

WHOLE TRACK

A lecture given on
25 January 1962

Thank you.

Okay. What do we have here? We have the 26th of Jan. AD 12. And here we go for a lecture on what? I know. What do you need? What don't you know anything about? Oh, Scientology. All right.

Come on. What don't you know anything about? What do you feel foggy on?

Female voice: Track.

Traps?

Female voice: Track.

Male voice: Track. Track.

Track? Oh, wow.

Female voice: The whole track.

Yeah. Whole track. I don't know. I haven't given a lecture on whole track for years. Do you want to hear something about whole track?

Audience: Yes.

Well, once upon a time there was a thetan. And he was free and all-powerful and stupid. And he didn't have any judgment at all, because he had no experience of any kind. And he thought if he just kept battering out things and withholding things and keeping things from coming in on him, that he would then stay as powerful as he had always been.

And that was a mistake. Because the more he battered out, the more he felt he ought to withhold—because at the same time he was doing all this, he was making other people guilty of battering out and telling them they shouldn't have done it. And then he duplicated those he told he shouldn't have done it. And the final analysis was that he was withholding. And here you are today.

Oh, it's very intriguing, the ideas of the whole track, but it'd be a nice— it'd be nice if you had ever lived before but, of course, this is just an idea. This is just an idea.

I'm reminded of John and he left here in pretty good shape. That was a good win for us, but I think in all of the twelve years of arduous processing and hammering and pounding or something like that—I think it was just the educational process had just made a little dent on his case—17th ACC. I think in all those years there wasn't a single process that had ever been brought out that had ever made a dent on him.

And he got over here and he started running into Routine 3A and 3D and Security Checking and a few things like that and all of a sudden, why, he blew off the first terminal of the Goals Problem Mass and found himself upgrading rapidly into other things and he was really flying.

And—give you an idea how he was flying: he cancelled the plane which would have gotten him home by Christmas to his family in order to get another session from Norman. He did, didn't he, Norman?

Male voice: Yes.

And Norman tied into it and found “an obstructionist” as the upgraded terminal of “a menial,” and this was tying into the teeth of “a cruel person,” and in between “an obstructionist” and so forth, there had been a hidden terminal called “a troublemaker.” And in that session he became absolutely certain that he had been “a troublemaker” (which he had never been). And that blew in just that one session, didn’t it? And then he found this “obstructionist,” and I think went home with that package. Isn’t that right? I’d think if he—he was smart, because if he had left here just teetering on the edge of tipping over into a troublemaker, look at all the trouble we’d had.

Well, anyway, that is the toughest case I ever came up against, in that the case was just quietly tough. You know? There was nothing spectacular about it, but probably right here there are some people who have audited this fellow or seen him gone and they knew how rough this case was.

And so we made a dent on it. All right. We got him flying All right. Swell.

But what did it take to do this? It took a very, very precise knowledge of the whole track. It took a precise knowledge of the consequences of—that a thetan runs into and how he had gotten himself balled up and how he’d tangled himself up along the line and then if you knew this perfectly, why, of course, you could take it apart. That’s fairly easy to do.

Some lectures on this exist under Routine 3 and they have to do with this. But you are following a rule in auditing whole track and that rule is—it occurs actually as a first or second sentence of one of the sectional books of Dianetics: Modern Science of Mental Health: If you can parallel what the mind is doing and undo that or handle that, why, you will get a gain. And that is the basic rule of processing and we have not violated that rule in all these years. That’s remarkable that that thing has remained that constant.

Well, let’s take a look at this. If an individual had lived only once and then you processed that one lifetime he had lived, wouldn’t it become apparent after a while that the individual would glow Clear and disentangle gorgeously on just having audited that one lifetime? Let’s just present that as a piece of evidence. That’d be possible, wouldn’t it?

Actually, if an individual had lived only one life—just one—here he was and if he was just a meat body and so forth and you know, he has a psychological-type brain; you know, solid meat and if that was-all there was to this fellow, then he would untangle in this lifetime. In other words, the aberrations could be untangled and so forth if they ever could be.

Now, if one lifetime were true, then Freudian analysis would work. If just one lifetime were true, Freudian analysis would work. But Freudian analysis didn’t work.

If just one lifetime were true, then running the engrams off one lifetime would clear somebody. Right? And that is not true and can’t be done. You run the life—all the engrams out of one lifetime, you can straighten somebody up remarkably, you can do marvelous things. But for some reason or other, there is always a little additional bug

Unless you go at it on the basis of conditioning the individual to be able to confront all of the pictures and things and stuff that he found in the bank—that is to say, he isn’t afraid of pictures and he’s not fighting them— you can actually do a very delicate key-out on one lifetime and leave him separate from all of these masses and so forth.

Well, you can—you can accomplish that.

Now, there’s just—that’s just evidence. This has nothing to do with anybody’s recall. This has to do only with the technical aspects of existence in Scientology.

Nineteen fifty-one, I rolled up my sleeves and started to investigate the whole track. Because in 1950—late 1950—it had started to raise its ugly and unseemly head. And auditors who would run into it and try to audit it and pcs who dare bring it up, of course, ran into a considerable social ostracism of one character or another. That was not done. The first Foundation board tried to pass a regulation, a board ruling to the effect that nobody would ever look at, believe in or investigate past lives, and so forth.

And yet auditors in auditing them kept running into them, you see? So that probably was the basic split-up of the first Foundation. The first Foundation wanted to sit there comfortably and just grind on and on in present-life engrams and consider that we had it all made and they wanted no further research or investigation of any kind whatsoever.

Well, that wouldn't go and that was that, because auditors were not turning out the results they should have turned out if one had only lived one life.

So in 1951 this—I didn't fly in the teeth of this. I would have investigated anything. I mean, there's no real resistance on my part. You show me something, tell me I can't investigate it, I'm liable to investigate it. You show me something and tell me I can investigate it, I'm liable to investigate it. I mean, there is no influence in that line.

I—just down through the trillennia, I have not paid attention to and/or paid no attention to people who have told me not to look. I just have not paid any attention to this one way or the other. This, of course, adds up to a total neglect of the—the “finer sensibilities,” I think they're called, of other people. The finer sensibilities, I think, is another way of expressing the idea “he's too yellow to look.”

So anyway, 1951, I started in to investigate how far back this went and where it went and actually an entire year was spent. And Mary Sue was of considerable assistance at that time and we went plowing around—I didn't mean to modify that by saying at that time only. I think—I think there was a time there in 54 when you were also of assistance for . . . But to be very blunt about the thing, there wasn't anything, I don't think, that we didn't chew into one way or the other.

If there was any free track associated with it, we looked at it, and the result of that work, the records of that work don't exist because you can't sit around and do research and make records.

You either research and get research done or you make records. And the primary thing they do today in the field of research is to make records. And you'll find the time-wasting and expensive thing to do in research is making records. That costs like mad. And you have 185 clerks filing and compiling records in quintuplicate and crossfiling and crossindicating. And what they neglect on the modern research line is to have somebody who is finding any data to record. They've omitted him from the research line.

Of course, this is probably very wise, because when you think of the people the research is being done for, you could see at once why there would be a slowdown (a strike, you see, on people who could research). Well, look at it. Governments and politicians and that sort of thing. Who'd do any research for them?

I'd research them; I'd use them as case histories—research them: “Look around here and find something you can go out of ARC with.” I think they— investigate that.

Anyway, what we found out basically, was a lot of the operational characteristics of the E-Meter were discovered at that time. And tremendous numbers of incidents of all shapes, sizes, squares and types were dredged up in whole sections of track and so forth. And I got a—did a track map at some time or another. And you can do a track map on an individual. It's

fascinating, too. But you start to do track maps and you start to do this type of research, you are only researching free track.

