

So, we are down on the most basic mechanics you can possibly be on, here in Dianetics. That is the proposition. In order to resolve the service facsimile, we must find the overt act because the overt act has all the charge on it. But in order to resolve the charge off the overt act — that is to say, the dramatization of the service facsimile — we have got to pick up the emotional shut-off. And where is the emotional shut-off? It is in the motivator, because an individual generally does not break down and weep in the face of his enemies. He tries to be as unemotional as possible — demonstrate to the greatest degree either that he has been hurt too much or that he hasn't been hurt at all. So, one, you get an enforced emotion, the other way you get an inhibited emotion. Your emotional shut-off is in the motivator of the service facsimile — the first incident of being hurt — and the emotion is in the second part of it, so it is very hard to take these two apart. But it is very easy to take them apart now: You take them apart by thought, emotion and effort, and that is all there is to it.

Now we are back at a simpler level of operation than Dianetics was in when it was first released. It is simpler to take apart a service facsimile than it was to take apart early engrams.

It is not necessarily true that an individual who has not had his service facsimile removed cannot remove service facsimiles, but it is true that the service facsimile is a pretty bloody affair and that auditors, after they have run them for a short time — brrr! These auditors are generally sinners to end them all — just as any other Homo Sapiens is. You have got about three hundred thousand years of overt acts to resolve, and it takes hours to do it.

Now that, by the way, is sin. A man is trying to live and survive through all his dynamics, and it actually does cut his survival down — it markedly cuts his survival down — to injure another

dynamic. And the mechanism which prevents him from doing this is the service-facsimile mechanism. And this is why we call it a service facsimile: because it is used by the individual; it and its lock chain are used. You will find that there is generally one of them in a case. You may have to run six, eight, ten incidents in order to finally get the service facsimile that contains all the charge on the case.

As one fellow said after it has been run out, why, it is just like putting him in a brand-new airplane; he doesn't quite know where all the controls are. I mean, the release is tremendous.

How does this compare with the Axioms, and what do the Axioms have to do with it? Well, this thing tracks down the Axioms right down the line: Every axiom — axiom after axiom — is delineating the various phenomena and laws relating to human behavior, and in particular directs one immediately to the service facsimile.

What is the thing that the life static does? The life static is the source of life. It can motivate and animate matter. How does it do this? Matter is motion. Motion touches the source of life, and the source of life uses this motion. Any motion it receives, it uses. And as long as it is capable of using every motion received or handling every motion received, it is well, powerful, constructive, and goes along on the optimum solution that it must behave for the good of all dynamics.

But one day it gets a motion it can't handle; something happens to the organism which it cannot use for the good and constructive preservation of the dynamics themselves. Something happens to it; it doesn't figure, all of a sudden.

For instance, parents are supposed to raise children so that children can grow up and become parents; there is a basic law in operation. So one day this little kid is standing there and his parent turns around, picks him up by the heels and bashes his brains out against a tree. This is unexpected, unusual.

If you don't think that incident is on record . . . Anybody here want a headache? You have had your brains dashed out one way or the other. But we don't necessarily have to turn these things on, because you are handling that. After all, what is getting one's brains dashed out?

But getting one's brains dashed out by a parent would be some kind of a problem; that would be a bit of a problem, wouldn't it? A parent is supposed to raise you and take care of you; you are supposed to be nice to the parent and yet the parent kills you. Well, it would be very upsetting.

But of course, the funny part of it was the parent thought you were a wild animal and you rushed out from behind the rock, and you never got this equation at all because your brains were dashed out at the time. Sounds pretty wild, doesn't it?

Well, that's mild! Some of you people should audit some of these service facsimiles. Boy, they are wonderful! Edgar Allan Poe should be here (if he isn't).

So, an individual, in other words, is behaving straight along this pattern of motions as laid down in the Axioms. What is the initial part of it? ARC, the static and so forth; it handles motion. Then one day in comes a motion and it picks up this motion to throw it back; it is too hot to handle. But what do we do with it? It is wrong! This motion means non survival on some dynamic or other, but it certainly means non survival on us. What are we going to do with this thing? It's wrong, it doesn't add up, it is painful and it is non survival, and yet the individual has got it.

What is thinking? Thinking is the process of picking up relatively related or disrelated memories and combining them into a new thought. And whenever you failed to solve a problem it was because you didn't combine these memories into a new thought and label it "concluded." The second you say "conclusion," this package of thoughts will just drop back on

the track out of your road. And that is how you can think about one thing one minute and another thing the next.

But I will give you a little experiment (if some of you aren't doing this already): Think of something that you intend to do, and just don't bring it up to a point where you make a conclusion. Now think of something else that you ought to do, but don't bother to bring that to a conclusion. Now think of something else that you ought to be doing; now don't bother to bring that to a conclusion. You are going to be uncomfortable. Why?

