

ILLUSION OR TRUTH

Transcripts and Glossary

L. RON HUBBARD

The 18th Advanced Clinical Course Lectures • Washington DC, July - August 1957

Part 1



Golden Era Productions®

A HUBBARD® PUBLICATION

Golden Era Productions

6331 Hollywood Boulevard, Suite 1305 Los
Angeles, California 90028-6313

© 1994 L. Ron Hubbard Library
All Rights Reserved

These transcripts have been prepared from the recorded lectures and written materials of L. Ron Hubbard in accordance with his specific directions for the publication of his recorded lecture materials.

Dianetics, Scientology, ARC Straightwire, Flag, Golden Era Productions, Hubbard, OT, Personal Achievement Series, Purification, Purification Rundown, The Bridge, Ability, Book One, Clearsound, E-Meter, HCO, LRH, Freewinds, Saint Hill, Celebrity Centre, False Purpose Rundown, New Era Dianetics, NED, the Scientology Cross and the Golden Era Productions Symbol are trademarks and service marks owned by Religious Technology Center and are used with its permission.

Scientologist is a collective membership mark designating members of the affiliated churches and missions of Scientology.

NEW ERA is a trademark and service mark.

Printed in the United States of America Any outness

found in these transcripts should be reported to:

LRH Book Compilations

Tape Transcripts Editor
6331 Hollywood Boulevard, Suite 1006
Los Angeles, California 90028-6313

IMPORTANT NOTE

In studying these lectures, be very certain you never go past a word you do not fully understand.

The only reason a person gives up a study or becomes confused or unable to learn is because he or she has gone past a word that was not understood.

The confusion or inability to grasp or learn comes AFTER a word that the person did not have defined and understood.

Have you ever had the experience of coming to the end of a page and realizing you didn't know what you had read? Well, somewhere earlier on that page you went past a word that you had no definition for or an incorrect definition for.

Here's an example. "It was found that when the crepuscule arrived the children were quieter and when it was not present, they were much livelier." You see what happens. You think you don't understand the whole idea, but the inability to understand came entirely from the one word you could not define, *crepuscule*, which means twilight or darkness.

It may not only be the new and unusual words that you will have to look up. Some commonly used words can often be misdefined and so cause confusion.

This datum about not going past an undefined word is the most important fact in the whole subject of study. Every subject you have taken up and abandoned had its words which you failed to get defined.

Therefore, in studying these lectures be very, very certain you never go past a word you do not fully understand. If the material becomes confusing or you can't seem to grasp it, there will be a word just earlier that you have not understood. Don't go any further, but go back to BEFORE you got into trouble, find the misunderstood word and get it defined.

Definitions

As an aid to the reader, words most likely to be misunderstood have been defined in the glossary included in this volume. Words often have several meanings. The definitions used in this glossary only give the meaning that the word has as it is used in the lecture. This glossary is not meant as a substitute for a dictionary.

The *Dianetics and Scientology Technical Dictionary* and *Modern Management Technology Defined* are both invaluable tools for the student. They are available from your nearest Scientology church or mission, or direct from the publisher.

INTRODUCTION

In these twenty-two lectures, given to the students of the 18th Advanced Clinical Course, L. Ron Hubbard covers subjects intimate to everyday living-phenomena one encounters continuously as part of life's routine. Some of them so common that they seem "just part of the scene," utterly "normal," rarely given a second thought. Subjects like sleep. Laughter. Time and "the past." Mental image pictures and thinking itself. What *are* these things, really? Are they as "normal" as they appear? Or are they illusions, part of an intricate mechanism trapping man in this universe, stuck in a body, caught up in a mind, quite blind to the truth and the reality of his tremendous native ability?

Ron throws the light of understanding on these topics and many more, shattering eons-old illusions with a straight, hard, clear look at the truths of existence. This is data about life and living, data every thetan must have to break through to the truth and operate free from the lies of the past.

The 18th ACC took place in Washington, DC, beginning on the 8th of July and ending on the 16th of August, 1957, with sixty-eight students privileged to attend. Now, for the first time, these lectures are broadly available in their entirety.

You've been running blind too long. L. Ron Hubbard has offered you the way to *see* again. Welcome to *Illusion or Truth*—the lectures of the 18th Advanced Clinical Course.

—The Editors

CONTENTS

<i>15 July 1957</i> ,	
Scienceology and Effective Knowledge	1
Question and Answer Period	13
<i>16 July 1957</i>	
CCH Related to ARC	17
<i>17 July 1957</i>	
Theory and Definition of Auditing	31
<i>18 July 1957</i>	
What Scienceology Is Addressed To	45
<i>19 July 1957</i>	
The Five Categories	59
<i>22 July 1957</i>	
Control	73 ,
<i>23 July 1957</i>	
The Stability of Scienceology	87
<i>24 July 1957</i>	
Auditing Styles	101
<i>25 July 1957</i>	
Scales (Effect Scale)	115
<i>26 July 1957</i>	
The Mind: Its Structure in Relation to Thetan and MEST	129
About the Author	145
Glossary	149
Bibliography	185
Address List of Scienceology Churches and Organizations	211

STUDENT USE OF TRANSCRIPTS

The tape transcripts in this volume serve a vital purpose for students. With a written text of the tape in hand, students can follow the tape rapidly and spot their misunderstandings.

