

AS-ISNESS: PEOPLE WHO CAN AND CAN'T AS-IS

A lecture given on
5 April 1962

Thank you.

Okay. Second lecture, 5 April, Saint Hill Special Briefing Course, AD 12. Now, we've been talking about what won't as-is. The things that won't as-is. First and foremost, of course, the things that won't as-is are the things you don't know anything about. Can't as-is it if you don't know anything about it.

And the next thing is something that you can't communicate with and that can't communicate with you. So that's a poor show as an as-is. That's just overtly can't, you see. A person knows something about the natives of upper Lombovia. It's very hard to as-is the natives of upper Lombovia if one simply has the idea that they might exist. You've never talked to them. They've never talked to you. But this is not in order of damagingness to the individual.

There is a reverse situation that you would never suspect, which is nothing there to do any as-ising. See, you'd never suspect that one. There simply is an operating GE. You get the idea? And of course, it won't as-is. Nothing will as-is with regard to this thing because there's nothing there to as-is it. That, of course, is the—basically the most, obvious but the least discerned of the as-ises.

See, if you're not there to look, why, there it'd be. But it'd be something with nothing in it to as-is it. And of course—and that won't as-is, of course. Won't alter-is either. It won't do anything.

Therefore, any mechanism which makes nothing out of the thetan becomes non-as-isable. Do you see that? See, if something makes absolutely nothing—you see, a thetan really isn't nothing. If a somethingness must always have matter, energy, space and time connected with it, of course, then a thetan could be nothing, but a nothingness wouldn't have ideas and a personality and capabilities and creativeness and position ability and view ability and register ability and memory ability. You can't call this a nothing, you see.

Although it may be nothing with regard to matter, energy, space and time, it is not nothing with regard to its abilities. See, it can do things. Well, a nothingness can't do things, but then a thetan isn't a nothingness. So if you had something which made absolutely nothing out of a thetan's abilities and a thetan's existence and a thetan's lookingness and a thetan's creatingness and a thetan's doingness and a thetan's causativeness in all directions—you would, of course, have a not—a non-as-ising situation.

Only the not-is that exists there is in reverse. One is not not-ising the item. The item is not-ising the person. You see that is a reverse mechanism? And of course, that is your most dangerous valence.

A lot of religions tend to set up this valence. The campaign of most religion is to get rid of all the evil spirits. And they really go to town on getting rid of all the evil spirits. All early religions—I don't care how they become modern religions later on—or some—after they've gotten rid of all the evil spirits they usually become modern and benign. That's because they've done their job. But early they're quite militant. Any religion, whether Christian or Mohammedan, anything else is quite militant on the subject of the evilness of the spirit—the evil spirits that must be around.

So that you get the religion of the German woods is totally based upon how horrible all these things are that live in pools and trees and caves, don't you see? How they're liable to spring out at you at any minute. Earlier religions, less violent, less aberrative types of religions,

admit the existence of beings which are not necessarily malignant. There you get the Irish. The Irish have a whole category of little people that do various things, not necessarily bad.

And it's very funny that that ancient religion would ride right alongside of the most violent, modern religion which we have—that these two things would go hand in glove. But they seem to have succeeded in doing so. And of course, we probably will see the day when we know nothing about—who was it that “driv the snakes out of Eire-land”? we won't 'ear about him anymore. We won't hear about him at all, but we will still have leprechauns—the wee people.

And when a religion has been totally successful, utterly and totally successful, it manifests itself in a society where the spirit is totally unknown and there are no spirits. Now, beware of that society because it is the furthest south. There are no spirits. They just don't exist. Man is MEST. The brain is the limit of psychology. There are no spirits. Now you've achieved a total overwhelm.

Not only are there not even no—malignant spirits, but there just are no spirits. And you have a soul like your car has a spare tire. It has nothing to do with you. You're taking care of this soul. you see, it's an otherdeterminedness by this time. You're taking care of this soul. And if you were a good boy or you were a good girl, why, you can send this soul off at your demise to some pie-in-the-sky sanatorium or something for souls, see.