Now, in view of the fact that amongst a dozen pcs, almost any part of the track is free track, you see, these twelve different pcs will have different parts of the track grouped and occluded into what we call valences. But they've still got lots of free track amongst them.

And if you take the free track collectively of these individuals, you can get a whole track. But the Goals Problem Mass consists of those sections of track you know not what of, which have become balled up into what we have for a long time called circuits; we've called them valences; we've called them ridges—they have had numerous names. Of course, a ridge deserves just a little bit of—it isn't a valence. A ridge is a ridge. But a valence or a circuit are definitely just an identity that is so dominant that it balls up a whole section of the whole track. It takes a large section of the whole track and bundles it all up in a black ball and it's got—all full of pictures and when you think at it, it does thinkingness and this is all very, very tricky.

A thetan never made these things. He lived this life and then he got in trouble and it all went scrunch. And he's since maintained it.

Well, of course, it was trying—he was trying to persist while he was it, so of course the common denominator of all such circuits and valences is persistence. So naturally, there they are and you'll find them right here in present time today. They're persisting

Well, you take a whole section of lives. Let's say he lived numerous lives as a plumber. And all these lives as a plumber, if he then withheld it and considered them reprehensible and attacked things as a plumber and was attacked as a plumber and a bunch of other conditions—in other words, your four flows are beautifully violated and mucked up during these four, six, eight, ten, twelve lives as a plumber. You're going to get a gaudy mass of condensed pictures and characteristics and individual thinkingnesses, behavior patterns, everything that you now consider an individual, is all going to be bundled up in a little black ball. And that little black ball we call a valence or a circuit.

And when it be—gets activated or restimulated, of course, since he has been it, he can now dramatize it. And when it is too close in on top of him— and I do mean that in actual space—when it is too close in terms of space to the pc, he will dramatize it.

Now, to run out its individual characteristics is a long, thankless, arduous and stupid task. And there'd be no reason to do this. You can run out the whole package all at once. So there isn't any reason to take it apart characteristic by characteristic.

Now, that thing I'm talking about, that circuit or valence—better known as a valence, but it operates as a circuit; anything I've ever said about circuits are done by valences—all of that in a balled-up mass is a mass; it is an electronic mass; it does have weight; it does have density; it does have influence; you could feel it and so forth. It is actually—to the degree—to the degree that it is in the mind and therefore rather ephemeral, it has the same reality in the mind as a big black billiard ball would have, sitting out here on the table. You see, that's just—is it—isn't any imaginary mass, you know, that all of us have heard about, you know?

When you run into this thing, you go splat, see? If you picked it up and threw it at somebody, it would go splat. You see, it does have that characteristic. You might ask why is your body at this present moment persisting or why is that blackboard persisting? Well, that blackboard is a—is a mass which is persisting in time and that's all you can say about that. Present time is a persistence of mass.

Well, in the mind you get a mental mock-up which nevertheless is persistence, which nevertheless is mass. And the primary mistake that you could make about these things is that

these things are—you'd say these things are imaginary because, of course, they occur in the imagination.

And of course, when the fellow first runs into one of these things... Let's take a bowling ball, you know, of some size—and a black bowling ball— and he's standing there holding this black bowling ball and somebody has greased it up and he drops it and it hits him on the toe. Well, that would hurt. That would hurt, I guarantee you. And if you tried to tell him at that moment that it was an imaginary bowling ball, you are liable to get into an argument. You would be very likely to get into an argument.

As he stood there rubbing his toe, he would be likely to express not only his opinion of bowling balls but his opinion of you. He wouldn't enter into the logic or a discussion as to whether or not it was imaginary. He would simply refute that. That was intolerably stupid.

Well, similarly, one of these black valence masses, when collided with, or these mental energies when collided with, are imaginary just up to the time of that collision. And after somebody yo-yos in and out of one or tries to go through one and hits an apathy strata in one and dramatizes it too, and after he's had one pushed up against his chest or tearing the back of his head off, after he's had all the somatics of the thing going through his stomach or something like that, he would not be in any condition to argue with. He wouldn't be set up nicely to argue with.

You couldn't come up and say—I think there are several in this class right now, that I don't think—I think it would be adventurous to go up to them and say, "Well, you know, these masses you've been running into, you know they're just imaginary. And they have no existence in fact and so on. They are just imaginary."

I think you would get a rather interesting argument at that point. Isn't that right? And in fact, I don't think you'd get much agreement at all. I don't think that would be the way to build ARC.

Well, it's not on the basis they're defending anything. It's just that it violates a reality. Well, what's reality? Well, reality is not what the individual thinks reality is. Reality is what the— the majority agree it is. And you look over this and if people can weigh these things in their hand or feel the pain of these things in the small of their back or, as they hover out in front of their faces, they perceive them one way or the other, why, I don't think you have any argument that they're unreal or imaginary. They are real within that viewpoint.

Well, it's so much for that. It's almost as if here, on a broader agreement in the physical universe, we were to take billiard balls and bowling balls and footballs and several other types and pile them all up on the table here, just keep piling these balls up and get a whole big mass of these things and so on. Well, that would be something that would look very like a Goals Problem Mass. I mean, it wouldn't look much different, except a Goals Problem Mass doesn't have the pretty stitching and it doesn't have orifices to blow them up. Otherwise—it doesn't have holes in them to pick them up with three fingers. But aside from that, that would look quite like a Goals Problem Mass.

Well, of course, a thetan is really in no great position to appreciate the character of their ephemeralness, once he collides with them and their ephemeralness ceases to be a matter of grave interest to him. Their isness is a great matter of interest to him. His effort to not-is them being combatted consistently by the isness of them causes him a considerable amount of worry.

So that we find, then, that the authorities on the field of the human mind dared adventure into those areas which had been totally not-ised.

Authorities on the field of the human mind do not believe in pictures, do not believe in engrams, do not believe in time track, do not believe in masses, don't believe in any of these

things. So we would say offhand, then, that they were only brave enough to adventure into those areas which had been totally not-ised by them. So if they had successfully not-ised something, then they were willing to look, if you call that looking.

There is looking and then there is not-ising and of course, not-ising, it's very—it's very easy to look. There's many a fool has gone out in battle while the cannonballs were flying by, saying, "I don't see any." And this—the sergeant there, lying under the log, says, "Well, you will presently."

Of course, they lug him off to the burial detail shortly if he keeps walking around in all this. So I imagine that's what's happened to field-of-the-human-mind people who have been carefully schooled into believing it is all imaginary and then they've walked into one of these cannonballs. They probably tried to tell one another about these cannonballs. And the fellow tried to say, "You know, there's cannonballs around here," and they've said, "Well, he's gone stark, staring batty. He—now he thinks he is Napoleon or something of the sort," and they probably disposed of these chaps to the local institution, you see; the burial detail has gotten them. Or they've simply collided with them, have actually seen a tiny corner of one of these things and have cut and run and have said, "Well, we want nothing more to do with the study of the human mind. That is about that. I mean, that settles the point. We have now settled the point. Should anybody ever investigate the human mind? The answer is no. And therefore, we're going to stick very, very closely with Freud. We're going to stick very, very closely now with Wundt. Now, these are the boys to stay with. They don't cause you any trouble. They say there is nothing in the mind but meat or inhibitions or an unconscious and that nobody can see he's unconscious, so that's all very safe."

Well, now, you didn't know you were brave people, did you? But frankly,— frankly, there is no substitute for guts when it comes to taking a look at what goes on on the backtrack. You're not necessarily brave people. You're just people who are willing to look and there were lots of people who would have been willing to look if everybody had told them there was nothing to see. And nobody is willing to look when he says there's nothing to see, you know? Somebody goes to the window and looks out and somebody says, "Well, what's happening out in the yard?"

