

Clearing: Fixed Ideas

A lecture given by L. Ron Hubbard
on the 2 June 1959

¹Thank you.

Well, I haven't done very much for this particular Unit except develop a few processes for it and test them out. And you surprise me today by having heads. Everybody has got a head, still. That's remarkable. Ever see the picture of "The Invisible Man?"

Audience: Yeah

Well, there is a phase through which pcs go, coming up the line, where they disappear, you know? They get into the Not-isness band, you see, and there it goes.

But... Two or three people looking at me very worried. What's the matter? You attached to your head?

Yes.

All right.

²And this is a lecture on clearing, 6th London ACC, and it covers some fundamental processes and says a few more words about clearing.

Now, first and foremost here, first and foremost, we have a principle that any auditing discharges fixed postulates or fixed ideas.

Now, an idea is fixed before it disperses and we don't run the dispersals because that comes after the fact, so we are actually auditing at fixed ideas.

A fixed idea – particularly if enforced by other-determinisms – which is no longer usable or applicable, becomes an aberration. And any aberration is, first and foremost, a fixed idea.

Now, as ideas become fixed, the ability – the free decisive ability of the person to fix ideas declines. And a thetan in good condition is *the cause* of ideas which he can fix in things or the source of fixed postulates. And a thetan in very, very bad condition is *the effect* of fixed postulates that he can do nothing about. See that clearly? This is in the earliest Axioms, actually, of Scientology. It's more or less inherent in those, but this is a new interpretation or a new look at those early Axioms.

¹ Audio Part 1: clearsound audio.

² Audio Part 2: original reel audio.

Now, Cause, Distance, Effect – we get the thetan at cause across a distance fixing an effect or an idea, eventually himself getting into loses when he didn't fix ideas. So he fixed them in himself. And he flipped around to the effect end of the line and became the effect of ideas which he'd fixed and then tried to unfix or didn't want fixed, or something of that sort. Do you get the idea, see? So he did a flip, he went from cause to effect on the subject of fixed ideas.

Now, he considers most ideas that are fixed to stem from other-determinism. Well, if he himself in his own virtuous, powerful, strong, flamboyant native beingness – if he himself there, was able to fix ideas and then if he departed from being himself, where did the ideas land? Well, now those ideas, now, are apparently other-determined ideas merely because he's not being himself – he's in some other valence situation, you see. He's come around, flip! He actually is still fixing these ideas in himself, but he set himself up here as an independent entity entirely different than himself and "himself," now, "himself" is Joe Jones, you see?

He knows who he is. He's Joe Jones and he got born and they fixed up his neurons and his stomach pumps him energy and he's alive as long as his heart beats, and... If he starts having a bad time he gets the idea that he's haunted – that something is bothering him, someplace or another, and something is annoying him and it's clawing at him and so forth. And he has actually projected his own beingness into something and then occupied it. And he becomes, actually, the subject of his own fixed ideas, particularly those ideas which he failed to fix.

Now, oddly enough, the ideas which he failed to fix were the lousiest ideas he ever had. They are the worst – murder, rape, revenge. They're the ideas that if anybody should walk upside down, then he will grow a parallelogram on his right leg, you see. And nobody would buy this idea, so he'd show them it was usable and he'd wear it.

There's an old, old maxim: "That which is least admired, persists." Well, that's true in this particular case. Those fixed ideas which are giving him the most trouble were the ideas that nobody would buy. And you get this universe, not as a common denominator of the finest, most wonderful ideas there are, but the common denominator of it in terms of behavior are some of the lousiest ideas that anybody ever originated. You get the idea? Yet, everybody gets these ideas himself and he does a flipperoo.

Now, we know pretty well what's good, with "the greatest good for the greatest number of dynamics" – that's survival on all hands. Now, how many ideas extant in this universe measure up to this? And we seem to occasionally find ourselves fighting the stream. We find ourselves out there, unable to understand why things run so differently than the way we think they should run and so forth.

Well, one of the reasons for this is that we still, basically, natively know what's good. But the fixed ideas that wouldn't be bought aren't in that category. So we have these things at variance. These things are at great variance, you see?

The ideas which were worth having, and so on, generally got fairly well bought and we didn't have any loses with those, but we had big loses with these other ideas that nobody would buy. And people began to wear them themselves just to show they could be worn and they never were admired and nobody would ever agree to them. And we get into an

individuation, back off of it – aren't like the rest of the people. Well, why? Because a person could eventually become a whole package of fixed ideas, which none of them were any good. And he knows, himself, these ideas are sort of stinking, you know.