It is very simple. It is because you never balanced off these things to make a new package. So you still keep them sort of floating in the air like a juggler juggling Indian clubs or something.

Here is a thought package; that is how people think: They take old memories and they bring them together and recombine them into new conclusions and then they file those. And then they have new experiences and new observations and they pick up old ones and compare them and so on, and each time they arrive at a conclusive statement. Right or wrong, it doesn't matter, as long as it is concluded, actually.

A fellow who decides to burn down the local schoolhouse with all the students in it may be thinking kind of wrong from your viewpoint, but he won't go crazy unless he wonders whether he ought to do it or whether he oughtn't. And then you get your obsessive-compulsive picture: the person who must do something but can't.

What is this act I was just talking about? This fellow who has had his head bashed out, and it was a non survival action. Now what does he do with this thing? He carries it with him all the time; he doesn't quite know what to do with it. He wears it around his head like some people think they see halos.

Here is all of this package, and one day he gets caught a little bit off balance and this thing is so hard for him to figure, it goes into action immediately, and he picks up a child — something like that — and bashes its head in. Only it is his kid, and the wife objects. There is the wrong use.

Now, he will go on and repeat that act several times, by the way. And then one day he will realize that he no longer can be trusted; he has all of a sudden taken a complete split with his self-determinism. He says, "I can no longer be trusted by myself to do what I am supposed to do." He catches himself in the act of doing something wrong that he knows is non survival — he recognizes it is non survival — and at that moment he cancels himself out as a person of trust. This, basically, is every criminal there is! And this, basically, is every human being there is.

There is evidently nobody who has come up that time track without getting a service facsimile.

Now, here's your individual: What does he do about this motion — this motion that he got way back there? Now it has got two sides to it: This motion says, "Do it! Do it! Do it!" and this motion says, "Wrong! Wrong! Wrong!" And it says, "You do it with your right fist" — "Wrong."

One day he knows he is going to do it; he is going to get mad. He will be so concerned about it and he will feel so badly about having used it that the next time he even starts to use it he is liable to get a complete switch and this arm is liable to paralyze.

By the way, there isn't a single person I have talked to yet who has a balance of muscular control, left and right. You know that most human beings, the thought of reaching out and striking — you get them to do that a few times, their hand gets all weak.

You ask this human being, "Well, reach out with your right hand and strike." He will go on and strike; it is perfectly all right. "Take your left hand and strike."

“No.”

“Well, go ahead.”

“No! “

“Why not?”

“Well . . . just no!”

“How does your left arm feel?” you say.

He says, “Limp.”

“Why does it feel limp?” He doesn’t know.

What has happened there is he has reversed clear around on this facsimile to a point where this arm, which is supposed to deliver the blow, is held in check. The memory in its muscles has gotten to the point where every time it starts to take any action, it will kind of swerve off toward taking a wrong action instead of a right one — just a little bit wrong.

Anybody here ever know a person who couldn’t hit the proper notes on a piano? This person is so afraid of the overt act and is so driven by the motion that he has gotten himself rigged to a point where he has got to be wrong — just a little bit wrong.

Now, in order to win in life, a person has to be on the winning side of a service facsimile. The winning side of the service facsimile is very simple. Everything has its personnel. You take the motivator, this first incident. In this motivator the individual was hit by another individual. When he is hit and knocked down, there he lies; he is not in good shape like he used to be in. In fact, very often he is dead. Well, that is the wrong side of it; that is losing. Obviously the winning side of the facsimile is to hit somebody else and knock them dead, only that is antisocial. When the person finally does hit somebody that hard, he goes into this state of mind right away: It says he can’t win — he regrets winning — but obviously he can’t lose because he would die, so he must hang somewhere between win and lose.

And if you look at the tone scale from 40.0 down here to 0.0, here is win for all dynamics, potentially, but here is win with action, and here is lose. How thoroughly can you lose? You can die.

Now, a gradient scale between win and lose determines where an individual is on the tone scale. And you want to know why an individual below 2.0 takes care of his things badly, handles himself poorly, comports himself badly, is destructive to other individuals and so forth? He has gotten down to a point where he has got to lose; he actually wants to be killed! He is on the losing side of it to a point where death is preferable. He has got to lose, and he will lose if he has to kill himself and kill you too.

Up on the winning side of it he is perfectly safe, because if he were all the way up on the winning side the problem would be resolved. It is only an unresolved problem that is a big maybe.

Why do human beings act like human beings act? They are trying to lose, most of them. They talk like they want to win, but they don’t dare win.