Such transcripts do NOT supplant the tapes, as *how* the words were said and *how* preclears in auditing demonstrations actually responded are quite important.

L. Ron Hubbard

SCIENTOLOGY AND EFFECTIVE KNOWLEDGE

A lecture given on 15 July
1957

Thank you.

Good evening.

Audience: Good evening.

Now, I hope you understand that Scientology has something that is different than any other Earth organization of information or knowledge to date. There is a difference. The word *science*, as you know, is a simple word meaning merely "truth." *Scientology* means "knowing"—*scio*. But *scio* means something quite interesting. It doesn't just mean "knowing," it means "knowing in the fullest sense of the word." Now, Scientology is an aim at a total know.

People have a great deal of difficulty describing Scientology to other people for the excellent reason that they try to fit it into a frame of reference with other knows. And Scientology is different than that because it's an aim at a *total* know. And there aren't any other total knows. Hence, you have difficulty describing it sometimes and giving it data of comparable magnitude, and therefore in trying to talk about it people say, "Oh, you mean just like psychology." Don't kill them! They meant well. They don't understand what psychology was or is—that it's not even a science but an operation. They say, "Well then, it's like ..." something or other. Nah.

Well, there have not been any other total knows. As far as the basic attempt is concerned, there has only been one organization of knowledge on Earth which has been . . . had a similar goal—which is the goal of freedom, exteriorization, being able to get out of the trap and confusion, being able to back up and take a look at it all—and that was Buddhism, which was developed in a very formal state, but existed long before, by Gautama Siddhartha, who was known as "the Buddha," and most of the Western world refer to him as "Buddha," quite incorrectly. A buddha is somebody who has attained a total knowingness or total freedom.

Well now, that was 625 B.C. when that occurred. Buddhism squirreled when it went up into Tibet and became Lamaism, and many other branches and sects spread from that particular information. But it's interesting that the information itself was not a cult or a sect; it simply had to do with a great many people who wanted to know more about where they were and what they were doing. It had the idea of freedom; it attempted to answer the question of the hereafter; it did a great many things and attempted to do them.

Now, we actually don't know at this time what Gautama Siddhartha said. His work was very, very poorly preserved. It's quite interesting, however, that we know something about it.

15 JULY 1957

It's quite interesting that we know the same age and period as developing an enormous number of very vital things. At the same time as Buddhism—almost the same period . . . It's like that ancient age in Greece that gave us so many things—the Golden Age of Greece all happened in the lifetime of one man. Well, it's practically the same thing back there around 625. Within seventy-five years either way of Buddhism, we have Taoism— that's the work of Lao-tse—and at the same time we have the work of Confucius. It's all there in a pile. Bang!

Well now, there hasn't actually been any declared effort in the direction of total information and intelligence on the subject of man, regarding his whereabouts, which was an analytical, knowing, reasoning approach, having nothing to do with faith or belief, on the basis of take it or leave it—if it's true to you, it's true, and if it isn't true to you, it isn't true—since that time. And that is practically twenty-five hundred years ago.

Now, it's all very well for somebody to come along and say, "Oh, you mean Buddhism." Well, unfortunately that isn't adequate either as a comparable datum to Scientology because the Western world hasn't a clue as to what Buddhism is all about. Buddha was a fat-bellied god that sat upon a throne and, I don't know, for all of them, that he ate small babies. See, they think of it as an idol worship. Well, surely enough, in various parts of the Orient, an idol worship did take place—they worship Buddha as an idol and nobody would have laughed harder than Gautama Siddhartha. He would have thought this was hilariously funny. Because it's the one thing he told people not to do.

2

That, therefore, to the Western world, is not a datum of comparable importance, and maybe . . . You understand we're not talking about the *importance* of the development; we're just trying to talk about its *goal*: has man had a comparable goal to Scientology, and so on. And that therefore would not be articulative.

Well, the best refuge to take in this particular instance would be the refuge into the incomprehensible. And the best comparable datum that you could give somebody would be to say to them, "Epistemology." And they'd say, "Go-o-osh!" You know, "Scientology's just like epistemology." And they would say, "Is that the study of pins or insects or what?" If they've got to do it that way, they're so stupid that you just better baffle them and let it rest right there, and then say, "Give me your hand. Thank you." Best way to explain it I know.

But for our own understanding, we should understand that we are embarked upon something which has not been embarked upon for twenty-five hundred years. And that gives it a rather interesting significance. It isn't that what we are doing is as important as Buddhism. It isn't that Buddhism is as important as Scientology. But both of them attempted to select out the important things—a selection of the importances of life—and to fill man's void of knowing with accurate observation.