Like – give you an idea: "One should always honor one's father and one's mother, regardless of what they do." Actually, it's a fixed idea. Beings generally merit what they merit. And we get some sort of a broad "Jewelers never go anywhere" going, you see, and we've had it. You see?

So somebody's father is a staggering drunk, or something like that, and mother is out at Hyde Park Corner and we have a picture of family life here which is not particularly inviting. And this kid goes into it and hears that he should "Honor thy father and thy mother." He tries to make this gel, you see – he tries to make this gel and he can't quite make it. So he goes into a total protest – now, get this particular point – he goes into a total protest. And that is the basic source of protest, is the conditions don't match an ideal. But the ideal when it's a fixed idea is devoid of variation by judgment. So you could define a fixed idea as something which is not altered by judgment. That's the reason why you can't educate a pc into being some other kind of case. You slightly can, if you've got enough altitude, but not all the way. Because why? His judgment is very poor – that is to say, he cannot vary his fixed ideas.

When education is combined with an attack on highly specialized, not-too-good fixed ideas, which is to say, the reactive bank. The reactive bank, composition of, is fixed postulates – fixed postulates which do or do not bear any resemblance to reality, which are unalterable by judgment – and these fixed postulates which are all unalterable by judgment are supposed to go into action and do things when certain things happen.

And this little kid that has the very bad father and the very bad mother, he has the fixed idea, let us say, that "One should honor thy father and thy mother," and here it is.

So he goes into this protest. This brings him into a (quote) "fight against life." This brings him into a constant and continual contest with existence. He's always sparky and so forth. He is always trying to get back at it somehow or another, he knows they've got it in for him and he knows he'd better, *rarah*, and so forth.

And now one day this fellow sits down feeling a little tired and says, "I wish I had some peace of mind." Well, he isn't likely to have peace of mind, since his mind analytically is unable to alter his mind reactively, which has fixed in it a tremendous number of unworkabilities. And thus, he's out of pace with himself, out of pace with life and doesn't come up to PT worth a nickel.

Now, any fixed idea, it might entertain you to know, is stuck on the time track. Any fixed idea is stuck on the time track. So the number of ideas a person has over which he cannot exercise judgment determines how far out of PT he is. He's that far out of present time to the degree that he has fixed ideas which cannot be altered by his own judgment.

Now, we get somebody living by rules or policies. Well, conditions change and if policies or rules cannot be altered to suit the change, why, then we have vast difficulties, at once. We're in trouble, in other words.

Let's say a fellow is educated to be the best buggy whip manufacturer ever produced. And his fixed idea is that the manufacturing of buggy whips is the thing to do and the making of buggy whips is the thing to do. And he's got to make buggy whips and in quantity. And nobody ever uses any buggy whips. He again goes into a state of protest.

Now, let's examine this state of protest a little bit further and see that all we're looking at is a state of disagreement. His fixed ideas do not agree with generally bought fixed ideas – workable fixed ideas. So when he gets one of these crosswise and can no longer rationalize on it and it no longer moves in time, the next thing you know he feels totally out of agreement with life.

Well, life is a thing of changing ideas and a person who cannot change his ideas is a person who cannot move in time. And therefore, he's stuck reactively. And eventually he gets a very poor opinion of his own analytical power and so at length is incapable of altering his analytical mind as well as his reactive mind and he says – he speaks very analytical, you see, he's very analytical about everything he approaches and very analytically gives out all of this sort of thing, but actually he's just running off a record. See? So his (quote) "analytical" mind is actually itself reactive.

Now, this person is penalized to the degree that he cannot unfix and refix ideas. And he believes at last that he cannot change his own mind – he cannot change his mind – his mind is that way. And you will find as a common denominator of cases that the worse off they are, the less they change. Well, that's just it – you're looking at a bunch of fixed ideas. The person still usually has enough ergs left to say, "You know, I'm not quite moting³ on all two cylinders. You know?" But he can't change that condition because, evidently, one of the fixed ideas that he's tried to hand out and nobody would buy – that, "you mustn't mote on all your cylinders," see?

You go back and look this over and you will see in a broad way that everything a person is suffering from is an idea that was not salable, but an idea which will not change and which he himself in particular evidently cannot change. It's not true. He can change it. But this little, this little bug here is what holds us up in processing: that the more fixed the idea, the more out of PT the individual is. So his awareness, his alertness, his ability to react, his ability to judge, his ability to make up his mind, all of these things suffer.