You remember a time in your life when you felt very competent with your hands? That was before, in this life, your service facsimile kicked in again. You felt very competent physically. You felt like if you got out on a dance floor, you could dance beautifully. You felt like if you took up something or other, you could take it up. You could win, in other words. You could

use motion to accomplish maximum operation or action — good action, good survival operation.

But then the service facsimile keys in, and what do you have to do then? You can't win. What is winning? Your service facsimile says that to win you kill somebody.

When he gets to 1.5, he will do just that; the closest he can get to winning is by killing somebody. So what does he do? He holds himself continually. He reverses everything, so black becomes white. That is as close as he can come to survival, but he is already succumbing. He is on the losing side.

Now, if he gets convinced more and more and more that his service facsimile was wrong, that his overt acts are terrible, if people are working on him constantly, continually, hour in and hour out, day in and day out, on how wrong he is, they will kill him just like that. 1.5s are very vulnerable, 1.1s are more vulnerable, 0.5s are almost out the bottom, and you can do anything to an apathy case. I swear that you could kill an apathy person merely by a fast motion of your hands.

And the reason they are trying to die is very simple: it is so they won't kill. But they kill in trying to die. In other words, here is a big maybe — your terrible paradox. The service facsimile is difficult to run only because it contains blood, death. A service facsimile will not resolve by addressing one lifetime — namely this one. You cannot achieve this effect by addressing this lifetime only — unfortunate for them as have such horrible overt acts in their past that they can only face one life at a time.

You will find out, by the way, that the people who cannot face an earlier overt act than this lifetime are people — you know why? — way down the tone scale. And you talk to these people about living before and boy, do they let out a scream — “Mm-mm! No! No sir. Impossible! Couldn't! What's the idea, inferring something like that?” Yak, yak.

And yet the most logical approach to this business of living demonstrates that you couldn't possibly have any preventers against death unless you had the experience of death in your own bank.

By what necromancy did people before Dianetics think life was carried forward? Well, they never bothered to explain, but they didn't bother to explain anything else either, so there is your point.

And by the way, this isn't even in argument with the Holy Bible. You ever read in there where it says you will just go on and get born, brother, over and over and over and over and over, and maybe someday if you are a good boy, maybe you will get to heaven, but not now, fellow. You want to read the New Testament with that in mind and you will find it confirmed all the way through. It is very interesting. So I support myself by authority if you won't believe me by reason.

And quite in addition to something else, if you still want to argue about it, make this little test: Envision a face up here, and reach out and grab it by the throat and squeeze, and then bite the face off. And practice that a few times. Do it quietly when you are alone someplace and there is no help at hand. How do you suppose your space in front of your own face will suddenly disappear? Why will you start to cough and strangle? You know very well in this lifetime you never bit anybody.

There is something very funny: You can take a person who has a paralyzed leg and you can say, “Go on, kick somebody in the knee. Kick somebody in the shins. Just go on.”

They say, “Why, I've never kicked anybody in the shins!”

“Did you ever kick anybody at all in this lifetime?”

“No! “

“Well, kick somebody in the shins.”

“All right.” And they start imagining themselves kicking with this paralyzed limb. And the first thing you know, the most fiendish light will come into their eyes, and they wanted to kick Bessie and Agnes and Mable and Grandma and Papa and so on. And they will kick and kick and kick, and pretty soon they will run out of things to kick. And then all of a sudden they will find something they actually kicked — a tin can one day. Then they will be fairly happy about the whole thing, but they are getting this kick effort off. You say, “Go on and kick some more!”

“Well, I think I’ve kicked enough.”

“Go on and kick a few more times.”

“Well, all right, if you say so.” They are not feeling good about this.

Women for many, many thousands of years have used their feet. A man has fought with his hands, teeth, but women have fought with their feet to a large degree. If you ever see a girl get mad or get in a fight, she will pull the other girl’s hair and kick, use her knees, her feet and so forth. And I dare say a census would demonstrate that women’s legs are ordinarily weaker than men’s legs. Furthermore, you take a woman — just as a matter of fact — and you just have them start stamping on somebody’s teeth, and what will happen to their own teeth shouldn’t happen to people.

Now, it isn’t any imagination that you can suddenly dream up an injury enough to make a preclear sit in the middle of the floor and scream, because these are real somatics. You think you have had something to do with somatics before — hah! That gives to laugh.

The somatics are rough enough to be the equivalent — when a person gets a musket ball through his stomach, he gets a musket ball through his stomach. And of course, before, it happened quick and he died fast, but when you are processing it out it is much worse, because it is with full volume but it takes longer. And you get the motion of the spine — the bones of the spine — to deflect the bullet: “Let’s go over that. Let’s go over it again. Let’s go over it again. Let’s go over it again. Let’s go over it again. All right. Now let’s shoot this fellow in the stomach.”