Well, let's take a limit—a limiting view of this sort of thing Now, how has this manifested itself in our present world. Well, let's take what they're called—the exact sciences. And let's see what these exact sciences are all about.

Matter, energy, space and time. Well, the first fundamental of elementary physics as taught in every school in this western culture is the conservation of energy. This is the first and foremost thing that is instructed. Energy cannot be created. Energy cannot be destroyed.

Along with this we have conservation of mass. You burn a candle and if you were to seize all the carbon and all the other gases and elements and compress them in fragments down again and to rescue all these things and put them together in the platter, they would weigh as much as the candle did. See, once the candle is burned the residue which is left will weigh as much as the candle. I consider it very interesting nobody has ever done it. Interesting theory.

Well, we could see that this is perfectly reasonable. But notice how reasonable we all are on the subject of physics. Very reasonable.

We cannot destroy or create energy. And all mass suddenly turns out to be energy. Well, the weird part of all of this and the contradictoriness of all of this, if there's matter, energy, space and time and there's never going to be any more energy or any less energy and all—it's always going to be this much energy and nobody can do anything to this energy except maybe alter its condition—if that's the case, where do they come off having an expanding universe. See, they have conservation of energy, but they haven't gotten to a point yet where they have conservation of space.

See, they still talk today about the expanding universe. In other words, there's more and more and more and more and more space. Interesting way of overwhelming somebody, isn't it. There's going to be more and more and more and more and more and more and more and more space, you see. And there's never going to be less space, so it's expanding, expanding, expanding and expanding, see.

But you're not going to be able to do anything to energy. And space is just overwhelming you. Well, you wonder why a physicist goes nuts. The commodity which he is handling he is instructed that he can never do anything to. See, he can never destroy it and he can never create it.

So if he can never destroy it and never create it, of course, it's sacred. And, man, if you ever want to get into a religious argument, start talking to a flock of physicists. It's a religious argument. It has nothing whatsoever to do with the reasonableness of this or that.

They don't realize that religion itself has brought them to the pass of this, because these things consist of a series of postulates which are agreed upon and made. And having agreed upon these postulates, having made these postulates, we wind up, of course, with an agreed-upon situation and condition. But I think any one of you on the backtrack are liable to find out where you violate the principles of energy or the principles of mass.

I imagine you've been sprinting up and down the backtrack at some time or another and you may have run into, all of a sudden, well, I don't know, making things disappear suddenly and startling everybody or suddenly making things appear and startling everybody or making all the trees grow twice as big suddenly or half as big, or just as-is-ing things at a glimpse or overwhelming in general someplace on the track. See, doing something to energy.

I think somewhere, even if it's just stopping somebody, you've got a facsimile of doing something to energy. But of course, if you can't do anything to energy, time becomes inexorable because time is manifested by the change of space of particles—well, of course, is itself a postulate and is not monitored by the change of space of particles.

But one becomes aware of the passage of time because of the change of space amongst particles, even if it's just the tickety-tock of a balance wheel of a clock. It's still change of space of particles.

Now, the physicist, then, is actually a priest gone mad. That's all he is. And having imbibed all of his stable data and having sworn on the blessed Black's textbook on physics or something like that, to forevermore uphold these principles and to never turn away from any of them and to support them to the death, he then starts studying nuclear physics. And this is very difficult because he finds there's such things as holes in space and sometimes certain particles will shoot through in certain ways and become two particles and they were only one particle. And energy misbehaves. And the finite laws of elementary physics start to get foggy.

Now he's trying to hold on to a set of principles which tell him conservation of energy, while experimenting with a set of principles, of course, which tell him that there—something is astray about the conservation of energy and he usually winds up by saying, "Well, it—none of it violates the conservation of energy at all," with the attitude of a boy whistling as he goes by a graveyard.