Now, the degree that you get him up to PT is the degree that he can exercise judgment. Well, what keeps him out of PT? Fixed ideas – particularly ideas that he ought to stay there, ideas that he shouldn't be in PT. These are all backwards ideas.

And every once in a while an individual gets the idea, "You know, I seem to be victimizing myself. I start to feel better and, all of a sudden, why, something hits me, whomp, and I think this totally traitorous thought to myself and I'm not capable of altering this traitorous thought like, 'Well, it's going too good now – I ought to commit suicide.'" Well, just look at that as an idea, that's an idea nobody would ever buy. Isn't it?

A fellow walks up, he's got five wives and three mistresses and six coaches and horses and a gold-plated Cadillac and doesn't have to pay any income tax and all sorts of blessings have fallen his way. And you tell this fellow, "Well, it's so good now that you've got only one

³ mote: probably short of "motoring"

thing left to do – that's commit suicide." The guy won't buy it. And you say, "Well, it's very logical that you should commit suicide. You've reached all of your goals and the end of everything that you hoped for has arrived and you've got everything squared around that you hoped to get squared around and so, therefore, obviously you ought to commit suicide."

And he says, "Nya-ah. "

And you say, "This is a discourteous fellow. Now, we'll point this out again."

"You once had the goal of making money, right?"

And the fellow says, "Yeah-huh."

"And you once had the goal of having lots of dames."

"Uh-huh."

"And you once had the goal of gold-plated Cadillacs and so forth, didn't you?"

"Uh-huh."

"Well, have you achieved all those goals?"

The fellow says, "Yes, sir."

"Well, all right. Obviously, when a person achieves a goal, that is the end of the cycle, isn't it?"

And the individual says, "Nya-ah."

And you say, "Well, there's really nothing left for you to do (in sort of desperation) but commit suicide, because you actually are through – finished – done. You see?"

And this fellow pulls out a diamond-plated watch and glances at the time, looks in his address book to see which girl he's supposed to see next and whistles up the driver of his chromium gold-plated Cadillac and drives off.

Nothing left to do but make the postulate stick, nothing left to do but commit suicide. Well, that was the intention.

Now, the earlier on the track, the greater the power to make an intention or postulate stick. And when one had the intention of making them stick and the intention boomeranged, of course, one couldn't admit he was wrong, so he made the intention stick someplace – and there he is. So as he goes down the track years and years and years go by, lives and lives go by, and one fine day, why, he finds himself with an address book full of dames and a tremendous establishment and a gold-plated Cadillac and mystifies everybody by committing suicide, you see? He made his own postulate stick, but he did it by sort of flipping valence, you see, and going along the line. And he became very obsessed with this thing. A thetan very easily becomes obsessed with making his postulate stick.

If you want to drive any thetan berserk simply convince him by any necromancy or libelmancy or psychromancy, that his postulates aren't sticking. Rig up something which betrays him, one way or the other.

He's always been able to turn green lights red, so you rig up some kind of a mechanical mechanism that every time he tries to turn a green light red, even though it's time

to turn, why, another green light appears. And he tries to turn this one red and another green light appears. He's now got three which haven't turned red, you see, and he – "Oh, no!! " – get in there and trying to fight this thing and make them turn. Actually, he is sending his intentions across a mystery. And the mystery is an other-determinism. And his intentions, sent across a mystery without complete understanding of what he is doing, very often fail.

Well, this fellow will go around with a beet-red face for a long time – just to make sure that his postulates stuck.

Fixed ideas. Aberration, as we know it, could loosely be defined as a fixed idea of non-survival import⁴. A fixed idea of non-survival import is an aberration. That's a loose definition. A better definition, more technical, would be a fixed idea which is apparently unchangeable by the person himself and is inapplicable to his environment. And we get into various psychiatric conundrums and philosophic balderdash, and so forth, of the years of searching out the mysteries of Man and so forth.

And you can just see one of these old-time, long-bearded philosophers way back earlier on the track, you see, before he became a philosopher – way back earlier, getting another being to stand there while he said, "Well, you really think it's all a great mystery, don't you, that nobody can understand?"

And the other being, very cheerily saying, "Well, I don't know. I don't see anything very incomprehensible around here. Here's a temple. Good dancing girls. And there's an inn down the road where you can get very, very good sack. And I make an awfully good living as a highwayman. And I don't see anything mysterious about it anyplace. Sack is sack and the temple is a temple and the dancing girls is the dancing girls and being a highwayman you eventually get hanged, but it's a merry life till you get there and I don't see anything incomprehensi – "

"Oh, no. No. No. No. No. Really, don't you find it all totally mysterious? Isn't it all just a little bit beyond your observation and comprehension?"