“Oh, who? Somebody else?”

“Yeah, let’s shoot somebody else in the stomach.”

“Okay. Bang! Oh!” Terrible — the terrible accuracy of this!

One of the boys in the physics department at Columbia, shortly after the first book on Dianetics was issued, came over and he said, “I just wanted to meet you,” he said, “because of the diabolical accuracy of your predictions as to what happens in the human mind!” He was furious. After he said that to me, he walked out the front door and disappeared — never saw him again.

You want to process preclears for blood and have them recover well and fast, you use this service facsimile, and that is the technique which you use. And if you don’t want them to recover, do something else.

The techniques in the handbook are mainly addressed to the first dynamic. That book will resolve a case on the tone scale, because an individual becomes more and more the first

dynamic as he goes down the tone scale. So you get an evaluation on the part of the individual; you get his evaluation of what is happening — to him.

Actually, what is terrifically aberrative is where he has made an overt act out of what has happened to him — his misapplication of motion. And what is aberration? Aberration is just miscalculation of effort, and that is all this service facsimile is: you receive a motion and you try to put it out again and you miscalculate it. You put it out wrong.

Now, many philosophies of life can be worked out of this; a great many philosophies of life have been worked out of these observations. None of these observations were complete; they were very remote from their completeness.

Dianetics very probably is not complete, because we have not gotten a quart of theta yet!

But the diabolical accuracy of what will happen to the preclear when you do and say certain things to him — it used to be very, very astonishing to somebody. A lawyer was arguing with me one day and he said, “Well, what’s this thing, Dianetics, you’re working on? I heard about it and I. . . Well, nobody can solve this problem, anyhow. Everybody tried and there’s no solution there or anything. What use would it be anyhow? People are better off dead anyway,” and so forth. He was giving me all this line of chatter.

And I said, “Would it be to any advantage, to you, if you could merely snap your fingers in a person’s face when he was sitting on the witness stand and utter one sentence to him and have him roll up in a ball and fall on the floor incoherent?”

And he said, “Yeah, that would be pretty useful! Can you do that?”

“The file clerk will now give us the engram necessary to resolve the case.” Bang.

He said, “The what? The what? The what?”

“The incident,” I said, “the incident.”

He said, “What? What?” Bang.

Now, that won’t happen with everybody. There are many people to whom this will not happen if you do this. Your occluded cases and so forth are not that much in touch with this sort of thing, but yet it will happen to an awful lot of cases. They don’t know anything about Dianetics at all. You just ask for the engram or the incident or the painful moment necessary to resolve the case, and the file clerk has been sitting there like a coil steel spring for the last three or four thousand years. The first thing the guy asks for, he gets, right now. Spooky.

But now, on the service facsimile, you don’t have to have a well coordinated, smooth-operating file clerk. The person can be psychotic; they can be way down the tone scale and you can still get some of these manifestations out of them. You may not be able to persuade them to hit somebody in the jaw or something, but you certainly can turn on something, and it will be way down the time track. You won’t turn on anything in this life if you start asking for the service facsimile.

And if you try to keep a person to this life or if he insists on keeping to this life, you are just wasting your time. To find out this, I have brutalized some cases lately; I made them stay in this life and tried to resolve their cases. And I let the first one drop through, and boy, he went like, well, someone falling into the infernal regions — a bat, let us say.

So, there is the magic involved. Does it work? Yes!

Now, someone can come around and tell you this is an illusion out of birth — nuts! I wish to comment on that: Nuts! Somebody can tell you this is delusion. If they tell you this is delusion,

their level of reality is very low. Look them over for it and send them to psychiatry, because all psychiatry is so low on the tone scale that it is nothing but delusion. They call everything delusion — hallucination, delusion.

You can actually take a psychiatrist back down to the time he is one year of age, sitting there in his crib sucking on a bottle, and he will say, “Isn’t this a funny hallucination?” (suck) They have specialized on calling it all hallucination. The first requisite to enter that field is to have what is called an “invalidation restimulation” — in other words, be in a service facsimile which a person has handled by saying it didn’t exist. You take off from there, spring up the time track, live with this service facsimile by saying it doesn’t exist. Of course, you would have to say everything is nonexistent, too. By the time you’ve pronounced all hallucination, delusion — right in their textbook they are so naive. There is one textbook that is the standard textbook of the University of Michigan — I think it is — and one of the paragraphs in there quotes a case by saying, “‘Well, I considered myself to be in the prenatal area. As a matter of fact, I was feeling pretty good, but they carefully explained to me that I was not in this part of my life at all. And it all seemed so real, I was very confused. I wish that I could believe in it, because it all seemed so real to me.’ It was explained carefully to the patient that this was delusion. She was then hospitalized for another three months.” In other words, they drove her crazy. That is right in one of their textbooks.