And the fellow says, "Nothing," so nobody else goes to the window. And that's sort of been the field of the human mind.

Here was this terrific battle, these tremendous things out there in the yard, you see? There were all these masses and lines of soldiers and free track and pictures and identities and madnenses and pain and everything else out there in the front yard. The fellow went to the window, took a look out—it was his job to be lookout—and he went out and he looked. And he says—and they say, "What's at the window?"

And he says, "Oh, there's nothing there. Nothing there," you see? Blood running all over the place. "Nothing going on. There's nothing happening"

So nobody else bothered to look. That's about what it amounts to. Anybody who has an operation to control people in the past has apparently tried to work this operation on the basis of keeping them from looking at the mind, because all the mechanisms of control were resident in the mind. And if the mind was much looked at, it would as-is and therefore with it would as-is these mechanisms of slavery and control.

If you were to take a superstitious people—you know, superstition is a powerful control mechanism. You may run into a valence sometime or another that specialized in it. "Now, if you never touch the cherry trees in spring— never—and if you're careful not to look at the moon during the first part of its phase and if you're awfully, awfully careful never to eat your oatmeal with a left-handed spoon..." You get the enormous number of not-looks that they're sowing into the thing.

Well, if you—just on that basis alone, if you’ve sowed in enough notlooks, you would render a person so introverted he would be very easy to control. He would be very simple to control; he would be nothing but an automaton. You see how it’s done, you see?

Militarily, you see this. You must not strike a superior officer, militarily. Well, what is this mechanism then? It means that you must not reach a superior officer, but a superior officer can reach you. It makes a nice stuck flow, doesn’t it? So after a while, a superior officer says, “Now, the best possible survival action that this company of troops can take is to dash over that parapet into the teeth of those new machine guns the enemy has just started firing.” This is a survival action. Nobody questions it at all and they go over the top of the parapet and that’s the end of that. Nobody has to worry about that company anymore, you see?

But the recruiting sergeants are all talking about the line and they get people in. And people—they say the best possible thing to do is this or that or the other thing and everybody does it, you know?

If you can’t look and if you don’t look and if nobody is trying to get you to look, of course, these mechanisms, then, all add up to slavery mechanisms. They are mechanisms of introversion.

Now, if that is the bulk of thing which has been on the whole track, and it is—what do you expect the whole track’s condition to be like? The overts of making people introverted so they could be controlled—you get this as a different mechanism; introverted so they could be controlled, you see—the motivators are getting introverted so that one was controlled and the common denominator of the whole thing was “Don’t look.” And, therefore, if we kept everybody from looking and if everybody kept us from looking and we get everybody’s anchor points well in, we of course would wind up with balls of goonk, inevitably, you see?

If the individual led twelve lifetimes as a plumber and during that whole period of twelve lifetimes, he was basically dedicated to keeping customers from looking at their bills or at the plumbing work he had done, you see, and all of his customers were basically dedicated into keeping him from looking into the bathroom or the guest bedroom at the wrong time—in other words, their common ground of communication was not-look.

He didn’t want them to look, they didn’t want him to look. Well, if this is very acute, you wind up with a ball, not a track.

Now, your track can be plotted against time. It goes pocketa-pocketa-pocketa-pocketa-pocketa and the seconds go on, the minutes go on, the days go on and so forth and all of this can be plotted out.

Actually, the track isn’t vertical or horizontal or diagonal in somebody’s mind, but a person can move from one moment of time to another moment of time. The word moue is used advisedly because he seems to be in different positions in location while he is in different positions in time. So he gets the position change associated with the time change, so therefore he thinks of himself as moving in time.

He does have a mobility in time in all those areas except where he has a mass. Where a life—series of lifetimes or a lifetime has become a mass, he no longer has the possibility of moving in time or in space. Why?

Because all the overts of it were introvertive and all the motivators of it were introvertive, so if the overts and the motivators both had the same thing in common, the commonest ground was not just don’t-look between himself and other valences, but introvert. And this introversion or looking inward, carries with it, pulling inward.

So we have these things taking up actually the most economical geometrical shape for the maximum mass for the minimum space. And that is a sphere. These things actually are spheres.

So the maximum—maximum amount of content—if you want the maximum amount of content or volume of any geometric shape, you get a sphere. And you want the minimal surface for the maximal content, you get a sphere. In other words, that's the most pull-in that's got the most packed into it.

And these valences are very funny. I heard of one, one time very recently, in the last three or four weeks. You peeked into it and you could see all these little pictures like 35-millimeter pictures and when this thing moved in on the pc, it hurt and when it moved off, that was very nice. But when it came around he could look into it and he could see 35-millimeter pictures, all color slides in it and so forth. Well, that of course was the fellow's track as that identity.

And you got this identity, you see, but all of its time track is in a ball. You see, yesterday is tomorrow is next year is last year. All time is this time and of course there—it's gone down to no time. So because it's gone down to no time, it'll float in present time like a shot. See, no time, present time, what's the difference—not according to this valence.

So here it is. In that ball, if you could lay this ball out like you could a—you take a—you know, you take a—ladies, you take these bundled-up tape measures you're always getting your hip measurements with to make sure that age is not creeping up on you, you know? Lots of those things. You take one of those tape measures and here it is and if you wadded it all up in a ball and laid it down in front of you, you see, knead it in, so it's nice and spherical and so on, that would be one of these valences all grouped. See, that's all time is no time, everything is here, now. It is a sphere. Now, that thing has got all the identities, characteristics, ideas, type of machinery thinking Everything it's got is all in it.

Now, if you would take both ends of this tape measure, if you could find them, you see, and you just stretch it out like that, you'd have your—the lifespan stretched out. Well, it was like that once. See, it was nicely stretched out, but maybe about three-quarters of the way through that life, it started to ball up and the moment of death sure put the finishing touches on it, so it went uomp, and there it is all in a ball.

Now, that's these things you're handling. That's these things; that's these masses. Now, of course, they have engrams in them. Now, what you're facing there is a package of engrams. Now, we're auditing packages of engrams.

Now, if you think of Book One: supposing where Book One—Book One— everywhere you said "engram," you said "valence," you see that—instead of auditing an engram your target was a valence. You could have transferred over, then, all the characteristics of valences into these engrams, you see?

You got what I'm talking about? I'm just trying to give you some kind of an idea. So, today, we're not auditing engrams, we're auditing packages of engrams. And we're auditing these packages of engrams directly with 3D Criss Cross and that's what audits them.

And these packages of engrams contain in them, if audited one by one, enough engrams to keep an auditor busy for about ten thousand hours of auditing—just one of these packages. Just one of these packages would have enough engrams in it to keep an auditor busy for about ten thousand hours. And he'd have to be a good auditor at that.

All right. Now let's look at this more closely: There are tens of thousands of these packages in what we call the Goals Problem Mass. So it'd be tens of thousands times ten thousand hours. You add it up and it makes an impressive-looking piece of arithmetic, but it would be just trying to give you an approximate idea. Say ten thousand hours of auditing and there's tens of thousands of packages, each one of which would take ten thousand hours of auditing

You'd have to multiply ten thousand times ten thousand and you'd get quite a few hours. And I don't think you're going to be around that long—I mean, just auditing one pc. I think you'd get bored.

I do—I don't—I don't think he'd see enough gain, because he'd just be out of one engram into the next engram and on and on and on.

Well now, that all means if it were feasible to audit the engrams in these things, it would take ten thousand hours. But now let me cap this: It's not possible to audit the engrams in them.

Yeah, why isn't it possible? Well, that's because you've got the condensed tape-measure action. You could not separate out enough time in one package to audit one consecutive engram.