It might well be said that Buddha was the first scientist. He did organize his things rather well, if tradition is right.

But we in this modern age of science have not developed out of the field of the humanities anything comparable to scientific observation of the mind. The humanities can be said, at this time and place, to have failed. And what do I mean by the humanities? I mean that group of information which is apparently covered, or is supposed to be covered, by the university.

Now, what are those things? They're psychology, sociology, the various branching studies of the social sciences in general. Do you understand that? There's a whole group of things called the humanities. Now, why didn't these

SCIENTOLOGY AND EFFECTIVE KNOWLEDGE

develop anything? Why haven't these lived? They haven't lived; they're a matter of changing fad every few minutes—beyond psychology, which was the work of a single man named Wundt in Leipzig, Germany in 1879, who believed that all men were animals and has convinced everybody since. But he hasn't convinced us. This was hardly a human study, since it specialized from the beginning in animal studies. But it's included in the modern humanities.

Now, why haven't these humanities developed something? Why haven't these humanities made something out of all of the opportunity, the funds and so on that were available to them?—since enormous funds have been available to these people over the last century. Why haven't they made something out of this? Because they were all used as control mechanisms. Each one of them was given a pitch in some sort of effort to push man further into the mire. And their goal was south, not north. Their pitch was down, not up. They study man to learn how to control him by duress. They study man to find out how to take advantage of him. Psychology at this moment, defined by the United States government, is "a deceitful procedure to trick one's enemies." Let me assure you that in this atomic age we can't afford to have enemies and therefore cannot have something which deceitfully attempts to trick one's enemies.

Here, here is the single point of difference between the humanities and what we are doing. We have found this to be the case, and if any auditor or Scientologist does not at some time achieve an understanding of this, then he has never understood the subject as a whole. And that is to say that the only way you can better man is to better him; you cannot better man by worsening him. The only way you can get an IQ gain on a person is to improve his ability to communicate, to live. The only way that you can make his personality change is for the better. So this is just a little worse than change.

The reason the psychologist believes, at this very instant of my talking to you, that man cannot be changed, we have also discovered here in Scientology: We cannot push him down. That is very hard to do. It is rather easy to pick him up, because you have his assistance. But you don't have his assistance when you try to push him down. So therefore, if you tried to reduce somebody's IQ, you would have a hard time of it. I don't say that it's impossible, because in Scientology every now and then we can take the Auditor's Code, read it backwards, have the auditor audit by standing on his head and have bricks dropped on the preclear every couple of seconds, and after the right process has been used and misused to this degree, we'll find he's lost his enthusiasm for answering an IQ test.

Now, when it comes to personality changes, it is very difficult to worsen these things. Now, life itself, with all of its mechanisms, its duresses of all kinds, is able over a period of half a lifetime to suppress personality changes, characteristics, talents and abilities. About half a lifetime, something like that, it manages it.

It takes some fellow who was an enthusiastic artist when he was twenty—well, he gets to be about forty, and he isn't quite as enthusiastic as an artist and doesn't respond, and his willingness to be an artist is not as great. You understand that. But it took *twenty years* to suppress this. In other words, the MEST universe can accomplish this on a sort of a gradient scale. So only by allying oneself with the particles in that wall, only by allying oneself with the mechanical laws of life—MEST-wise—only by turning and facing down anything alive and saying "kill it" can we at length suppress the ability of man. It is *hard* to do.

15 JULY 1957

Well, this is the awfulest condemnation that was ever handed out against any activity or era—that it is terribly easy to improve him. It doesn't require anything at all to change him upward. You have his assistance. It takes some good communication, it takes some good reality, and it takes some affinity, and the fellow improves!

Why do you suppose anybody can come into a PE Course, sit down and communicate with one's fellows and wind up improved in IQ? Look, he's only been there for ten hours at the absolute outside, and his IQ has improved? Well, let me show you that these students of the mind that are studying out of the animalistic philosophy developed in Leipzig tell you that man cannot be changed—his IQ cannot be changed; his personality cannot be altered. Which tells you what at once? That they've only tried to worsen him. Now, do I make my point?

Male voice: Yup.

The road was wide open for any pair of eyes. All one had to do was desire to better his fellow man. That's all one had to do. What is as rare as a June day in January.

Terribly easy to ally yourself with MEST—terribly easy. Fellow comes up to you, what's the proper thing to do? Hit him! If anything comes around and sits down, why, what's the right thing to do? Well, fix it up so it'll decay. Well, doesn't that stuff do it? It's not that that stuff is bad. But that stuff is there to be *used*; it's not there to *become*.

4

So it tells us that the humanities were far less interested. But they had withdrawn so far or were part of the universe that they never conceived any future for themselves in exact observation or in other actual scientific principles.

One had to separate himself from MEST in order to look at it, to some degree. He had to look at his fellow men and find out what they were and what they were doing. He had to observe. And the second he started looking, a great many simplicities fell into his lap; he couldn't help it. So you will pardon me if I doubt the sincerity of the forebears of this subject. I believe that there has been a total gap between 1625 B.C. and 1957 A.D. I believe that because it's too easy.