A summary, by the way, of psychiatric treatment is in my hands, if psychiatry wants to get rough — all the quotes, all the quotes, concerning the use of electric shock, psycho surgery and so forth. We have assembled a full report on it. They say themselves it doesn’t work. They say themselves that psycho surgery and electric shock and insulin shock and all the rest of these things do not work, and that psychoanalysis doesn’t work either.

Well, they have just said they don’t have any reason for existence. Well, we agree with that.

A picture now, a slow motion picture, of what goes on with what an individual does with motion — a motivator, the overt act — and what happens to him.

All right. Here is an individual; he is minding his own business and somebody comes up and gives him a heck of a sock in the jaw. Crash!

We will take a very light example; you understand, service facsimiles aren’t this light. This just merely breaks his jaw and knocks most of his teeth out — mild incident. Somebody walks up to A — that is the victim, that is our character — and this is A’s time track; somebody walks up to him, hits him in the jaw and knocks his teeth out, breaks his jaw and knocks him down. This is received motion; we will call this the motivator. A receives a broken jaw and gets minus his teeth, and this, we conclude, is a motivator. Now, obviously, as everyone will agree, A lost. A lost.

The motivator, then, is losing. He lost there. Well now, it is non survival to lose; one should try to win in life.

So, as A goes along in life he is threatened with a situation which approximates being socked in the jaw again.

Well, it is very simple; he figures that this is the kind of a situation where he would be socked in the jaw. He’d rather have it this way: this is the kind of a situation in which you sock people in the jaw. Because up here was B; B socked A in the jaw, so the best solution is to become B instead of A. A, after all, gets a broken jaw and loses his teeth. So let’s become B. “B socks people in the jaw and wins,” it says here in the memory bank.

So here is this situation in which B valence is used against C. Now, here is A being B to punish C. What does he try to do to C? He will hit C exactly as B hit A. In other words, what he is doing here: A is being B because it hurts to be A; so he is being B and he meets C and the situation evolves whereby somebody is going to get socked in the jaw; and the best thing to do

is to sock C in the jaw, not to have C sock A in the jaw. So what he does is — bang! Now we have the overt act.

What actually happens is A socks C in the jaw, using the same calculation and motion he received from B. And C drops to the floor, spits out teeth, looks bloody and, in fact, looks just like A did when A got knocked out — just exactly. But nevertheless he says, “Well, I’m B and I win.”

Well, then he finds out that C has a wife and five small children. And C doesn’t have any money and the doctor bill was thirty-three hundred dollars and the doctor did nothing. And he couldn’t go to work because, well, he was having a hard time getting along anyway, and now that he is sick he can’t go to work. So he loses his wife and family some way or another; they have to go back home and live with Mother, or something. This fellow is crippled; he doesn’t look good anymore. And A sees C hobbling around town with his face all out of line and no teeth. And he sees him become an alcoholic and he sees him become a bum and he sees him down at the flophouse.

Here is a nice dramatic situation. You see, it is very non survival to A to have a character around like C, because C is another dynamic and that isn’t the way you make the world get on.

Well now, A can put a very hard face on all of this and say “Oh well, no,” because somehow or other he has got to maintain his position as B or get a bad jaw himself.

But one day as time goes on, he finds out that C committed suicide. Of course, he traces it all back on cause and effect and blame to himself and that sock on the jaw. Now, the heck of it is, for his benefit of reasoning he doesn’t even know that this was motivated by B and A in a quarrel; he just figures he did this all by himself. And here we go, and here is C, stone-cold dead in the morgue, and it is his fault. Deep regret ensues. Well; that is actually the overt act. But now to make this really grim, we get a second overt act which is just a lock on the first facsimile, but it sort of starts charging it up.

It said in the first book, any physical-pain engram can later on be charged with emotion. Any secondary engram, any emotional engram, such as a shock, grief, something like that, that is purely analytical but becomes grief, depends for its force upon the physical pain underlying it. In other words, there has to have been physical pain around to make this thing work.

One day he is terrifically harassed; he is low in tone because of this service facsimile in operation anyway. He knows he is going to win, but shucks, he is hanging by this time so far toward lose — see, if he had been himself, why, this guy wouldn’t have gotten it, but he was being this person, so this guy got it. And his wife starts yow-yowing around at him and life starts to look kind of rough, and all of a sudden he hauls off and hits her in the jaw. He uses this on his wife! Well, gee, it was bad enough to use it on another human being, but to use it on a woman, and one that he has made postulates must survive! He has said, “I love you. I’m going to cherish you. I love, honor and obey you,” or whatever you say to women when you marry them. He has made these postulates; “I am going to take care of you.” And there she lies — very non survival, regret.