And the other fellow says, "No, I don't at all. I don't at all. You know, dancing girls and the inn and being a highwayman and that's it. That's it. Even when you get hanged you get to make a speech."

Well, this someday-to-be philosopher, you see, is trying to exercise some sort of moral restraint on this person with this fixed idea of "It is all mysterious and you ought to interiorize into it somehow, you see, because nobody can quite understand it." And he watches the highwayman go off and rob another coach and sees him later on the street with a girl on each arm, dead-drunk, you see, and he says, "It just isn't right, because life is mysterious and nobody can quite understand it," see?

Well, he doesn't think about this very much and he gets up the track. This idea gets restimulated by somebody else. The next thing you know, he's – oh, I don't know, he loses his fortune or his wife or something and goes into philosophy. And he's sitting there and he's thinking over life and suddenly it seems to him that life is all sort of mysterious and incomprehensible – and wouldn't it be fun to be a highwayman.

⁴ import: old form of "importance"

If you were to plow into him as a case, you'd find out his sequitur would kind of go this way – only it's very non sequitur as you look at it. And these two things would be tightly adjoined – that life is all mysterious and vague and that we really can't fathom any part of it and we really don't know where we're going or where we're from and so forth – but it's awfully nice to be a highwayman. You know, we'd look at this and we would say, "That guy is crazy." Well, we'd be right.

But what is crazy? It is simply the disrelated aspect, the nonapplicable aspects of the fixed ideas we confront as we audit him.

And when you audit somebody, he begins to plow up his fixed ideas.

Now, at the beginning of track – at the beginning of track, any idea went. And you hardly even had any agreement on what was bad and what was good or anything else. But things that were good for all, of course, were heavily agreed upon and those ideas if you unfix them in a person become refixed by current judgment. You see, he can look it over and he can see this is a good idea and he might be able to change the idea, but he sees it's a totally acceptable idea, you see, and he's riding along fine.

Furthermore, he has no vested interest in wrecking everything in sight because he's no longer in a state of super-protest. His protest is all artificial – his protest is always apparently against himself. No matter who he seems to aim it at, it's against himself, it's between life and himself. He himself is a sort of an other thing – is somewhere else. You normally discover this in most human beings. This isn't the Freudian "detached case," this isn't the super-aberrated person – it's just people.

One whole cult arose – it was not a small one, it wrecked the whole Roman Empire – where people referred to "their souls." And that's a weird one, if you get to thinking it over. What the dickens is a soul if the individual himself can say "my soul"?

Now, once in a while you'll run into a pc, and he says, "Oh," he says, "I know what exteriorization is now."

And you say, "How?"

And he says, "Well, I'm over there."

How can "I" be over there? It's not possible, you see. "I" is where I am, you see. And one speaks from the point of beingness, normally. But "I'm over there." The fixed ideas which result, here, is the individual becomes the target of his own fixed ideas and he does a flipperoo and therefore we get valence trouble.

And we could say, well, any time we want to alter anybody's profile – personality profile – all we have to do is shift his valence and he'll certainly get the profile of the new valence. This is very true.

But more important than that, there are certain fundamentals which have to be shifted, all of which are aimed at restoring judgment over fixed ideas. And that is the target of processing, is restoring judgment. Therefore, we attack to some degree those things on which judgment is barriered or with which judgment is barriered and that's fixed ideas. Now, when you start running somebody and fixed ideas start flying off, actually, you're restoring judgment, you're restoring inspection – he can inspect what he is looking at.

But what is the single factor that keeps him from inspecting fixed ideas? That's his basic responsibility for having fixed them in the first place. The only way an idea can be fixed and remain fixed in the individual, without further inspection and totally divorced from all reason, would be to totally deny ownership of it or responsibility for its creation. And this makes it without a creator, or without the correct creator, and so it doesn't as-is.

And this is a definite mechanism, this is a trick thetans do. They become anxious. They want to preserve something, so the way they preserve it, they say, "Well, that radiator... that radiator..." They just made it, you know, they just mocked it up and hooked it into the wall, you know... "That radiator, I never saw it before in my life." Now, they do this – grrh! And they say, "Well, a radiator! Isn't that amazing! Well, what do you know! Who put that there? You know, a fellow shouldn't put it there, you know. After all, it's in the wrong place." So, actually, there's a trick a thetan uses to prevent he, himself, from unfixing the radiator.