Now, that's the first thing we must know about Scientology is that by the attainment of a simplicity we accomplish a benefit. By the attainment of a simplicity we accomplish a benefit.

By the invitation of or involvement in a complexity, we accomplish the unfathomable and create a mystery—we sink man into a priesthood; we sink him into a cult. Instead of, as they said in the Middle Ages, "What monastery do you come from, Father?" (as they stood on the crossroads telling their beads one at another), why, they say, "Now, what university are you teaching at, Brother?" in 1950 and 57, you see? Same breed of cat. It's a sort of a priesthood: all knowledge is sacrosanct and it must all be uttered in a certain apathetic tone or it isn't.

Well, tone and emotion have nothing to do with knowledge. Authority has nothing to do with knowledge. Those things I tell you are true are not true because I tell you they are true. And if anything I tell you, or have ever told you, is discovered to differ from the individual observation (be it a good observation), then it isn't true! It doesn't matter whether I said it was true or not. Do you understand?

And you, in handling people, can tell them to look at certain things, and if they can see them and if they're true for them, they're true. But *only* if

SCIENTOLOGY AND EFFECTIVE KNOWLEDGE

they can see them. So just carry this same observation another stage. To some fellow who is terribly debased, some fellow who has actually just... aw, just gone all out—he's just been in nothing but hog wallows all of his life, you know? Drunk all the time, dragged out of bars, graduated from the University of Chicago, you know. . . . This fellow who has gone the limit *can't see*. And what is true for him? Blindness. That is true for him.

Now, I can tell you how to show that fellow a truth which would shake him. Put your hand across his eyes and say, "You cannot see, can you?" He would agree with you like he'd never agreed before, because he can't see, whether your hands are across his eyes or not.

Now, that is the first thing that he would have to find out in terms of his own observational power. He'd have to find out that there was a condition where he couldn't see before he would begin to look. And for this individual—all swelled up on significances of one kind or another, all taught eighteenth hand—a very remarkable thing is observable. He'll never learn until he finds out that he hasn't.

And the course of these intervening twenty-five hundred years has been a pretense of knowledge—inventednesses which never were, which are passed along and people are flunked upon just as though they existed. And we've had a worship of the fable. We have had prayers being sent up to a myth. And man hasn't been looking at all.

It's a terrible thing for somebody who has struggled through a tremendous amount of upset—let's say he has been ... this person has been married to somebody and just tried for years to make somebody *see* their point of view one way or the other—or for some child who has struggled up into manhood or womanhood with all of his efforts devoted to getting his parents to *see* something, to take his point of view one way or the other. It's an horrible shock to this person to find out someday that the reason he could never get a reasonability in his family, late in life or early in life, was totally based on blindness which in itself was so obfuscated, overlarded that nobody even noticed the blindness. And he himself never noticed the blindness of his parents, never noticed the blindness of his wife. Fantastic isn't it?

One does a terrific amount of living and apparent looking and an awful lot of thinking, and then finds out somebody was stone-blind. Isn't that fantastic? Well, that is the entrance point of any case. In other words, there are conditions worse than being unable to see, and that is *imagining* one sees.

The humanities imagined too many things to see; they never cared to look. And so they failed.

But we must not ourselves fail in this same track. It would be easy for us to do this. We have a complicated nomenclature in Scientology. There are about 475 or 80 words, all of which have special meaning. Fortunately, over 50 percent of these are merely clarifications of their actual English equivalents. But we have a vocabulary of specialized meaning. It's just as good as it explains things. That's all the good it is.

But don't let your specialized use of words throw you out of communication with your fellow man. Know these words well enough so that you can use their alternate phrases—because it usually takes a phrase or a sentence to describe one of these words in English. Be able to do that well enough to go out of nomenclature and into nomenclature again, depending on who you're talking to, and you will not be encouraging blindness. Because a label is just a label. The thing in the jam jar is jam, regardless of whether it says "pickles" on the front of it.

15 JULY 1957

Now, we have certain, definite, positive procedures. As valuable as these things are, if they incline us in the direction of looking at them, not the thing they help us look at, if they incline us (these procedures and activities) to believe that they are a thing, not a means toward doing another thing, then we ourselves will be in the same condition. And we will consider ourselves to be the wisest people on Earth and have to discover all over again that we have to achieve blindness on the way up.

Many a philosopher has been blinded to the truth by the brilliance of his own syllablization. Now, wherever we develop an area of special knowledge, such as the training drills and processes (as valuable as they are) which constitute this course, we must also at the same time understand that these things are a means to an end and are not in themselves the end.

A very funny thing can happen. A person can take up what we call Training 0, Training 1, Training 2, Training 3—all of these drills—and get clear up to 6 without ever having integrated them into a single process. And yet, theoretically, he could perform them beautifully, each one independently, and yet never be able to do them in an auditing session. Theoretically that could happen.