And he goes mad about that time, so it's no wonder that the primary threat to this particular planet at this particular time is the explosion of bombs of nuclear fission. Because the first thing such a fellow would do would be to destroy himself.

We hear of the dedication of science and the dedication of science, of course, is all for science and nothing for me. All scientists should give all of their patents and developments to the club or to the university or to the manufacturing firm or to somebody or other. People should not, themselves, take out patents on their developments.

Nobody should have a right to his own developments. One of the most violent experiences that any physicist wants to have, will greet him or any chemist or something like that, if he's working for a university and happens to pour test tube A into test tube B and get molten student or something. If he were at this particular moment to take out a patent on this process in his own name he would probably be thrown out of the American Society of Chemists, the American Society of Physicists, the university and probably out of the house, too, as having been a traitor to the cause. He had done something to himself. It's quite peculiar.

If you think of the number of times you have tried to tell an educated person in the field of the mind or a psychologist or somebody, about Scientology, it would strike you as absolutely

amazing that anybody could make the— this remark: “Well, I don’t blame you for keeping it all a monopoly to yourselves.” And yet that is the adjudication that the American psychologist makes about the Scientologist—that we are keeping it all secret to ourselves.

If you think of the number of times you have tried to disseminate and compare that with an attitude that we are keeping it all secret, it will look absolutely asinine to you. But of course, these birds are just asking for an executioner, that’s all. You’ll never have any trouble when you finally top the rise on this sort of thing.

The only trouble you will have will be trying to save the psychologist from his suicide. He will not combat you actively. He will only combat you in a direction which executes himself. That’s the only way he’ll combat you. And he’ll probably make hysterical public statements—they do, you know—that make them sound discreditable or silly. Or they steal the wrong part of the technique. It’s all theirs, but they steal the wrong part of the technique, you see or something like this, to publish some asinine nonsense based on this sort of thing

What’s very peculiar and the only thing I’m bringing up here is, is here we’re practically trying to force it down the guy’s throat, you see and they’re only mad because we keep it secret! That’s from their view that’s what we must be doing.

I’ve had one of them tell me that—accuse me of not publishing papers in the American—I don’t know what they call them—the American Society of Psychologists’ Journal. Why didn’t I publish papers in the thing It a—”Just—just one of these cases!” I had heard one fellow say one time, “Just one of these cases! Just—just look, you know. The guy. . .” The average gain in an HGC, you know. “Just one of these profiles published would revolutionize the whole of psychology!”

They’d never publish one of those things. You could walk in with Sten guns and they’d never publish one, see. The guy’s very upset because you’re not publishing, you see, in this magazine. And this magazine, of course, would never publish anything you gave them because you’re keeping it all secret. Isn’t this a fantastic spin? Well, I used to go round and round with arguments of this character.

At first, if you tried to talk to them and some of you will, sooner or later, you’ll talk to such a chap and he’ll be impudent or insolent with you at first and then just go into apathy. Thud. There isn’t any gradient scale. He just doesn’t go down like this, you see. He goes along insolent, apathetic.

Now, what he’s trying to do is carry on something he thinks comes out of physics. See, he’s trying to keep the sacredness of energy. He’s trying to keep the sacredness of the brain. We’ve long talked about care of the body, care of the body, as one of the ills of our modern society, you know. “The worship of the body.” Let’s put it that way.

Care of the body, care of the body, care of the body. you got to do this with the body, you got to do that with the body. you got to get up, you got to exercise and you got to—got to do this and you got to do that. Well, maybe you got to but . . . When a fellow starts telling you that the brain does all the thinking, of course, this is just an effort to get what’s inside the brain—a thetan—totally overwhelmed by his immediate environment. See? Which will get a total survival of gray matter and the total nonsurvival of a—of a thetan.

See, when you try to teach a psychologist about Scientology you’re going straight up against his basic stable datum, is that the thing which is there to as-is isn’t there.

Now, therefore, those valences which you’ll have the most trouble trying to run out or will give you the most trouble on a case are those valences which totally deny the existence of a thetan because there’s nothing there, you see, to as-is.