He thinks to himself immediately, “Oh, if I could just help her out in some fashion or other.” Well, of course, how can he help her out? There are two ways: He regrets having hurt her, so he wants her to heal up her face right away, so he actually turns on an effort to heal up her face, in his face. That gives him the somatic. That is one. But the somatic (where it comes from) that he is trying to heal up is back here. He brings this engram right up — wham! — and says, “Look, that isn’t my wife lying on the floor, it’s me.” All of a sudden he almost looks at the truth of the situation — smash! These two things come together and he gets full somatics.

Now, it looks very mysterious. He hits somebody and he gets the somatic. He has got a service facsimile. (I am just plotting this out as though it occurs in one lifetime just to show you its anatomy; it actually occurs over a longer space of time.) But after that he will go around with

neuralgia; he will go down to the dentist and have his teeth pulled out because they hurt. (And the dentists all tell you that that is abscesses; they want to make a fast buck too.)

And in short, he goes around not daring to be A but approximating it pretty closely, and he is in the losing side of the valence. Well, he is well down tone scale; he doesn't dare win. And all of a sudden he doesn't dare win in anything, really, so he will make halfhearted efforts in various directions; he becomes your average Boeing employee.

So anyhow, the point here is, as we get up the track, this fellow now has a service facsimile keyed in, and what has been his emotional tone change? Here is your scale which follows that; we'll say that's 20.0, that's 2.0, and here is 0.0. Zero is death; 20.0 is the great optimum. He was pretty well up here before he got hit; he got hit and he came down there. And then he came right up again, and then he got along here, and then one day when he met C he swept down to there, but he got up here kind of a little bit, and he went along here — boredom, average, normal. He got some regret, he got a little bit more regret here: he began to find out what bad things he had done to C. And when we get over here to where he hit his wife, he comes down here and becomes an average human being. And there he is, there he is: dead!

That would be about the tone level that is taken on a service facsimile, and I don't care whether I have drawn this line for a thousand lives or one life. It is the same thing.

Now, let me show you the exact mechanics of this thing, because it is about as mechanical as a Model-T Ford — a lot simpler, simpler even than a Gillette razor blade, even those new ones.

Here we have this overt act. The common denominator of all of these acts is unconsciousness. Here this individual is hit; he goes unconscious. During that unconsciousness he records what goes on. We don't even have to worry about that now; I mean, we don't have to prove that one way or the other. We know he was hit, and when he woke up he sure had a sore jaw. Now, unconsciousness ensues there. Remember that he went unconscious at this point where he was hit; he was shaken up.

What do you think happens when he hits C? I wouldn't let the cops know if you go out and make this experiment, and I wouldn't even actually do it on another human being — I would take a brick wall or something. Or you could even do this trick: Let's be sensible. Let's take a heavy, hard pillow and put it up against the wall, and you haul off and hit it with your fist — hard! Hit it three or four times. You will find something interesting takes place. There is enough jar and shock on your fist to enturbulate the vectors of force — jar with the fist, enturbulate the vectors of force. (Unconsciousness is just misaligned force vectors through the nervous system.) Up travels this shock, goes into the nervous system, and the individual for a split instant goes unconscious. It might only be for a half a second, but it is normally longer than that. When you hit a heavy blow like that it is quite shaking.

During unconsciousness, a person's memory files go off. The file is not compared to the environment exactly, and it is during this moment of unconsciousness (he is recording during that moment, by the way), during that jar, this shock, he sees another human being falling. He records this. He himself is off-balance, and he does an identification with this other human being, just like he did an identification with B. He switches valence. He switched valence to get into B's valence to save himself from falling when he went unconscious; that is to say, the jar, shock, the whole world — A=A=A=A. Everything is everything: he was B. and B was the sock, and unconsciousness is B. and unconsciousness is A, and he gets confused. If you have ever been hit in the jaw, you know how you get confused.

All right. The next thing happens here when he hits C is he gets an instant shock of unconsciousness, and what you have got there is a real, honest-to-goodness, dyed-in-the-wool key-in — a perfect one. There is your key-in. The individual at this point, actually, has used this facsimile; he has used this memory of hitting somebody — that motion — and when he hits somebody else he is using that facsimile to pattern his action. In other words, he remembers how you hit people because he has been hit.

Now, here he goes — shock and so forth. He has an incident lying on top of the first incident and both of them are hung together by unconsciousness. They are lightly keyed together — that is true — but unconsciousness is clear down here at the bottom of the tone scale. You get a person far enough down there and he will be unconscious. Death is preceded by unconsciousness and unconsciousness is somewhat synonymous with death. So he has got this all set.