6

Well, this would be a person who had totally forgotten what they were for, and that is to create the proper communication atmosphere to a session so that an auditing session or a human conversation (that being one of the lower sorts) could occur without jolts and jars. In other words, the end view of all those early training drills are communication, and when one loses the sight of the fact that they make somebody confront and look at—Training 0—he's lost the benefit of the whole sweeping mass. Do you understand that?

Now, the funny part of it is these things can be lots of fun in themselves. I would be the last person to admit that they weren't positive jewels of genius. But I would be the first one to throw them away if they got in the road of anybody's communication! Remember that, and use them accordingly.

They take a gradient scale from "not look" to "look." And they're a pretty good gradient scale. And they've been in use for a long time now. But we're just now learning that they were too fancy. We found out the best coaching remarks that can be made in teaching somebody to do these things is "Do it!" "Confront it!" Not "how," just "do it." Actually, the whole thing boils down to confrontingness and nothing else.

An individual can't give an acknowledgment because every time he gives an acknowledgment some mysterious force hits him in the teeth. Well, that's simply. . . that mysterious force is just something that he is unwilling to confront, in the present or the backtrack. It's just something he's unwilling to confront. You need the rest of the drills, apparently, because just plain confrontingness doesn't ever stir these things up. Just sitting there ... the fellow has already learned that if he just sits there and minds his own business nothing will happen except that he will vegetate and starve to death. So we have to occasion a further reach.

We have to have a further reach. And that further reach is communication—verbal communication. And it finally winds up with total symbol amputation, and we do it by hand, like wigwags from battleship to battleship. Quite interesting. But it's a gradient scale of communication, and thus it must be understood.

Now, we move up into the upper reaches of that battery of indoctrination steps, and we get into what's called Upper Indoctrination; we have these things in practice. And it is always a lovely thing to watch the first day when

SCIENTOLOGY AND EFFECTIVE KNOWLEDGE

anybody who has been through a Comm Course butts into plain 8-C—simple-command process where you tell people to go over and touch a wall. You never heard so much trouble. They never had this much trouble before. Why didn't they ever have this much trouble before? Because this process integrates all the lower training drills and say, "Well, that's all right, sonny. Just do them all at once. That's all. That's all you have to do." Of course, you aren't doing them all at once, and he finds out eventually that you do each one at a time. Fortunately, you don't have to do them all at the same instant.

But what does this wind up to become then? What does this wind up to be? A gradient scale of observation whereby one reaches *out* and receives *in* intelligence concerning life, forms, mass, energy, space and time.

I woke up eventually to discover that these training drills all by them-self, practiced with sufficient rigor and coached well enough and instructed well enough, were steps on the road to Clear all by themselves without any further processing. Why? Because they directly raise the communication level as an individual. But they take another course. Instead of processing this fellow, you say, "Do it!" And he says, "Ya-ya-ya-ya!" And you say, "Do it!" And he says, "But my head—my feet—I can't—*vulumn.*" And you say, "Do it!" And then he says . . . all of a sudden he says, "*Eooohhh-oooohhh-uh-oo*"—boom! And just about the time he's lying there in the exact position where his mother *always* sympathized with him, he finds the coach and the Instructor putting him back in the chair saying, "Do it!" And the circuits blow up and after a while he says, "You know, I can communicate."

It's a ghastly route to take. It could only be attempted on people of considerable stability, of considerable back-processing and a great deal of willingness and understanding, and I'm afraid wouldn't work on the routine preclear, unless in the process of doing them you made a willingness to be a Scientologist.

A group similar to this one, given as much duress as this had in one week, would be all plastered all over the walls by now. So understanding must accompany any drill, mustn't it? And you survive these because you understand that there's an end goal to them. You understand where they are going and what they are doing, and so your understanding raises your tolerance to a point where you will actually attempt to do this impossible and incredible thing. So understanding has something to do with it, doesn't it? The funny part of it is the understanding is demanded *of you*, and you look in vain for the Instructor to understand a damn thing! Well, that's all to your benefit. It keys in past understanding on you as you try to give it to him and fail.

But when we look this over on a broad view we find ourselves articulate on the subject of where man is going, what man is doing, what the end product could be; and we for certain have sorted out factors that none of the humanities ever sorted out or ever dreamed of sorting out, and didn't even know they would ever *have* to be sorted out—that's more important.

In order for a man to see when he can't, he would first have to understand that he was blind.

Therefore I pity you when someday you find in your midst—thrown to you in a government project or something of the sort—the fact that the old base psychiatrist or psychologist or something or other is going to be put into your particular project, and you're going to be called upon to train this man. Now, there are certain portions of a horse's anatomy which are never mentioned—particularly amongst ladies—but this fellow, this fellow would be best described.

15 JULY 1957

Now, what's wrong with him? And why is he untrainable? Because he's on this terrific pretense. He is staring at fancied information which has never benefited him or any other human being—yet it sounds so wise. It's so impressive to have 18,000 names, not 472. He'll think you're a dog because you don't know these 18,000 names, and he will tell the people around him that you are a charlatan and a cheat because you don't know these 18,000 names. But you know something he doesn't know. You know he's blind. There is a condition worse than blindness, and that is thinking you see something that isn't there.