Ah, but why does he employ this trick? He only starts employing this trick broadly when he gets the fixed idea that he cannot trust himself. He gets the fixed idea that he's irresponsible. And at any moment, even though he needs the radiator constantly and others need the radiator, he feels he may take his attention off of it – another idea he has, that in order to mock anything up and make it persist he has to keep his attention on it all the time. That's an anxiety too, you see. And he no longer trusts himself.

And he thinks that if he remembered that he mocked-up and put that radiator in the wall – if he remembered this himself, he'd walk in the room, remember doing it and the radiator would disappear.

Now, of course this is an idiotic line of reasoning because if he did this and still wanted a radiator, remember he did mock-up the radiator in the first place and so could do so again. So you could say that this doubt proceeds from or follows after loss of trust in self. When one no longer has any confidence in himself, one no longer trusts himself, then he adapts various ownership crisscrosses – ideas that things won't as-is if you no longer know their ownership. You see, that's a fixed idea, too. Then he can say, "Well, by no longer owning up to this thing, why, I'm all set." That's trust in self and that has to do with simply the fixing of postulates. And when he does not feel he is any longer capable of fixing postulates, all he does after that is, of course, is distrust.

Distrust is a belief that one can no longer fix one's postulates – that's all. Distrust. You see a Caterpillar tractor careening down the road without a driver. Instead of throwing the postulate into the transmission or the switch and turning it off, one says, "Oh dear, it's going to hit me!" and jumps out of the road.

A little boy going down Tottenham Court Road here just a few minutes ago, a taxicab threw a right turn signal practically in front of his face, but he just kept on pedaling alongside the taxicab and so forth and finally gently bumped into the side of the taxicab. It didn't upset him any and so forth. Well, he was in some kind of a state of daze. He evidently had a fixed idea about riding a bicycle down Tottenham Court Road, you see, in a straight line that had nothing to do with any other traffic. Well, that's an interesting contention, and an interesting experiment. But don't try it unless you can fix your postulates, because some postulates are liable to get fixed into you.

Thetans actually have taught each other that their postulates no longer stick. This has been taught, carefully taught. Yap-yap-yap-yap-yap-yap – about 76 trillion years' worth. Yap, yap, yap, "Your postulates don't stick. You see, you said it was going to go all right and look at it now." You know? "You think you're good luck, do you? Well, we didn't let you in on this before, but your three servants were murdered yesterday. They were murdered and robbed and thrown in a lime pit, all for a crime they didn't do. That wasn't very lucky, was it? Well, you certainly didn't bring them any luck, did you?" Yak, yak, yak, yak.

Well, now that basically proceeds from what? If the ability to fix ideas deteriorates on the Third Dynamic, what does it proceed from? It must be a distrust of others proceeds after communication. One knows what one is composed of, but he has a hard time estimating what the other fellow is composed of and after he kind of falls off communicating a little bit, why, he's had it. See, because he never then can discover what the motives of the other fellow is. And then after he flips valence for a while into a few bad valences that he himself has more or less invented.

He's looked at Joe and he thinks Joe is a bad boy. And after a while he flips into a valence called "Joe" and he's a bad boy, you see? Thetans are never themselves a bad boy or a bad girl or a bad anything else. They've assigned a badness to a being and then they've skidded into it. It's one of the nicest tricks you ever watched. If you know this thoroughly, you can out-Pavlov Khrushchev.

There's the black arts. The black arts have to do with falsely impressing people with one's ability to fix ideas through some trickery or other, that everybody agrees to it and convincing them that their ideas can't fix. And you'd say that's a black art. Well, it's very non-survival, but thetans have been doing that. And this must have happened early, that this single mechanism of distrust led to a feeling of obsessive responsibility, obsessive correction, obsessive reduction of power on the part of others and then eventually, refusal to communicate at all. And the mechanisms are simply laid out there, very interestingly.

An individual is communicating, C-Distance-E, you see. He's communicating Cause, Distance, Effect. He's receiving communications. Then one day something happens that he begins to believe that his communication didn't or shouldn't have arrived. Well, that it didn't arrive would be kind of mysterious to him, but that it shouldn't have arrived is a correction of self. And there aberration begins because he said, "I mustn't fix a postulate like that."

Quite coincidentally, something happens. Every once in a while this will happen to you and you will begin to wonder for a moment or two what cooks here. You will have been thinking about blowing up something or destroying something and a teacup falls off the table and crashes. And you say, "Eeeekk!" Well, now maybe you did make the teacup fall off the table and crash – maybe you did and maybe you didn't. But there's no finding out, is there, really? And therefore you say, "Well, you know, I can irresponsibly fix destructive ideas in objects and I shouldn't think destructive ideas... You have Christian Science.