That's different from—you look at a steel plate and look at it very heavily and you know you're looking at it and you'll—one of your first conclusions would be that looking at the steel plate would be—well, that would be a hard job of as-ising, trying to get a steel plate to disappear just by inspecting it. Now, you will—you would admit that this would look pretty hard. No, this is nothing. This is nothing compared to being a steel plate. See, at least the first situation, you're there looking at a steel plate trying to get it to disappear. But the second, there is nothing to look at it.

So that is the extreme case of not as-is. No as-isingness can take place in the absence of something to as-is it. See, you're not going to get any lumber sawed if somebody has hidden all the saws in the land. There isn't a saw in the land. How're you going to saw the lumber? You're not going to.

Now, being a steel plate and being only a steel plate, not being a spirit that is in a steel plate, but being a steel plate—"Me the steel plate"—is the least as-ising situation. See, as an auditor, you must know what the least as-ising situation is.

Now, if—therefore it gives you some wisdom in your trying to disentangle items. You look over a whole bunch of items. Let us say, we go over this list of items and we inspect them. Your E-Meter reading will give you the one most likely to as-is. It doesn't give you the most overwhelmed. See, it'll give you the one that will run. But remember there are some others after this has run and the individual has increased his beingness, his own beingness, you see, to the point of not being what you have just run out. Now, he will be in a situation where he can be assessed again and will become aware of the fact that he is not quite the steel plate. We—before, when you went across that, you got no reaction at all because you just got the reading of a steel plate.

He's being totally a steel plate, you see. Next time you run across and you read steel plate to him, you see, you've increased his ability to view, to be himself without being something else—and he'll register now on being a steel plate because he's not quite a steel plate.

A tree out here—if you put an E-Meter on a tree, you won't get much of a read because trees are really being trees. Boy, are they—are they . . . Whatever spirit combination puts together trees is sure being trees.

But oddly enough tomatoes aren't really being tomatoes very hard. That's very peculiar, you know, because you can get a tomato to register. You can get corn to register—maize. A lot of vegetables, a lot of flowers will register and a lot won't.

It's the amount of endure connected with a vegetable which gives you the lessened needle registry on the E-Meter. In other words, the more endure the less registry. That's an inverse proportion.

The greater the effort to survive, the greater the endurance, the more mesty a thing is. And the less registry you will get of livingness.

So frankly, in the early stages of sorting out a 3D Criss Cross Goals Problem Mass, you will come across no reaction at all on those that should be run. put somebody on the meter. You say, "Do you have a Goals Problem Mass? Do you—have you ever been anything else or anybody else?" The possibility is you get no registry at all.

He's in two conditions. He's in the condition of not-know about any of them and they're there but he isn't there. In other words, you get a total overwhelm involved here that includes a not-know and of course you should be able to see at this time that a total overwhelm is a not-know.

Of course you get no registry at all. But now, you start differentiating items and you start nulling them and you start getting items. All of a sudden bing, a fellow is this one and bing, a

fellow is that one and you've got another one and got another one. You're getting your various lines. "Oh-oh, there's a feeling along here someplace that these things have a peculiar beingness of some kind or another."

You at least have the fellow in present time exterior to the view of being able to say, "Yes. Somewhere on the track there's a whizzer."

Ah, well, that's much different. You see, up to that time, he couldn't say a whizzer was even on the track because, you see, he was a whizzer without being there at all. So all you got a reading of was a whizzer. Not a whizzer plus a thetan or a whizzer being inspected by a thetan. That—you didn't have that. you just had a whizzer.

And the fellow who is saying, "I wonder if I could have been a whizzer?" See, that's the period where he's sort of coming out of the morass—coming up to a point where he can inspect.

So your listing, differentiating, nulling, finding and proving an item, is leading a person further and further along the line of being able to inspect and is lessening his identity with MEST because all of these valences are composed of matter, energy, space and time and trapped postulates.