Now, when we are asked to train such a man, we can do so only if we ourselves know that we, too, have risen from the unseeingness.

It's a very funny thing for a fellow sometime in processing: he sits down, he's being audited, and he says, "You know... you know, I think I've got things wrong." Boy, you said it. He's not just had them wrong, he's had them upside down. But this sneaking suspicion comes through to him. He sat down there so that you would audit him and thereby prove that he was always right and he was simply put upon by the rest of the world. And he finds out in the course of it, somewhere along the line, that he was dead wrong and, to modify English, couldn't have been wronger.

He sits there and he says, "You know, maybe I wasn't right. Maybe *ya-uuh* , . . Maybe some of this responsibility was mine. Maybe... maybe life . . . *uh-huh-huh-huh-huh* . . . I wonder. Say, you don't suppose I've never taken a straight look at that girl, do you? Or I wonder if I have ever really been part of my job at all." Or as I did to one fortunate individual—he's fortunate because he found this out—he said, "I wonder if I have any right at all to wear these five stripes on my sleeve."

8

Now, we weren't asking him to dive into humility; we were trying to build him up. But humility was north! He was on a swollen, pathetic egotism which wouldn't admit his admission of truth that he didn't think he was up to his job. And this he had hidden even from himself. And he had to discover this all over again before he got out of the morass.

Do you know that no blind man thinks he is blind? He may tell you so, but he doesn't think so. I processed a blind man one time and found out why it's almost impossible to process blind people. Because they see all sorts of things. They have all kinds of perceptions. And they're getting audited so they won't have to admit they're blind.

And I audited this fellow up the line and all of a sudden he clapped his hands over his eyes and he says, "My God," he said, "I can't see!" That's fascinating. He'd only been blind for about a quarter of a century. Big cognition. I couldn't understand why he went around . . . I just . . . it just stopped the session in its tracks. On a cognition of that magnitude you would—just let the session go to hell. There was no getting this fellow back into session; he kept walking around the room saying, "I'm blind!" It was a great relief to him.

I never audited him anymore. I closed off that particular session because it was a short one anyhow—I think its total duration was supposed to be fifteen minutes. But he's been a fast friend of mine ever since. I was the only fellow, he tells his friends, who ever showed him an inkling of truth. Only he's got it all embroidered up now to all kinds of truths, but the truth of the matter is, I was the only fellow that ever came along and invited him to find out that he was blind and to stop kidding himself. After that he was perfectly willing to be blind. It was very interesting, but it modified his existence considerably, and he's a very fast friend of mine.

SCIENTOLOGY AND EFFECTIVE KNOWLEDGE

Now, I don't say that we couldn't go on above this point, don't you see, we couldn't go on north from this and have restored his sight and perhaps done all sorts of things, but I merely bring him forward as an example of a big cognition. And me as an auditor sat there, and I thought the last thing in the world we had to discover about this case was that the fellow was blind!

And I've had fellows on crutches tell me all of a sudden, "You know, I'm lame." "You are? What have you been doing for fifteen years with that crutch if you weren't lame?" The fellow didn't realize he was lame. This is a fantastic thing.

Now, we're not trying to pound the truth into somebody's head. We're not trying to beat them down so that they will get any lower. No, we do our best to make them communicate, to look, to cheer up. We're friendly, we're kind and everything's fine. And the guy improves and improves and improves and finds himself on the bottom. And only then can he go up.

Had a preclear one time who used to dope off all the time. And he told me one day, "You know, I dope off all the time." Well, he'd always said this. He'd always said, "You know, I get doped off. I just get dopey. I get dopey. I get dopey." And one day he looked at me very intelligently and he said, "You know, I dope off all the time." And I said "Yes," and I was about to pass it up because the most obvious thing about the case would have been the fact that he was doping off. And what do you know, it made a big difference to him. It isn't that he didn't dope off anymore, because he did—every now and then— but he had found out about it. And he would go *tok* and knock himself back into awakesness again. These are the fabulous things about Scientology.

9

Now, it tells you quite adequately that there is an enormous zone, an enormous wonderland, below blindness. It tells you that there is an enormous Valhalla mixed up with Pluto's realm, mixed up with fairy tales, mixed up with Menninger's works, lying all over below the level of truth. And the truth is a simple thing that anybody could see. And why don't they see it? Because they live in this gorgeous wonderland, which isn't and never will be.

You perhaps don't know the joke of why we use *Alice in Wonderland* in our training drills. It's just a joke, completely aside from the fact that that particular gentleman, besides being a fine mathematician, could also write.

But here is this circumstance—all this imagined knowledge. Somebody commits to memory a sixty-thousand-word treatise on childcare—just commits it to memory from one end to the other. Doesn't understand any part of it. Sees a child coughing and whooping and coughing and just having a terrible time, and turns around very learnedly to the mother and says, "Bronchitis—acute," and walks away. Bronchitis. Now, wait a minute. We don't care how many broncos are around there. A child is coughing!