Now, you can work these things out, just as a mental exercise. You could work these things all the way on down the line as to how people get into the states they're in, to the degree that they have to fix ideas, that they mustn't fix ideas, that they fixed the wrong idea

into the wrong thing at the wrong time, you know. All these kinds and variations, all having to do with postulates – making postulates and making them stick elsewhere.

Hardly anybody but a Scientologist would know what we were talking about at this stage, because it is so perished in the society at large – that one's ideas would stick anywhere – that they don't even believe today, on the broad western societies and the Russian society, that anybody ever had or fixed an idea. They say, "Well, Napoleon was the product of his environment. And the conditions were right and he was just an actor who happened to be on the stage at that time" and so forth. "He's totally sourceless, as far as the French Revolution was concerned and its denouement. There wasn't anything about it at all. And Napoleon never got any ideas, he was never cause and he never fixed any ideas" and so on.

You go around and see some big industrial magnate – they are "magnates" because they attract various things. And these fellows are sitting there being very grand about production or something like that and you come along and you say, "I've got an idea." They're liable to tell you, "Oh, I've got all the ideas I need. What I need is some efficiency and effectiveness." Yeah, well, he hasn't got all the ideas he needs – not by a long ways. He hasn't got the best ideas he's had, otherwise he wouldn't be getting "magnetted" quite so much, you see. And he actually will believe that he's got all the ideas he needs.

Well, maybe he's got all the ideas he needs, but they couldn't possibly be the right ones. He's much more worried about getting the ideas to stick that he already has than getting a new idea, you see. So he says, "New ideas are no good." And it never occurs to him until the revolution is all over and the factory is in ruins and the people have triumphed again or something like this, you see – it never occurred to him at all that any new idea could overthrow any old idea.

Matter of fact, communism built this into its woof and warp. Communism just polished this one up and – it's a fetish, it's something they worship, the idea that you can't get a new idea. That is a self-protective mechanism which was carefully built into the political philosophy of communism, that you will never get a better idea than communism. You see? Therefore nobody must ever revolt away from the communist philosophy. See that?

And then we come along and show them they could get any number of political philosophies. Boy, actually they don't have enough walls to stand us up against if they get their hands on us. See, we're right into the teeth of this basic thing. "Communism must go on, perpetually forever." Well, what is this but an obsessive stick of an idea on the part of a few men? They've got certain ideas and these things have got to stick! Got the idea?

Well, their ideas aren't the sort of thing that you can safely make stick. You can't safely make these things stick at all because they're not much subject to time and so forth. The nations embracing them will of course come to dust in a very relatively short period of time. Communism is already so close to a capitalism you can't possibly recognize the difference in its governmental operation, but it still goes on putting out the old pamphlets while being the total capitalist of Russia which is – it's something that just doesn't make sense. And of course all fixed ideas, when they're not re-adaptable, eventually begin not to make sense. And we wind up into an interesting state of affairs, where the old idea is totally outmoded and somebody fails, you see?

Now, a Scientologist doesn't operate in this sphere. He doesn't say one and two and three and six. There are certain things – there are certain things which we can do that improves judgment or the ability to fix ideas – certain things we do. And it's almost up to us which one we improve. We're interested in an observation of the mechanisms involved, of the alterations and changes involved, and below the level of our action and operation nobody's ideas are safe.

You can't have a little dictator setting himself up someplace getting some sort of a fixed idea that all girls should eat strawberries. Sooner or later an auditor will come in the place – sooner or later. And the auditor will find out that the reason all the girls have got to eat strawberries has nothing to do with the Goddess of Fertility, but has a lot to do with the fact that the little dictator has a total monopoly on all the strawberries of upper Swabovia. This looks like a swindle to him, which it generally is, so he goes around and waves his magic wand and unfixes the ideas.

And he says to the people, he says, "Get an idea that strawberries are good for fertility." "Yeah."

"Well," he says, "get an idea that strawberries are not good for fertility." "Yeah."

"Well, now get an idea that strawberries are good for fertility." "Yeah. Hey! What is this?"

See, boom! He blew an idea. You blow the positive and negative of an idea; what you're blowing actually is the postulate itself and then the protest against the postulate. The two things blow up and actually without anybody really realizing it, the postulate disappears. And this is one of the oldest gags that you can do.