Now, you have seen a pc that every time you “put them on the time track” (quote) (unquote) they got brrrrrrp. Have you ever noticed this? You'd said to them, “All right. Now, go to the moment when you hurt your foot.” And the guy gets about fifty feet.

See—you ever have this happen? He gets about fifty feet and there are about fifty different times and he can't tell the difference between them and you start moving him off of this point where he hurt his foot and he gets all sorts of feet and then he gets shoes and then the next thing you know he gets foundations and it all goes rrrrrrrp.

And you say, “Now, come on now. We just want that one foot that you're sitting there with right now and we're going—we're going to audit this foot”— brrrrrrrp!

You can't audit it, in other words. It—his attention, every time he hits anything, goes brrrrrrrp. Well, you've got a fellow whose present lifetime is a Goals Problem Mass valence. See, his lifetime—this lifetime has gone blunk! And, of course, all roads lead to now and all nows lead elsewhere, so that you've just got now, see?

And you say, “All right. Now, get in—get in contact with your tonsils.” Say, the guy has got a sore throat, you know? Say, “Get in contact with your tonsils.”

All right. He gets in contact with his tonsils, see?

“Well,” you say. “What's happening?”

“Yeaow -ayaaa -yeooo. “

“Well, what happens when you do it?”

“Yeooo. It makes me very dizzy.” He hasn't got an engram in his throat; he's got a Goals Problem Mass valence in his throat and it's an oppterm. And every time he hits it, he doesn't get the throat somatic, he gets dizziness, because it starts to move, you know? And it just shakes everything And this is “Ooo-o-o-oh, no. We don't want to have anything to do with that.” You see what this is?

So we're not auditing individual pictures or individual bodies. We're auditing packages of pictures and packages of bodies. We're auditing packages of identities, as far as that's concerned. I defy you to go into the middle of Goals Problem Mass. You know, I mean not with any 3DXX, see? Nothing like that. Let's just say, “All right. Now pick up the moment you were a Roman senator. All right. That's good. What's the matter?”

“Well, I don't find any moment when I'm a Roman senator. Yeaow-uuuu. Yeooooo.” “Well, go on. Find the moment when you're a Roman senator.”

“Uhhh.”

“What are you looking at?”

“Well, it’s just all black.”

“Well, can’t you find the period there where you were a Roman senator? I get a knock on the E-Meter here—Roman senator.”

“Nnaaa.”

Well, you of course think you’ve moved him back in time. Of course, you’ve run him into the Goals Problem Mass and that’s all now. So he hasn’t gone back in time, he is right here at now. And as far as the Roman senator is concerned, he’s contacted it. And if you watched him leave the session, he would swing his toga. But he couldn’t see anything.

See, his pictures are in a total condensation. That’s what bars out knowledge. Every time you try to think like a Roman senator or think like a plumber, if you’ve got a valence of a Roman senator or a valence of a plumber, everything starts to move slightly and it goes zzzzzz. And you don’t want anything to do with that. So you promptly don’t think the kind of thoughts that a Roman senator or a plumber would think.

And you get into a technical school sometime or another and you’re going along fine, you’re learning some carpentry or something like that or how to saw small rabbits out with jigsaws or something. And then you have to put a pipe through them to make them stand up, you know? And, my God, you can’t get the pipe through. You just do a beautiful job of sawing out the bunny out of the—out of the piece of board, but getting this little piece of pipe through so the bunny will stand up, you know? That’s just something you just can’t manage. You finally cut your finger on it and have to give up, you see?

Every other student in the place, they got the little pipe through okay. You didn’t, see? That’s because if you think or do like a plumber, you’ve had it.

And it isn’t that you have a mechanism residual which says “Never again shall I ever be a plumber because it is a failed life.” No, that thinkingness actually didn’t have to take place.

If you’ve got a valence as a plumber that can get disturbed in the Goals Problem Mass, then every time you try to think like a plumber, you think like an idiot. Now, you either can go into it wholly and with no self-determinism whatsoever, simply be it with no resistance—you’ll be a lousy one, by the way, but you could be it with no resistance at all. You can go on hooking up the cold-water pipes to the fridge, you see, and draining out—draining out all of the sinks into the fresh-water line and you could just go on and people wouldn’t quite find anything right with your plumbing, but they really wouldn’t find anything wrong with your plumbing. You’d be sick most of the time. You’d be a very sickly sort of plumber, but you probably could make it—you probably could make it. I think probably most of the politicians that are around right now busy politicking are in the valences of politicians.

It’s one of the easiest things in the world to get into one of these valences. First the individual just can’t stand the thought of it and then he makes up his mind to be it. And after that, he sort of goes through life this way, you see: fixed-eyed, steering an erratic course, no self-determinism, nothing of the sort, so that stimulus A happens, response B always occurs, you see? Just bang, bang. And they’re very easy to handle; they don’t make much sense.

But if they’re in that state—now get this—they don’t dare think. You see? They can only dramatize. They can’t think; they can only dramatize. Now, how many pcs have you run into that you couldn’t run “think” on?

Have you ever run into a pc you couldn't run "think" on? You had to run "Get the idea..." or something. I don't know where he's going to get this idea. It's evidently dragged in on an endless belt. And he takes it off of the assembly line.

But the idea of thinking is totally foreign to his abilities. He cannot think. Have you ever run into any like this?

Let me tell you, they're quite common—quite common. You possibly—because our processes over the last few years haven't ever used this to any great extent, you probably haven't noticed it too much.

But you say, "Put a thought in that object" or "Think a thought," or "Think of yourself as" any think-think. You know, the individual has got to input a thought—can't do it. That's because he's sitting in the middle of a Goals Problem Mass. A case that cannot do that, does not really surrender on an auditing process auditing thinkingness.

You see, you don't want them to audit thinkingness in order to get them to think. Now, there were some thinkingness processes in the Fourth London we had some that—they worked a bit. "What isn't thinking," I think the process was. "Look around here and find something that isn't thinking" Well, that's very interesting, because it would raise their havingness and it would move this valence off far enough so that the individual could think a thought.

Of course, havingness being havingness and no withholds having been pulled off, he probably walked out the front door immediately afterwards, had it collide with him again and was unable to think once more. But it was an interesting phenomenon.

So there are a lot of people around that can't think and they don't dare think. If they think, it almost kills them. They can dramatize, but they can't think. Spot that particular pc, because he's of interest to you.

Now, trying to find an engram on that pc is one of the more adventurous things that you could do, because the second you try to find the engram, it goes zzzzzzzzt, bzooooooooom-swish, and you say, "Now. All right. Now let's get the first moment you heard the news your father was dead. Now, let's get the first moment . . ." Zzzzzzzzzt-ba-zooooooooommm-boomp-boomp. What's he got?

"Well; I've got myself as a pirate captain in the year 1051."

"Oh? All right. Now, let's just—let's just get that moment, the first moment when you got the news that . . ."

Zzzzzzzzzt-boom-mum-zoooooooooom-boom. "What's happened? What's that—you look kind of startled. What's happened?" "Oh, uh—I don't know. I was thinking about my little brother."

"Well, uh—did he hurt his—hurt his foot?"

"Uh—oh, no. He had mumps."

And you get the idea of a preclear being totally out of the auditor's control and you're liable to start treating the pc as somebody who is out of control, when actually the pc isn't out of control, the pc is simply in a valence. And any time they move as the thetan—it's actual movement as a thetan, you see—any time they move slightly as a thetan or as a thetan put out any fresh energy, something activates. And it controls them more heavily than the auditor controls them. You see, the auditor can't hold the bank straight because there's no bank to hold straight.