It actually would require the observation that the child was coughing in order to do anything about it. Now, the *wrong* thing to do about it is give it a new name! That just takes you one step away from looking at it. And you realize that if you were in good shape, the child was coughing and his throat was raw and you looked at his throat and so on, his throat would get well.

Now, let's go into wonderland—the wonderland of syllables; the wonderland beneath the earth of never-never. What is all this? We know it as a dispersal. An individual looks at something and it flashes back and he can no longer look in that direction. It kicks him in the teeth. He thinks it will continue to kick him in the teeth. So he mustn't look that way. He must look somewhere else. And he eventually learns very well never to observe anything, but if he catches sight of something, to go on a via at once and look the

15 JULY 1957

other direction. Do you see that? And that is the exact mechanic of how a wonderland of pretended information which became the social sciences was created. Individual couldn't confront man so he turned around and developed a theory about man. He said man was something that was made by the devil in the image of God or something—some such myth. All savage races, *all* savage races, even the American, has had myths concerning man's origin—the Aleut, Tlingits. You see, he's had all sorts of things.

Now, he certainly couldn't have been looking very well if he'd never noticed exteriorization as such. He must have been blind for centuries never to have included this in his literature. Isn't this fascinating? If any man knew anything about it, he didn't dare say anything about it because nobody else knew anything about it, you see? He stood there as a little island of information that quickly died. He invented all sorts of things about heaven and hell and hereafters.

Then he invented the "functions of the brain," which is the wildest thing I ever heard of; I don't know that the brain has a single function. I know I stopped depending on mine years ago. Someday I will will my brain—I just thought of this—I'll will my brain to science and they can put it in a pickle jar, and it will have served its first useful purpose. I don't even enjoy it as head padding because every once in a while you put a helmet... have to put a helmet around it to ride motorcycles, and it's already too heavy. You know? It doesn't work well.

10

Now, what is this additive, make-it-more-complex thing? Well, we try to look at something, and then because we don't want to look at it anymore, we turn around and look another way and tell somebody all about not looking at it. We tell somebody how dangerous it is to look in that direction. Or maybe we're just feeling puckish one day, and we invent a direction not to look in. We say, "Everybody who looks northeast by north, up through that pass up there, is apt to see the jub-jub monster," and nobody could tolerate that, and so nobody ever looks in that direction. And when you've got all points of the compass sorted out, somebody is totally blind. After that he really *does* have theories.

There are no theories quite as towering as the theories of one who has spent his life in an ivory tower. These theories are gorgeous. They have the beautiful charm of having no possible bearing on reality—which is of course the *ne plus ultra*.

Now, a thetan on the other hand, all out of thin air, has as his greatest accomplishment the ability to create, form, maintain, a universe. So when he has this ability of creating a universe, this dims out so that he's not doing it very intelligently. And he sees a bunch of things in the universe that he doesn't want to look at—he gets a dispersal there—he combines these two talents. So the universe he builds is below the level of the current universe he's in. And you have to bring him north to find out he's in a trap.

Fantastic thing, but I'm sure that you could go down to penitentiaries and take prisoners—some prisoners that have been there for a very long time—and run 8-C on them and get some terrific cognition all of a sudden, you know? The fellow would go around touching the walls, and all of a sudden he'd say, "Iron bars? Iron bars?" He's hung on to them every day you know for the last twenty-five years. "Iron bars? My God, I believe I'm in jail!"

Well, we should understand this across the whole of knowledge. We should understand invented knowledge. We ourselves are sometimes accused of it. Perhaps there are some things in Scientology which were unwittingly

SCIENTOLOGY AND EFFECTIVE KNOWLEDGE

invented. I myself don't know what they are. There were a few things that we discarded. I wouldn't say what percentage because I don't think it would be a storable percentage. It's such a tiny little amount of data that we've picked up and then had to discard as incorrect or wrong or a misconception, that it doesn't amount to very much. Most of our data is on the firm foundation of having looked.

And your ability to know the subject is your ability to look. No more, no less than that. Now, the only thing, actually, that anyone can do for you is to provide you with an example of having looked, and perhaps to furnish you a little road map saying, "If you travel up this way there's some scenery." Got it? "And if you look at this scenery real hard, it won't bite you." Some reassurances can be offered. Some drills can be offered that show an individual that he can observe, look and confront, exchange communication with or communicate to. These things can be done. Observation can occur.

And all the observation in the world being done at this moment—all the observation in the world—actual real observation in the field of the humanities, if put totally together into a thimble, would get lost.

Now, I don't say that maliciously. I'm trying to show you something. I'm merely trying to show you that wherever we have succeeded it has been in the direction of a straight communication. And where training and processing processes are successful, they lead toward a straighter communication.

And therefore, the road out is marked by simplicity and direct observation. And the road in is more and more and more and more vias, vias, vias, complexity, complexity, complexity.