Because even though, after you've fixed an idea – you fixed it so you couldn't fix an idea – remember that the fixed idea is prior to the arrangements to keep it fixed and you can always blow it out independent of its arrangements. So you get the oldest and crudest brand of processing in Scientology, practically, which is simply Concept Processing: Get an idea. Get the reverse idea. Get the idea. Get the reverse idea. People go into a lot of confusions and stir up their banks and get all **chewed up** and so forth, but they also get over a lot of foolish nonsense.

§ Max problèmes : One of the reasons it isn't too successful is that it has to find and choose the fixed idea it's going to shoot and that depends on somebody's judgment. And if we started blowing the idea, "Children should be careful going to and coming from school," and we started blowing the idea before we've taught anybody to – before we've taught anybody anything about living without eating, we blow all the ideas about eating. I mean, we'd blow ideas about what to eat or what is good to eat or something like this – we're looking at a blank file. We've done something to the ideas about eating without doing anything, really, about the obsession of eating. We haven't touched the basic mechanisms, we have only touched the specific fixed ideas.

Now, in view of the fact that you cannot tell from one preclear to the next what kind of ideas they have or how non sequitur they have, simply because those ideas are uniformly goofy – their fixed ideas are not right. As I told you at the beginning of this lecture, the only

ideas that really stuck were the lousy ones. And the preclear will halfway agree with you, but not be able to change his mind that some of the ideas he got are pretty sour.

Like, the best way – the best possible way to make a woman get married – the best possible way to make a woman get married is to buy all the horses in the north country. And you have this woman going around, "the best possible way to please a husband is to flirt." And you have some kid going around, "the best possible way to get attention from the parents is to get pneumonia every sixty days." See, I mean, it's just goofball.

But in spite of that, in view of the fact that every thetan has his own package of failures, to draw a common denominator of fixed ideas – the worst fixed ideas – leaves us with solely and simply a problem of having to understand the basic philosophy of all fixed ideas and idea fixation and dispersal. We have to know what a thetan is all about, because the judgment on fixed ideas, if we're only blowing fixed ideas with Concept Processing, is totally resident with the auditor, isn't it? We're actually not really improving this person's judgment at all – we're just getting him to change some of his ideas.

And you've audited pcs where you've changed their ideas and changed their physiology and changed them all around – the pc never found out about it. Well, that's because you never raised his powers of observation and judgment.

So fixed ideas, although they explain aberration, are actually not a legitimate processing target – they're not a legitimate processing target. What you want to restore is the individual's ability to exert judgment over his own and other ideas. And when you've restored that ability, you've made somebody worthwhile. You haven't got a woundup doll anymore, you understand, you've got somebody who can function.

Therefore we have to look into the basic mechanisms of how ideas get fixed. We have to look into the basic mechanisms of judgment, we have to look into the basic mechanisms of communication and so unparalyze the person to a point where he can inspect his own ideas.

And there are many points of attack, many, many points of attack to do this. One is simply let him win! I mean that's one of the weird easy simple ones.

An auditor in a games condition very often misses this one. He won't let the pc win. Well, actually just letting the pc win encourages the pc to exert judgment. He must have been right, he must have made a right decision, therefore he extrapolates from this that it may be possible that in the future at some time or another he might possibly – if he isn't too careless – sometime hence, even in the next thousand years, make another right decision. It just might happen! See? And you reawaken this little idea that he's not always wrong, that he might possibly be right. Well, that alone, of course, translates into "I dare fix an idea because not all of my ideas are wrong." See, you get him over that angle of it.

Now, one of the ways that he never finds out about anybody is to refuse to communicate – his panacea for the whole thing. He doesn't want to hurt people, he doesn't want to damage people. He can be so wrong, he can be so upsetting that he'd better not get his ideas fixed in somebody else, so therefore the best way to do it is not to communicate at all. We could attack that by simply attacking and improving his communication. As his communication improves, he'll find himself putting on the brakes here or there, but as his communication improves, why, he can look at people and he can gradually understand that he

is still not beheading Nell Gwyn – or whoever it was – you see. He's not still doing that act. He's actually talking to somebody else, not the victim. You see, he's moved in time. Communication – he's made him leery of communication. Restore his confidence, in other words. Restore his confidence, you restore his willingness to exert judgment.

An individual's answer to a total defeat on the subject of judgment is to have fixed ideas. So anything that you restore in the way of confidence or judgment tends to dismiss and dispel the fixedness and the irrationality of his notions and ideas that he's got packed up.