So the auditor is trying to hold the bank straight and there is no bank and there's nothing there but a valence. Now, this is very amusing that a case of that character cannot have engrams run on him, but he can do 3D Criss Cross like a startled gazelle. Nothing to it. Give me a list of people you don't like. Brrrrrrrp bang-bang-bang-bang-bang Differentiate the list. Bong-bong-bong-bong-bong. Null it out. Bu-bow-bow-bow.

And all of a sudden, particularly if you run lots of Havingness with this kind of thing, why, you'll find the individual zzz-rrrr-m-oom. It's all right.

Now you could say, "Well, now, think a thought."

"Think a thought. Mm-mm." He'd be able to think a little bit, you know? Not for long, because you've still got some more masses for him to confront, but he wouldn't be solidly impacted into a dozen at once.

Now, they could be in one valence or they could be in three valences or they could be in a valence which is a combination of the oppterm and term—a combination valence. It has all the characteristics of the terminal and oppterm. You'll find this occasionally. It's the most maddening thing you ever had anything to do with, because it'll do nothing but beef up the Prehav Scale and it'll—just won't run and euuuuuuu.

What it is, is the waterbuck has faced the tiger until you have a waterbuck, you see, that is thoroughly striped and has long paws and swims and you'd say, "What is this?"

And he'd say, "Well, it is, 'I'm a waterbuck.'"

"All right. That's fine, but what do you look like, you know?"

And he'd say, "Well, I have these—I'm a waterbuck, I have these long stripes. I roar, uh—and so forth."

In other words, everything is totally collapsed into it and he would as easily call it a tiger. Only it's the same thing. It's a waterbuck-tiger.

And if you—if he said he was in a tiger valence, well, he was in a tiger valence and goes ga-zoo-uh, and he's in a—he's a swimming sort of tiger and he has smooth, soft fur—only it's hair. He has hoofs. All his tigers have hoofs. In other words, it's a combination valence—waterbuck-tiger.

And it—actually, he has lived along some Goals Problem Mass package, on and on and on and on, until finally he has hit this as a valence; he has become this valence in life.

He is a police officer with all the characteristics of a criminal, you see? He is a politician—he is a politician—an American politician with all the characteristics of a Russian, don't you see? You get the idea? Or he is a criminal with all the characteristics of a police officer, or a Russian with all the characteristics of a . . .

This is a special kind of valence, see. It is one being. It is not two beings, but it has the characteristics of both sides and it won't run. Won't run! I insist on this, see?

This is the thing. This is a thing. And you'll hit that occasionally and the pc will sell this to you—will sell this to you with all of the salesmanship of a Dale Carnegie. Hell give you the whole thing. He'll try to fiddle the can and everything else because this is the thing. Hell tell you, "This is the me. Oh, man, oh-oh-oh-o-o-o-ah." It isn't that every one he tries to sell you is a combination valence, but the combination valence is almost always sold. He'll sell it to the auditor, you know? "Well, that's it. I know what that is. Yeah. Ooooooh, yes." Terrific game going on here. Yeah, oh-oh, big, big game. Oh-oh, yes, yes, we gotta run that thing

The auditor ran it. The Prehav Scale would beef up and the pc would fall in pieces and fall on his head, see? It's a late valence on any cycle. Usually there is a combination valence toward the end of any long cycle.

In other words, a period of 60 thousand, 600 thousand years and so forth of one game going on and on and on—one game, the spaceship officer and the spaceship crewman. Let's call that just one game—the spaceship officer, spaceship crewman. And he will finally—you will finally get a spaceship crewman who acts like a spaceship officer who is a spaceship officer because he's a member of the crew.

In other words, you get your current breed of officer, as it exists more or less in the armies today, you see? They're not really officers. They're not really enlisted men. They're nice to all the enlisted men, you see and all the enlisted men are nice and then they all . . . Do you know, it's all kind of messed up? It's a very interesting state.

Now, that's—that's a combination valence and cycles finish in these combination valences—quite ordinarily. The guy goes on playing the game of the criminal, the police official, the waterbuck, the tiger—standard games. This is a very, very standard game type of thing and he finally winds up with the guy in CID. The CID man who was just arrested the other day for burglarizing a warehouse. See? He's a combination valence, you know? He's both at the same time, simultaneously in one body in a lifetime. Quite amazing.

Now, individuals, living as they come down the track, live a certain amount of free track and those are usually fairly happy lives. When you run into engrams on those, they will run them quite willingly, but what's the difference? Not going to make any difference because actually it's one engram out of God knows how many and it doesn't amount to much.

Don't mistake it though. You can change a case all over the place by running one of these whole track valences, you know? You can practically have him growing fleas. Everything is wonderful and so on. They say that's the exact somatics and so on. You can make a change in the individual.

In the same number of hours of 3D Criss Cross, you would make ten times the amount of change. See, so don't say that you—running engrams is no good. That is not true.

But you're running engrams off of free track. And the trouble with the bloke, that is going to be the long, persistent trouble, is this valence and there's no free track in the valence to run any engram out of.

All right. Now let's go a little bit further. How did these valences get there? Why did they get there? And why does a Goals Problem Mass hang up as a mass? Now, you already have an adequate answer when I say the motivators were to extrovert—introvert somebody and the overts were to introvert somebody and so on, you're naturally going to get a ball of introversion. Naturally.

But what makes it so persistent? It's because this ball, which is a valence, in its lifetime, had hates. It had things it didn't like and things it had overts on. So we have this fellow and he's lived this lifetime and he is this whole lifetime the temple priest. That's fine. The temple priest, and he's gone along, he's done all right—sacrificial altars have all been well bloodied and he's done every—all the now-I'm-supposed-to's of a priest—collected all the loot, lied to the peasantry, invented gods that everybody would be terrified of; he's done all the proper things that he's now supposed to as a priest. He's been a very successful priest, lifetime after lifetime, after lifetime, after lifetime, after lifetime, after lifetime, you see?

But somehow or another, down along the line, he just didn't like these temple virgins. He just didn't like these temple virgins. He never could quite see a temple virgin. Actually, he had a few overts on them and this sort of pyramided up into more overts.

It's not actually an overt-motivator situation. A fellow accidentally gets an overt on something. One day he was raising one of the burning pots up before the brass god, you see, and one of the vestal virgins was helping him and he slipped, because he was terrified of spiders or something, you see? He slipped and he spilled the whole ruddy lot on top of her and that burned her up to a cinder.

Well, having done this overt, you see, he now will do overts. See, he tries to prevent himself from doing this. So every time he gets around to burning incense pot, if there's a vestal virgin anywhere in the temple anyplace, he of course is very careful not to let the incense pot go toward her.

And it takes only a relatively short space of time, like a lifetime, two or three lifetimes, till just the thought of the incense pot and the vestal virgin, he's h-hrum-hrum-hrum—he's holding the incense pot—and by the reverse flow which he is setting up, he gets to a point where he sees the vestal virgin; he knows what he's supposed to do. He's supposed to take out the incense pot and dump it on her, you see? This is how you handle that situation. It's easier to do that—to keep on restraining yourself from doing that, you see?

And the fellow who every time he has an accident says, "Well, it ought—it had better be a good accident. We had better make it a good accident," you see? He's just tired of restraining himself from having accidents. So now that—the mere thought that he's going to have an accident, he's going to have a good accident. This is the laws of flows at work.

So inadvertently at first and then later on, more purposefully and then more and more purposefully and more and more and more purposefully, he just gets more and more and more overts on vestal virgins and temple virgins. He just gets more and more overts on them, you see?

And finally he gets up to a point where he's in a terrific games condition with them. They're on that side of the temple and he's on this side of the temple. If he is a priest in a temple, he knows that there's one thing that he has to be very careful about, because the whole cult is liable to be overthrown by those vestal virgins. He knows what they're up to; they're plotting to dump burning incense pots on his head.