They haven't got thetans in them; they got trapped postulates in them. You can see the postulates come to view. The person doesn't see himself coming out of these things. He sees at first the ideas of them come alive. And then eventually, why, hell—he sees there's been a thetan in them, namely him.

So what you've got in 3D Criss Cross—a gradient scale of bailing somebody out. Well, of course, the extreme condition you're bailing him out of is you're auditing a brick wall. You're not auditing anything, except an object, an identity. You're auditing a plumber, see. It doesn't even register, see. The Goals Problem Mass has no registry on it of any kind whatsoever.

At that stage of the game, before any differentiation took place, if by some necromancy you had been able to look over the shoulder of Yahweh or Tetragrammaton or whatever the fellow's name was... Somebody keeps books on somebody. I think he has an angel that keeps books. And if you'd read the angel's books and not got that from auditing the pc and you found out he'd been a waterbuck and a tiger and a whizzer and a plumber, see, off the good books and you said, "Waterbuck, tiger, whizzer, plumber," you know, you would get no reaction on the meter at all.

It wouldn't do you a bit of good to know all the Goals Problem Mass on a pc if the pc didn't know any part of the Goals Problem Mass on him. Because you'd get no registry. Because you're reading those items which are there which are not as-isable because there's nothing there to as-is them. He's just in them. But he's not there in them. They just are. And they look to him like packages of MEST when he first begins to view them.

They're balls of energy sitting in space. They have mass. Sometimes some time gets connected with them and pieces of MEST when he first looks at them. Well, he is that MEST when you first encounter these things. And there's no differentiation of any kind at all in his mind. So you don't get any read on the needle.

No, you have to approach this from the point of view, not even of, "Could this have been me?" That will occur to him rapidly enough.

You say, "Who or what—." You notice he scratches his left ear. Let's take some weird gradient here. This is not necessarily a proper approach at all. But let's take a lightest possible approach. And you notice he very often scratches his left ear. And so you say, "Who or what would oppose scratching an ear or a left ear?" We do a long list of this thing.

All of a sudden, why, the item that falls out of it is, “a doctor.” And he suddenly has a picture of a doctor in school who used to tell them never put anything smaller than your elbow in your ear.

And he gets an actual identity. And this actual identity falls out of the bank and there it is. Well, you know. Well. Suddenly the past track, you know, there’s something a little more real to him here, you see.

Now, “Who or what would oppose the doctor?” you see. And if we did something like that, there’s another identity that he was being obsessively in. It tends to come out just a little bit, you know?

You’re getting something there which can as-is. See, we’re moving from a not there and therefore can’t as-is. Can’t as-is because one is not there. These other things are there, but he is not there. You see, it’s an other-determined condition entirely. We moved that on a gradient to these other things being more and more and more observed. And of course, on this gradient we get more and more awareness of self.

And of course, we have more there to as-is. Now, you’ve heard me tell you for years and years and years and years and years that the most difficult pc was the one who couldn’t as-is, whose thought didn’t have any effect on anything.

You’ve heard that one. All right. Now, put that together with what I’ve told you tonight. Of course, the least condition of having an effect on anything is not even knowing you were there to have any effect on it. So that sums that case up instantly. And that tells you why 3D Criss Cross has a constant, continuous gain. That—this is what I’m telling you is the therapeutic value of 3D Criss Cross.

Now, if you’re not getting tone arm action during listing of 3D Criss Cross then you’re not there and they’re not enough there to have you there, so of course, nothing is as-ising.

Well, you’ve got some tiny action. Yes, you could probably keep it up. you could probably win from that tiny gradient.

But there’s another way to approach this situation. And that is to use the CCHs. And when you do this the pc appears—pardon me, the beingness of John Doe and the beingness of the auditor—no thetans or other beingness—but those two identities appear. And out of all the nowhere-ness we’ve got an observation of identity. See, we’ve got an observation of present time identity.