You'll find that there are many approaches to the problem – many, many approaches to the problem. One of them is to get him to confront and look again at those moments when he shouldn't have fixed an idea quite as thoroughly as a sword blade across her throat. See? You get him to look at that again, you get him to inspect it again. Get him to go through the experience analytically instead of just emotionally-reactively, the way he went through it the first time. In other words, wash it up, get him to take a look at it. It's a causative experience – make a causative pc by getting the pc at cause over the experience. You can do that because he's still packing a picture with it.

Why is he packing a picture with it? Because he was never responsible for it in the first place – he says. His irresponsibility is such that of course the picture is still there. That instant in time is stuck from here on out, so an approach simply approaching those times when he didn't take responsibility for something – get him to reinspect the thing and gradually take responsibility for the action – of course does what? It restores, to a marked degree, his judgment.

If you just ask a person, "Who are you? Thank you. Who are you? Thank you. Who are you? Thank you. Who are you? Thank you." You might as-is all of his havingness and mess him up, but sooner or later... That's not a good process, I'm just stating it as a level of crudity – it's straight out of the definitions – there's beingness, doingness and havingness. You could ask a person just that, "Who are you? Thank you. Who are you? Thank you." It's crude. It won't get very far, because you're just drilling away at one fixed idea actually. But you're trying to get him to move around to being himself enough to cope with his own ideas and concepts.

Now, in processes in general there's another bit of a maxim here, speaking of fixed ideas. We deal in Scientology in actually agreed-upon or true considerations. And these things may or may not be fixed ideas, but they're sufficiently senior that they offer a way out of the lower-class junior mudholes. So as we look over processes in general, you could attack the same condition, which is fixed ideas, attempt to implant in somebody else, you see, failure, plant in self, swap valence, source of undeserved effect – see, the individual caused an effect and then he found out the person didn't deserve it, so he tries to pull it back, but he's already planted it, so there it is over there. Who's going to wear this effect after that? Well, he is, of course. He pulled it back, didn't he? He didn't pull it back in the same moment of time that it happened, he pulled it back in a later moment, which of course makes it endure, because it won't as-is now. There's all these tricks, mechanisms. As you look this over, you get a good grip on exactly what went on and what's going on and what you have to improve, why, you actually don't need too much guidance in processing. But we apparently do, so I work at it and try to take these various aspects and angles and take things apart.

Now, anything that can be used as an effective process can be used as a Straightwire Process, that's one of them. Any process that works in the PT environment can work on a past-track engram environment – that's another maxim. That's one that will stand you in good stead sometime when you find somebody stuck in an engram. Just run a PT havingness process or something stupid like this, you know. Something will happen. That I guarantee.

The individual says, "Well! I'm terrified. I'm just terrified. All the time I'm standing right here and I've got this huge picture of this Martian!" You know? Been down to the planetarium lately. "This huge picture of this Martian – I'm just terrified, all the time; I'm terrified all the time about it. I just can't do anything about it – can't do anything about it." Well, if you don't want to run the engram, you don't want to do this or that about it, almost any PT process that would get him out of a present time problem or would orient him in the environment in any way, shape or form could be worked on the environment of the Martian. You just take that engram as the environment, see. You'd process him in the PT he's in – that's PT to him. See?

And you just say, "Well, all right, in the moment with the Martian, look around here and find something you can have." You'll find all sorts of oddities this way.

Now, similarly, almost any senior postulate or agreement or truth can be translated into a Straightwire Process. That's another thing for an auditor to know. You could take almost any idea or concept or axiom, translate it one way or the other into a Straightwire Process.

Now, let's take some of the 6th London notes. And we have a new series of processes and they're being run to run cases rapidly. And they are based on exactly the same processes that you run on engrams, which is to say, "What can you confront?" you know, "What part of that incident can you confront?" And then another command for another run is, "What part of that incident could you be responsible for?" and so on. Well, we take those and we find Responsible goes on a lower mockery and then moves up to Confront and then moves up to Responsible again. So we're using that as a Straightwire Process and you find it's quite successful because you're undoing these misownerships. Communication processes, whatever you are using or utilizing, whatever you translate in, the things which you are undoing – things which you're undoing is the inability to exercise judgment. And you shouldn't really try to wipe out all of a person's past, all of his experience, all of him – not-is him completely. All you're trying to do is restore his judgment.

If his judgment came back 100 percent, then he could salvage what he wanted and throw away what he didn't need and he'd be all set. And you'd say there's a very sane man.

Of course, people who were totally crazy would say there's the only insane man in the world.

Thank you.

Thank you.