Now, of course, in view of the fact that all during this period of time the vestal virgins have been accumulating—the whole line has been accumulating overts on priests, we eventually get the two sides of the temple, which is the priest and the virgin and so forth. And we get this awrrrr and it goes wraaaw and wow! So he accumulates enough overts on one and he can't stay out of them. That's advisedly stated.

He kicks off as a priest one day: The mob as usual overflowing of the dikes of the temple has eaten them up and he takes off and he goes up and he sits on Cloud 19 for a little while and then he knows exactly what he should do. He goes right back down and picks up a girl and becomes a vestal virgin. See?

Now, you've got a real interesting game going. Up to this time, every time one of these lifetimes as a priest balled up, it would find itself opposed to only a thought of the existence of a temple virgin. And it's only opposed internally into pictures he has of temple virgins.

But now we're really going to fix him up. We're really going to fix this one up now. He picks up this girl, he knows exactly what he's supposed to do. He goes down—as soon as she is of any age whatsoever, he won't let his parents rest, you see, until she is enrolled in the temple.

And he goes up through the lines and is very carefully virginal and goes carrying right straight on through and oddly enough, has a slight feeling that this virgin should be kept away from priests. He just has this idea as a virgin, there's just something tells him—you call it intuition if you like—but that he had better not go very close to any priests.

So by the fact of disassociation from the priest and by the fact of no communication with the priest, he of course is getting himself into a beautiful condition of just going into a long series of overts against priests.

So now as a temple virgin—as a temple virgin, every time the cups for the libation are served, why, she, now, goes down the line, you see? And somehow or another, every time she comes to a priest—not a—not one of the local citizenry or something—every time she comes to a priest, she's liable to trip—the wine, you see, is liable to be dripping slightly—there'll be something a bit wrong—and occasionally spill a whole tray, you see, in their direction. And we'll give her another lifetime or two running along this particular line and she doesn't just drop wine cups, you see, she carefully puts the hemlock into one or two at the proper occasions, all for the good of the temple, you understand.

This is well understood. Everybody realizes this. That it's nothing personal about this. It's just—it's better to get rid of the priests and everything'll be fine, see?

So we get up to the hemlock stage and then we get up to the cutthroat stage and then go back down into the hemlock stage and then somehow or another in all temple revolts claim the citizenry was the one who murdered the chief priest and it's always, of course, somebody else who did it—and carefully puts the bloody dagger in her shirtwaist afterwards, you see? And says, “A bunch of peasants came up and stabbed him to death as he knelt at the altar. Yes, my lord, that is the way it happened,” you see?

You got big withholds building up on this particular line and enough of these and all of a sudden you have a round ball called vestal virgin. Now, this can drift around loose because internally it's only opposed to priests and it can drift around loose on the track but kind of floating in present time.

And then having lived a number of lives in this particular line and gotten this all balled up because it's a high games condition, takes off one fine day after the peasantry has burned down the temple—which is the usual indoor sport of the peasantry after being oppressed and taxed for long enough—takes off, picks up a boy and comes back and joins as a priest. Now he's a priest.

All right. Now let's accumulate some more overts against vestal virgins, you see? Oh, my God! The first time he shoves a dirk into a vestal virgin, all of a sudden it's so funny, but it's all those—kind of waagh-thud!

You've got the ball in the bank which was the vestal virgin and the ball in the bank which is already the priest, went together scrooo splat! And there they are—almost inseparable.

Now, he can go on and live lifetimes of priest; he can go on and live lifetimes of vestal virgin; he eventually will come up to a combination lifetime. He will come up to a life of an effeminate priest who has interesting habits.

And that's the dying line. That's the combination valence he has arrived at there and eventually it's just too painful to be any of these things and he won't want anything much to do with them and he'll drift off. But he's carrying all of that with him.

It's all part of his baggage. He doesn't want anything to do with this bag gage and he doesn't quite figure out how he got this baggage, but there it is.

Now, by the time he's gone through this whole cycle of the priest, the temple virgin, the combination valence and so forth, this whole thing balls up into a mass of some kind or another. It's composed individually of a lot of individuals.

Now, if he's—if he's got all this—priests and vestal virgins and the combination valence—all bunched together, you'd think he wouldn't have anything more to do with this, you see?

Now that's it. That's a finished action.

Well, he goes along for a little while and he lives a lot of free track. He gets out; he's—actually gets a job as a water boy or something like that to a camel train, goes travelling around the countryside—he gets a lot of free track. Nothing ever happens to that free track, it just stays free. It gets kind of looped up and squeezed in on other things. But one day he's got a body as a merchant. And there he is as a merchant. And he is busy selling Aladdin's lamps, cheap, cut-rate price, straight from Syria. And somebody drifts by in a canopied sedan chair and says, "Deliver it at the temple." He doesn't see anything wrong with this. So he picks up the lamp and he takes it down and delivers it to the temple. And as he goes out, why, one of the vestal virgins chucks him under the chin.

And he goes back and sits down. It's been a bad day. It's really been a bad day. Now he goes on as a merchant, gyps everybody, introverts them, keeps them from doing business, eventually becomes the military—a military governor who is bound and determined that nobody shall ever do any business, graduates up into a standard income-tax racket like they've got going in some countries now—I won't mention the name of—where they take all and give back nothing And this—he goes on this whole line. It hasn't anything to do with anything like temples or anything like that, but it's a brand-new game, you see?

It's the merchant prince versus the tax collector versus the governor versus the army versus the government. The merchant prince versus the government, so he's a merchant prince and he's the government and he's the government and he's the merchant prince and he's a military governor and he's the collector of taxes and he's a prince of merchants and he is a merchant and he sells things and then he's an industrialist and then he manufactures armor and so forth, for the government. And we've gotten to our combination valence stage on this series of packages. See, he is an industrialist who manufactures only for the government; has only one customer, the government. And, of course, that's a combination valence.

Ordinarily, when that gets down to a total thing, you—generally the political form the country has is a fascism. That's the—generally the end product of fascism—all production is for the government. And usually by force of arms to keep the rest of the population enslaved. Interesting economics. But regardless of that, it's some kind of a game of this character and it's run on: Of course, as a merchant he has formed these masses; of course, as a military governor he's formed these masses; and of course, by the overts, one another, you've got a whole new package here, see? You've got this whole new package.

So you had the temple priest, you see and the vestal virgin and all of that game and that became a package. And then you had a lot of free track. And then you've got this other thing and they have gradually grouped together as a package. You see, these things plotted out against time very nicely until they grouped. And of course, they grouped with the ne plus ultra combination valence sort of a thing

A combination valence just groups everything anyhow. You see, the effeminate priest, he can't do anything that doesn't restimulate being a vestal virgin and he can't do anything without restimulating a priest. So he can't do anything without pulling his bank together. It's impossible.

So you've got this Goals Problem Mass. Now, that is a Goals Problem Mass. You see, your—the problem that a vestal virgin would have with the priest and the priest would have with the vestal virgin and all that sort of thing, that's a Goals Problem Mass all by itself.

And up here, we've got the merchant prince and the provost marshal and all that and that's a Goals Problem Mass all by itself. And then one day after that—he can't sell things anymore—what he does these days is he's a night watchman in a rice paddy. And he's sitting there nightwatching like mad and he notices there's a fire going on over in the edge of the woods someplace. And he decides to go over and investigate it and he finds that somebody

has set up a brass idol and they are all going oowah and wumm-wumm. And they're all calling out to woo-woo, and so he says, "Hey! What you doing there?"