For an instant he was one with the fellow he hit, and he will even do this action: he will confuse himself as having been hit. He will hit and then he will see this fellow fall, and he will try to straighten himself up to straighten the other fellow up. Very simple. The second he starts to do this he holds himself in the instant, completely aside from the fact that he is trying to hold himself erect after he hit this fellow.

Now, time goes on. There is his most vivid recollection of C — is the moment of shock. If you don't believe this, you can take a person who has made a practice out of hitting people and you can ask them to go back down the time track a little bit, and you ask them to see if they get any little pictures. Oh, they will have pictures! They will have a little picture of everybody they have knocked out or mangled or had mayhem on — just little pictures. They are out of size, they are not real visios; it is very interesting. That is the moment of stop. Well, of course, they got the stop all confused; they think they are stopping this person from hitting the floor. Actually, all they are doing is keeping from falling down, clear back in this original engram.

All right. Now, we find out that C has just committed suicide or something of the sort. "Boy, was C down." The person isn't analytical about this: "Well, he was down and he's dead, and I must have killed him. Well, I couldn't have killed him, but I did."

And you ask a lot of people: they will tell you, spookily, "You know, I have the idea I've murdered somebody." Lots of people will tell you this — "I have the sneaking hunch like I'm guilty of having killed somebody." Well, naturally, they are right; they have, but that is beside the point.

When it comes to associating this down person and the dead person, and so forth, he has got a nice charge-up in the package, but the person is somewhat associated with being the person who is down. So that makes him just that much deader now that this person is dead. You call that "regret." So the guy tries to go back in time to get back to the point where this fellow was alive. He has the impulse of not hitting, the impulse of not letting fall, C, so he will just lock on that, mechanically, the impulse of not letting C die.

Up here where he hit his wife in the jaw, there is again shock, sock! And the package has added into it a new moment of unconsciousness — the instant of shock — and immediately afterwards the realization that it wasn't a man, society frowns on it, that he shouldn't have done it and so forth and so on. And his wife will take care of him too. Time goes along; she will find out that this regret will get out into levels of fur coats and new cars and all sorts of things if she works it right. As a matter of fact, that is the mechanism of propitiation, right there, at work.

Now, sock! and she is added into the package, and now he has really gotten a service facsimile which is a nice cross-up — wrong person and so on. He can't win now. If he wins — if he is B and the winner — then he is liable to hit her and he is a real loser now. So if he tries to win, then he loses, so he wins but then he will lose. So he will lose, but if he loses then he is liable to win — big maybe. And the fellow will just squirrel-cage on this computation. A computation, as I say, is merely a big maybe: unsolved problem. And these incidents make together, as a package, a beautifully unsolved problem — terrible.

Now, if you will notice something else here with this anatomy. From 18.0 or something down here to 0.5 on the tone scale (this being optimum motion, optimum living, this being here at 0.0, death), a person was feeling fairly cheerful and then he was hit and he was suppressed

into unconsciousness, which is down close to death. He has established here a curve plotted against time — an emotional curve, which is a pattern curve.

When he hit C, he got down to anger. There was a moment there when he approximated this curve, because he went slightly out of valence and so forth. In other words, this will automatically give him the feeling of regret.

Now, when we get over here — we have got this curve where he hits his wife, we again have an approximation.

What happens to this poor guy once he has got one of these emotional curves which is soldered down?

When you are happy and certain things appear in the environment, you get sad, and you will get sad just on this curve.

So, people will say things to him; they will drop a curve on him. He will feel happy, and he will get to a point finally where, almost anything that happens to him, he will begin to approximate this curve. In other words, his emotional pattern is this; there is his emotional pattern straight through, only it won't be on just these incidents. After this it will be so bad that it is down flat.

But if this were covering over a much longer span of time, you would be able to see that emotional curve dropping on the same pattern, but each time not coming up quite as far as it did before. And how does it debit?

You see, the overt act — this overt act where he hit C — taught him the first time that he shouldn't use this motion, and up here where you get the rest of the facsimile, boy, he really learned not to use that motion. So he knows there is a motion that he mustn't use, but he is not analytical about it because that motion is all tied up with unconsciousness. So he says, "There is some motion I can't use," and he will begin to wonder on what it is, worry about what it is. He will try to do this and that and the other thing about this motion. But any time he thinks badly of somebody it will become an overt act. In other words, the physical overt act now gets overlaid with tremendous numbers of thought and emotion locks.