Now, objects can—all cases go on this gradient of show up. This is items that show up. And they go on this gradient. But some cases are not as far south as others. But this would be the extreme gradient: Future items, present time items, present life items, past life items. And as we go north from a case that’s all the way south we would first pick up future items. Sounds crazy, doesn’t it, but it’s true. We’d pick up future items and then we would pick up present time items and then we would pick up present life items and then we would pick up past life items.

All right. Now, if a person isn’t getting much tone arm motion, it’s much easier to cut them into this scale suddenly, clank, with CCHs. See, without struggling around about it and monkeying with it, well, let’s just cut them in to present time items, namely, an identity pc and an identity auditor. Let’s not worry about where they’re lurking on the track. Let’s just cut them into present time and take off from there.

Of course, you get enough control, communication and havingness going in present time and the individual will sooner or later get the idea that the identity can reach this other identity called auditor and certainly that the other identity called auditor can reach the identity called

pc and therefore they are two different identities. That is the first lesson that is learned. And that is the first CCH items that show up.

See, as when you're going—when you're going at 3D Criss Cross on this route you attain your first two items by CCHs. Sometimes the first one is auditor and sometimes the first one is pc. Sometimes the first one is pc and the— and the second one is auditor. But those are the first two items that show up.

In other words, they get a higher and higher ability to differentiate between pc and auditor and auditor and pc. You're not really differentiating that way.

We do have one of these CCHs that you're well acquainted with called Op Pro by Dup. which actually does forcefully show the individual... Oh, inevitably, if you run enough Op Pro by Dup smoothly enough you're going to have the pc sort of saying, "You know, I'm kind of out here looking at the body do it. You know, I mean. . ." It's a gradient. Their arms get thin or objects get thin. Something happens that they're not so cockeyed sure that they are an it and they get an observational point of view. That's if Op Pro by Dup is going to work, that's the direction it works. It's a great exteriorization process.

Of course, exteriorization is terribly violent. It's without a gradient scale at all. This is not saying this isn't Op Pro by Dup exteriorization. That's not violent. But I'm talking about now, exteriorization.

We say, oh, well, you want to get this guy separated from items. Ho-ho. Well, that's easy. Try not to be three feet back of your head, you know. Bang! The guy's three. . . All of a sudden he says, "What! I'm not that? God help me." you see and bang, he'll go back in or fly into other valences or something like that. Oh-oh-oh-oh. Shakes him up. Gives him a—gives him quite a start. Quite a shock.

It was very funny. A few minutes afterwards it would be very vivid to him. And a day or so later, it never happened. You've had it happen to you as an auditor, I'm sure.

"No. Why, the auditor keeps saying he exteriorized me. Why, he didn't exteriorize me, no."

Person was outside saying, "Gee, my gosh! Really! Oh no!" And you know. "Gosh," you know. "What about that, you know!"

Next day, "No, I didn't exteriorize. Nothing actually happened at all."

In other words, you can, on your determinism, blow him out of his 'ead. But that wasn't on 'is determinism. So you've blown somebody out of his head who is in no position to recognize that he is any different. And the only way he can survive is by being an identity, some other identity and being thoroughly enmeshed in it.

And that's good. That's good and safe and so forth and you give him no chance to get used to it. Well frankly, 3D Criss Cross is an exteriorization process. It does it on a tremendous gradient. It's a very, very gradient, gradient. Very slow. Item after item, mass after mass that the person has been in, the person begins to come out of. And they don't even come out of them very far, each one at a time, don't you see? They don't violently come out of them. Their attention goes on the things and as you increase though, the individual passes into an ability to as-is. And the last item that will come off is the one which was most sacred. And the one which was most sacred was the one that was him. Because he wasn't there and it was. And that would be the most extreme case on the bank of, "it was there but he wasn't there." And he wasn't there at all, not even vaguely was he present. He was it.

You ask any pc. He says, "Oh, well, I just want to be myself."

You say, "Well, good. What's yourself?"