That's enough. They all come over and he has to knock one of them colder than ice. And he gets in trouble with the local authorities and all that sort of thing and the Goals Problem Mass of the merchant and the military governor and the Goals Problem Mass of the temple come together and they make one awful big mash of bthaaa. See?

Well, free track sort of sits out here someplace and these two things come together and become undifferentiated from any time in them. Now you're really getting the mass.

What do you think happens after a thetan has had ten thousand such games? Ten thousand such games on the track? You see, each one of these games is one whole Goals Problem Mass, see?

They've got terminals, they've got oppters, they've got everything all mixed up. And, of course, as these things associate, you see, he had two association points that could have brought it together: once he did visit a temple as a merchant, but that was enough to start and then he actually knocked somebody out who was practicing rites in a wood, you see, while operating as a guard. Umm. And that really keys him in. He, by the way, got malaria after that and got very sick and they eventually buried him in the rice paddy, thinking he was possessed of demons—and he was, too.

So these masses just keep adding together and adding together and adding together and sometimes they're not totally added together at the moment the auditor enters into one. The auditor says to the fellow so-and-so and so-and-so.

And all of a sudden the fellow says, "You know that has some vague connection—a merchant prince and a temple. And there's something between a mer--- . Oh, there's something between a merchant—" Clank! And two pieces of Goals Problem Mass—two Goals Problem Masses go together with a splash. And the pc will say . . .

This has rarely happened, see? In other words, the auditing furnished the key-in, see? Don't let that worry you because it's inevitable. The thing was about to key in anyhow if it was that close, see?

Now you both key it in and separate it out again. He never would have had a chance of separating it out again, you see? So, don't let that worry you because you all of a sudden have these masses suddenly colliding with masses while you're auditing somebody.

You can sometimes group this lifetime. You're going along, pocketa-pocketa-pocketa-pocketa, auditing and you all of a sudden hit a whale of a grouper in this lifetime—overts and motivators and that sort of thing And this lifetime goes clank! And it becomes a balled-up mass. It's nothing to worry about. It would have gone in another year or two anyhow. You can separate it out and so on.

Now, the odd part of it is, you can take this lifetime apart if you can find the exact prior confusion to the exact moment of group. And you better learn how to do that because you can always take a Goals Problem Mass and put it back into a longitudinal track. You can take one of these valences and stretch it right out along the track again by picking up—if you wanted to audit just that valence.

Let's take him as—let's take him as Ali the errand boy of Baghdad. And we've got a valence there that's Ali the errand boy of Baghdad.

And we managed to have gotten this thing straightened out and separate. We've peeled it off, you see? And we've got it separate and it'll stay separate, if you can imagine such a thing. It won't.

But let's say we could get it to stay separate. We could then audit it this way: We could say, "What is the principal problem that Ali the errand boy of Baghdad had?" and he gives it to us and we said, "Well, when did that happen?" and so on. And we run it down. And "What's the prior confusion to that?" and "What were you withholding at that time?" and so on. And we'll get Ali the errand boy of Baghdad straightened out, so that it'll be—it'll be a section of free track.

We could do that. We don't have to do that.

But you could get all of these valences straightened out again and you could straighten them out along the track or you could group them up in a ball. You could do almost anything you want to with them with auditing. They're fairly easy to handle.

The best way to do something with them, of course, is to differentiate them, one from another: Both by finding them, naming them, getting them inspected very closely by the pc and blowing them off, nulling them and winding up with those that won't budge. And those that won't budge, of course, won't budge because they are impacted on others that are too heavily charged. You just bleed charge, bleed charge, bleed charge.

Now, these things are dependent on one another for their own charge, and the thing wouldn't hang together as—now, you notice you didn't get a ball-up happening until the fellow had an overt on the oppterm and then you get enough overt on the oppterm, you get a ball-up. See, the priest didn't get the track collapsing on him—if you wanted to call it that, he didn't get the track collapsing until he actually had run up an awful lot of overts on vestal virgins.

Now, that priest thing could collapse all by itself because he had overts inside it on vestal virgins without any valence of the vestal virgin being around, see? But frankly, that will unwind very easily. There's not very much to it. So he had some overts against some vestal virgins. That's about all it amounts to.

It takes the mechanics of a problem to keep this thing in suspension and keep these things from straightening out.

Now if you've got valence A versus valence B, you have the terminal and oppterm of a 3D package—A versus B. And let us suppose that both A and B are heavy inflows. You've got a valence versus a valence which is flowing away from a valence while the two things are held closely together, you create a vacuum. And you have brought later valences up into the vacuum between these two valences.

You've got inflow—or outflow valences actually create the same thing. Two outflow valences flowing against each other will tend to create the vacuum at the backs of the valences—two vacuums created.

So you get the thing held together, really, by the mechanics of opposition. These things have to be in pretty close balance to hang there at all. Otherwise, they'd as-is. It takes a lot of doing to get one of these things persisting. I mean, it's very delicately, the way they hang together. It's something.

Now, once you've got these things shredded on, the charge blown and the fellow has looked at them and he's discarded them and he winds up with what it was and you find some more of them and blow that and you straighten them up, another step could—two more steps could be done with this stuff—is when you're doing line A, let us say, in the Goals Problem Mass, you could take every zig and find out what problem it had with every zag.

In other words, you could take the zig and the zag in it is temple priest and the zag is vestal virgin. And you could ask the individual, "Now, what problem would a vestal virgin have

with a temple priest and what problem would a temple priest have with a vestal virgin? And just state the problem.”

The individual will usually state it that fast. But you could do a little assessment on that point and tend to blow these things even further than they have blown. Just a method of differentiation, this would be.

And then you could say—your next one is—that happens on that opposition line is for some peculiar reason an idol maker and you’ve got, well, “What problem would a vestal virgin have with an idol maker?” Now you see, the vestal virgin always—already had a set of problems with the priest. Now, the vestal virgin can also have a set of problems with the next zig which is the idol maker, see?

So you could then get all the problems of the zags with the zigs. See? Consecutive. You got the problems of the zigs with the zags and now you can get the problems of the zags with the zigs. And you keep writing down problem and the fellow looks at these things. And it’s like running problems on somebody, only he’ll keep recognizing that he’s had these problems and so on.

This thing blows, blows, blows, blows further apart.

Well, every time you enter this thing at all, you improve the person’s ability to confront it and his ability to confront it as long as he’s permitted to confront it: It takes good auditing; bad auditing inhibits his confronting of it. Poor auditing, rough auditing, keeps him from confronting it and it’s trying to keep him from confronting it and the two complement each other and he really gets upset.

But it—let’s say it’s good auditing and he’s going along fine, as it would be if any of you did it (or I’d knock your blocks off). The—the point we’re making here is that the individual is continuously confronting the phenomena of the Goals Problem Mass, you see? He’s continuously confronting it, one after the other and what these things are and he’s handling these things by the bushel-basket load. And he’s getting somatics here and getting somatics there. And it’s kicking his brains in on this side and it’s going on and on. And he gets accustomed to this sort of thing; he gets used to it, that’s all.

He’s blowing them. He’s separating them, differentiating them. He’s seeing what they are. And they frankly have less and less effect on him.

Now, all the way up the track, he has only been the effect of those things. He himself has been the effect of those things, but now they are being the effect of him. And just by reversing this cycle and doing no other action but just reversing this cycle, you’d stretch out the whole Goals Problem Mass. And you stretch it out back down the track.