Any time he starts to get angry he begins to feel that he is liable to do something he will regret, and so he restrains himself from getting angry. Any time he starts to think some thought about another human being, it will approximate this curve and he will think that he is about to strike them; it is an overt thought. So his whole life will become overt, and the very business of living will seem to him to be an insult and an overt act to the rest of humanity. He is actually in a state where just his existence all by itself is an overt act. If he eats, if he sleeps, if he does anything, it is an overt act. He is down below "normal" when that happens, but not very far.

When a person gets psychotic they go into this one. Maybe there are other complications in it which make it possible for the two to vary, one against the other, and you get your manic-depressive: hysterical winning, locked on the time track at this point. Then he is losing — winning, losing. Or you get your schizophrenic: personality B and personality A are present alternately. And then one day he also exhibits personality C and this falls out of the psychiatric definition, so we don't notice it. There is your schiz.

Or he backs off from this facsimile and says it is all unreal; he has gotten to the point of so many overt acts — every thought is overt and so forth. He will transfer till he has figured out that the whole world is doing an overt act against him (win, lose or otherwise) and he will just back off into the complete unreality of paranoia: "They're all against me." "The Western Union Telegraph Company has just hooked up wires to my neurons so they can inform the U.S. government what I'm thinking all the time."

Any kind of a computation that will get a person out of this service facsimile package is compounded and recompounded. And that whole thing is a service facsimile.

This kind of a situation, because of the existence of this emotional curve, can be lost out of sight; you won't observe it immediately. But that emotional curve will be there. You can watch how a person behaves under stress.

"I must not commit an overt act." Now, it will get to a point, finally, where he will start in a cycle; this is a second complication. The first thing he says is "I must not commit an overt act." Then he conceives that people are causing him to commit overt acts and he doesn't want to commit an overt act, so he will commit overt acts against them to keep them from making him cause overt acts. You get the idea? That is very simple; it sounds complicated but it is very simple.

Here is this person and he says, "I don't want to fight with you. What's the idea?"

And the other person says, "Yaa-yaa-yaa-yaa-yaa — your father's a psychiatrist and your mother wears a mustache cup." The next thing he knows, why, he gets enraged, because what is happening? This person is making him commit an overt act. And he gets madder and madder and madder about it, and he blows up and hits him in the jaw and puts another lock on the service facsimile. He goes through that stage.

Now, finally he will get to the point where he no longer says "Don't antagonize me because I might hit you, and you mustn't make me do an overt act." He gets to the next stage, which is below that level of combativeness, and he says, "I'm innocent. I don't want to commit any overt acts. I don't commit any overt acts, and it pretty much doesn't matter what you do, you can't make me, and I'm not going to commit one against you, and I won't recognize if you commit one against me." In other words, we have hit a static, motion, static, motion. You see your cycle? What we are drawing is the various harmonics on the tone scale when we go through this.

Then he will get down to a point below this level where he says, "Why, I can't bear the thought of committing an overt act. And I can't bear the thought of going on living because I am an overt act," and he will actually start doing things to make people do overt acts to him. This is further justification, but it is an invitation to get killed so he can wipe the slate clean. He will go down to that point and then he will drop below that point, and there is about where you have the catatonic — no motion. Every motion is so dangerous that he can move in no direction at all, so he is just limp.

When you are resolving this problem, you resolve it knowing that these impacts must be there, that both sides of a service facsimile contain unconsciousness and effort.

Slitting somebody's throat with a sharp knife really doesn't contain enough effort to be a good service facsimile. There should be physical force involved in it. It might be a mild lock, but it is not a good one. There must be physical force involved in it — in other words, a heavy effort. You get service facsimiles with heavy effort. You resolve these things by making the person go through the motions of doing things to other people.

And the way you would diagnose this is very simple. There is really only one real overt act on a case — one that is very, very charged up — mostly because a human being can't stand to have more than one. He just blows to pieces. Actually, if we weren't interrupting this cycle of the overt act, the next thing you know, this race practically wouldn't be. That is about all there is to that, because they are going out the bottom on it now. He looks like what he has killed and regretted. And you could read that on the person; you will see about what he has done. But you don't even have to be that good about it. All you have to do these days is just tell him to start biting, and believe me, you will be into the service facsimile chain, and rapidly.

I hope all of this hasn't been too esoteric for those of you that are relatively new in Dianetics. But it actually is the story of man's cycle of aberration. And tonight, with Dianetics, I have been laying out an answer by which this deadly tangle can be untied. You work all this out very simply; you merely knock out, with Thought, Effort, and Emotion Processing, the motivator and the overt act, and clean up the lock chain of the service facsimile. And the person has lost his reason to be savage and mean, and at the same time has lost the suppression he has put upon himself to keep himself from being savage and mean.

Basically, man is good, and in Dianetics we are trying to give him a chance.