He'll give you something, but it won't be really what he's being He'll just give you a lock on it. He never gives you the real one and just gives you a lock on that thing.

But he'll finally be able to answer that question of what he is. And the one step out from that is he really is just—just “me,” you know. He's just a “me.” He is not a dandy with a three-foot top hat carrying a two-foot-nine cane, smoking Murad cigarettes, see? That is not what he is. It's just “me.” And this is going to drive somebody batty someday when they're doing listing, you know. The guy keeps saying “me, me.” you know, it's toward—way toward—you got about thirty, forty, fifty items, you know. Case has been progressing real well.

And, “Yeah and what would oppose that?”

“Well, just me. Just me. Just me.”

And you finally get an item which is “me,” which would of course be your last item. But of course before you get that last item that is really “me,” you have thirty, forty, fifty items at the absolute minimum, all of which the pc knows are “me.” But this last one, he finally knows that is me. That is just me.

“What would oppose that?”

“Me.”

Well, that's of course, if you did the whole of whole track dynamic clearing with 3D Criss Cross only, assessment only, never running, if you assessed out, that would be your final item.

But of course, every item before you get there, each one is, of course, “me.”

So there is the substance of the thing and there—how the bank sets together. There's the person who can't as-is. There is how you get a person to as-is.

Your CCHs cut into this very simply and very easily by simply slashing into present time and finding two items in present time—auditor, pc. Also, can find another item—wall.

And even if these items—a person knows he isn't these things, he becomes much less these things as he goes along.

One comment. How does all this happen? I mean how does a person get that interiorized? And I just want to make one comment here because it's now late and just one little comment.

How does a person get this way? By asserting a reaction of an identity or an object. He's asserting that it will react. That is the clue to all future interiorization.

Now, that—it sounds silly. If you wanted to set up this chain reaction you could say this piece of paper will react. And you've set up the overt-motivator sequence, you see. This piece of paper will react, you said. If you do so-and-so then this paper will do so-and-so to you. That's going even a little further than it just will react.

You see, a first gradient is this paper will react. The laws of reaction, don't you see. But then if you do something to this paper, this paper will do something to you. Now, you've got the chain well settled and that is the overt-motivator sequence.

See, if you touch a match to this paper and don't take your hand away, you will be burned. See, if you learned that lesson very thoroughly. If you set up this piece of paper to react in that particular way, you would have set up the sequence which would lead to a fully established overt-motivator sequence.

You say steel reacts. You go along and punch your fist into steel and it'll really fix your clock. Now, actually the resistance of steel depends to a large degree upon its conductivity and the fact it doesn't react. See, it doesn't react on itself and it does react on you. See, this is getting a little more complicated but it's all under the heading of react. If you do something to the steel, the steel will do something to you, but nothing will be done to the steel, don't you see? You made the steel sacred, in other words.

I can see it now. Some metallurgist wanting to make better armor plate for the Royal Navy. He knows how to do it. you just get everybody to sit down and pray down at the iron works and you'd have it made. That would work out just fine providing the enemy heard your prayers. But you'd have to teach the enemy that your steel would react and he would have to believe that.

A shell fired at this steel not only does not dent this steel, but instantly is catalyzed into a blow-back and sails in the same trajectory through the air and goes down the muzzle of the same gun that fired it and explodes therein. Now, that would be real armor.

Well, that's how your overt-motivator sequence sets up. That's how reactivity sets up with regard to these items. It all comes under these various relatively simple rules, relatively simple laws.

How you get a fellow fished out to a point where he can look, well, that requires a considerable technical accuracy, but you should know in using that technical accuracy what you're trying to do. You're actually just getting an individual out to a viewpoint. And that's all you're doing Okay?

Audience: Yes.

All right. Well, there'll be no lectures next week. you will get a chance to study. And I'm very happy about that because the number of passes you've been getting are terrific. But I expect you all to be classified by next Friday.

So you needn't worry about it tonight. You can have a good sleep. And remember sleep is sacred.

Good night.