And your eventual product of this, particularly if you added dating as a step (which I haven’t taken up with you and which I sometimes shudder at having to teach you, because I’ve had loses on it before) but if you were to date the thing and if you were to get a long roller tape of some kind or another that was about four, five, six inches wide and—so that you could put sections; you know, like motion-picture film on a spool. And you just kept writing down where these things were and you dated these things, you dated these valences, where they were found and so on and you got them all neatly in place on this long, endless belt of tape that—not endless belt of tape—the tape was so fixed that you could cut it out with a pair of scissors. And you could take another section—because it looked like you had everything consecutive, but all of a sudden a million years opens up in here that you never suspected before. So you cut the tape and take some Scotch tape and put another tape in the middle, see?

You add a section of tape, you see, because this thing will keep going that way. It will keep spreading out, naturally, as you get more and more track, don't you see? Eventually you'd have a time track of the fellow and you wouldn't do it on a—on a simple paper graph.

You'd have to have an endless-belt proposition, because I think the paper required to do this sort of thing would be something like about a hundred feet long, I think about a hundred feet of paper at a wild guess (just to give you some idea of the magnitude of it, you see). By cutting and patching—and you write up the track that you've got, this whole thing: he was a this and then in so many years he was a that and he was a that and he was a that and he was something or other and you put that . . .

Now, you find out, horribly enough, that this belongs in the middle of the temple-and-vestal-virgin game; it was an excursion on the temple-and-vestal-virgin game. You had to cut the temple-and-vestal-virgin game plot in half and sticky-plaster the thing to the both ends and now you've got that smoothed out. Don't you see?

And you could keep on drawing time track on the individual like this as an exercise, which would again just increase his ability to roll on the thing.

Now, at the same time, if every time you made one of these plots, you had him tell you the principal problems that were faced between these terminals and opptermes, you see, and the opptermes and the terminals and you had to—wrote the problems down on this line, you'd eventually have a long run of problems, problems, problems of various kinds. You'd be running problems on him at the same time.

What would you wind up with?

Well, you'd wind up with a whole track. Well now, when would these things start to unball? Well, you'll eventually find, early on the track, the mechanisms which made them ball up in the first place. And the individual actually straightens out his postulates on this subject and you would only find his postulates by doing this.

And he straightens out his postulates on this subject and all of a sudden all of them just go brump-brump-brump, stretch out, stretch out, stretch out, stretch out. They're eventually all lying out like tape measures, not lying out like balls of mud.

Now he could run on the time track and he could go the whole length and breadth of the time track. He could think of anything he has ever done and remember it.

Now, the reason he can't remember it, of course, is too much of his existence is in areas and in valences at which he must not think. If he thinks at them, he goes stupid, because they can think and he can't think. So therefore, he cannot remember his past. His past is totally occluded as far as he's concerned, because of there—total areas of no thinkingness. Do you see how that would be?

Now, that's about the only way you would ever recover a person's memory on the whole track and that's about what a whole track is all about.

And don't blame me if after you've got this universe straightened out, you haven't straightened out the home universe yet. That's your worry. We're talking about the whole track, we normally refer to this universe's track. Because earlier track is not in agreement with one person and another person, beyond the fact that they usually agree that there was a home universe and that they were building their own universe and other things were happening which were quite desirable and then those dirty dogs came with all the black muck and spread it all over everything and we stuck and that's why we're in this universe, see?

At first, in discussing things with them, you cannot find the identity of the dirty dogs with the black muck. I have discussed this with several pcs and they keep insisting on using the

“they.” They is the most prevalent pronoun with regard to this. So we haven’t found the fellows who did this and got this universe started and this time track going on total agreement. We haven’t found them yet. We’re still looking. We’re still looking to find the people who got this universe started that way and trapped everybody in it. We know it wasn’t you.

But on the other hand, you might—you might have met one of them at one time or another. And you might have some responsibility for turning him against beings or something. You might have had some minor overt that took them, you see, and made them antisocial so that they would do this.

Or on the other hand, on the other hand, on the other hand, thinking it over carefully, you might have been there and watched them—not intending to do it, of course and not having anything to do with it, but, you know, like people watch construction on the street—you might have been there watching them, something. And occasionally you might have offered them a small pebble—just to be helpful, you see; that’s just to be helpful, but no responsibility of yours.

Or on the other hand, on the other hand, there is some possibility—there is some possibility that you knew one of them rather well and agreed with what he was doing, you see, just because you knew him well. And there’s another possibility, if we reach a little bit further, that you were one of the workmen—of course, being driven with a whip, of course; but you were one of the workmen that was doing this.

And then there’s another possibility if you look very carefully on the whole track. You may very possibly find yourself standing there and the picture of a whip just below the level of your eye, and a hand holding this whip; and it might come through to you as a sort of a dim suspicion that if you had this kind of a picture at that point of the track that it might be you who was making them build a universe and who trapped everybody. You see, that’d be pretty hard to face.

So I’m not asking you to look at that, now. But I am asking you to look back at that period when you might have been standing there, caught, a total victim at the beginning of track.

Anyway, there is the—there’s the whole track and the way it rolls; that it exists, that it is there as a plot, that you’re still mocking it up and so forth, is quite remarkable. That this universe exists at all is quite remarkable and I am—I congratulate you. You did a pretty persistent job on it.

Okay. Do you see what you’re handling when you handle the Goals Problem Mass?

Audience: Yes.

Every one of the main valences has hundreds of subordinate valences and you can pull those off. And they’re what you get on a list; they’re the things that don’t hold on a list. They’re little incipient warts on the main—on a main mass. And then you know, at first, why, you just—the pc can’t tell the difference between them. At various—as you go on running, the pc can all of a sudden, even when he lists, recognize what the mass is and the identity of the mass. Even before you null it or differentiate it, he knows what it is.

And then that goes from there to knowing a little bit more about the whole track and knowing a little bit more about the game and then knowing more and more about life and knowing more and more and more and knowing more and then finally knowing all about it. That’s the other end that comes out.

There are many assistive things that an auditor could do. Many of these things probably won’t have to be done, because remember that you’re auditing a pc toward a rather steep increase of ability and recognition.

That's the Goals Problem Mass as it relates to the whole track. You might find the information useful—if, of course, you ever find anybody with a whole track.

If somebody comes around, you know and tells you that past lives don't exist or you have no reality on past lives, I'll give you one little tip in taking this sort of thing apart. People can't think of past lives when they're stuck in one life. But they normally, quite normally, have had the subject of past lives itself invalidated heavily in this lifetime. And if you pull that apart as invalidation and get all the ramifications with relationship to that, why, generally it will all straighten out.

This is too new a subject for anybody to have too much antipathy against. After all, it hasn't been around since Egypt. And in those days, if you said there was no such thing as a past life, why, you were liable to have had it, because it went quite the reverse.

I remember vividly—one of the mechanisms and overts and uses of past lives in Egypt was that the king could come back and claim his possessions. And I thought that was an awfully handy mechanism: did very well for a number of years. Went many lifetimes before anybody got wise to this thing and thought, "Well, we've got a better idea: a better idea. And that is, if we claim that everybody when he dies is dead, dead, dead, then we never have to give him back any of his possessions. And that settles that!"

And the idea of one lifetime stems purely and entirely and completely out of ideas of property and that is all. So you see why the popularity of it. I imagine the Prudential Life Insurance people and the Bureau of Statistics and the Record of Wills and the Recorder of Wills and Testaments and so on would be amongst the first people to shoot you down on sight if you went around saying people have lived before and you are only living again, because, of course, they have a very vested interest in it.

But so does everybody have a vested interest in there only being one life. Unfortunately, unless we admit the evidence before us that there—one has lived more than one life, we don't clear anybody or make him any better.

The only reason we're interested in the subject particularly is because unless you pay attention to one lifetime as a fallacy and audit past lives and whole track and so forth, you make no gains. And we're interested in gains, we're interested in understanding of the subject and interested in wins, so therefore, we have to admit something that seems much closer to the truth. Okay?

Thank you very much.