It's quite amusing, the evolution—there will be gentlemen hearing these tapes who have taught Comm Courses over the past year or so—but the evolution of a Comm Course is terribly interesting. At first I didn't have too much alertness on this subject; I simply invented the drills as a gradient scale and I told them to teach them and paid little further attention to it. Pioneering work on it was done by others. And it was only when I found out that every time that a Comm Course was established anyplace it soon became much more complex than anybody could ever imagine, did I realize that the people who were teaching Comm Courses had seldom been through them.

In other words, instead of a straight communication—for the first six or eight months of Comm Course history—instead of straighter communication, we were getting more complicated communication and instead of being able to do the drill better, we were succeeding in doing it more complicatedly. You see this? This is to be expected. It's man's natural bent.

Man—before he gets up and looks to find where he is, before he starts to look in a proper direction, discovers he's blind, and then says, "Hey, wait a minute," takes the veil off of his eyes and does take a look—has a tendency to keep diving into complexities.

So there is only one continuing stress in Scientology. That stress, until now, has been added to this subject, I am afraid to say, mainly by myself. And that stress is just this: Greater simplicity means greater communication. And I've been bucking my shoulder, in the organizations, up against any tendency to complicate a simple observation. And it has been necessary always to take the drill and simplify it, to take the subject and simplify it, to take the organization, articulate it better and simplify it.

Now listen. That it can be done is obvious. I mean, I have the *absolute* proof that it can be done. We have simplified the Central Organization in Washington, DC, to such an extent that we recognize fully there is none here!

15 JULY 1957

That tells you we must have looked at it because it's been as-ised. We know there's no organization in Washington, DC. We do know that there are several people in Washington, DC, who wear certain hats, who are in communication with certain other people with certain ends and purposes, and this is the first time we've had a running show that didn't cause anybody headaches twenty-four hours a day.

We dropped the *Alice in Wonderland* myth called organization. We found out the third dynamic was an agreement. All right, we'll agree. But in agreeing, let's not die the death. Let's not as-is every individual present simply because we've agreed that there's an organization there. Let's not create an all-devouring, *Alice in Wonderland* monster. You understand this?

We came uphill far enough to recognize that the third dynamic, how desirable and actual it may be in the upper realms of existence, at this level of existence is composed entirely of first dynamics cooperating. Therefore, it isn't possible for the organization to carry a ball independent of an individual. And if an individual in that organization is carrying the ball well, *dhuh*, he's liable to run square onto somebody who isn't. And the organization can never help him out. Now, maybe he can take refuge of one kind or another in the public belief that there is an organization there. You understand that? But, because he's taking such refuge, he should not be so untruthful and so blind himself as to believe that there is actually a somethingness there where there is truly nothing, nothing at all.

12

Organizations do not bleed, they do not breathe. They do behave, oddly enough, like a single organism—oddly enough. But when the individuals in it cease to behave as individuals, cease to have their own thoughts, cease to be capable of their own initiative, cease to be able to take their own action, then the whole organization boils down to just one man—and he's the only one that could make a decision, the only one who could do anything, the only one who could act. Now, we don't care whether this is a beneficent monarchy or a fascism or anything else. We're merely saying that in the end it boils down to one man.

If we believe implicitly in an organization, we have a situation whereby every agent of fascism in Italy had to phone Mussolini in Rome to make a decision. And when our military governments went into Sicily and Italy, they found out that the only people who were there who could do anything about the government were these former Nazis. They did try to put in other people in government to run the towns and so forth and found out that they'd put in the Mafia. They kicked them out in a hurry, a few thousand deaths later. And what did we discover? What did we discover? They couldn't act or operate because Mussolini was no longer there! In other words, they'd lost their individualism.

So the first thing I must tell you about this subject is that it is a subject, that it depends upon organization only to the degree that communication is assisted, that it is composed of individuals who observe and who look. And if the organization is ever asked on to look, we'd have to recognize something right there or we would be telling ourselves fairy tales; and that is that the organization, not being there at all, must therefore be totally blind. Thus we get the conduct of governments which are totally blind.

All right. The whole subject opens up at its inception with just this: That the simplicity of observation, the simplicity of communication itself, and only itself, is functional and will take man from the bottom to the top.

And the only thing I am trying to teach you is *look*.

Thank you.

Thank you.

QUESTION AND ANSWER PERIOD

A lecture given on 15 July
1957

Now, this period here, just for the next few minutes, I'll take some questions concerning your training, if you wish to place them, and try to dispose of them. Are there any questions relating to these drills processes, so forth that you are doing?

Yes, Marcia.

Female voice: Has it been decided yet whether we're going to, in 3A, be using dolls mostly, or not? When we get to it. . .

Well, there's an actual process in 3A that is very, very easy to audit and you will not be using dolls and probably will not be coaching on it. You'll possibly do just a little bit of hit-or-miss, patch-up auditing—and that's the contacts. Location by Contact and so forth. You will be using, to a marked degree, dolls at this particular run of CCH A—in this particular run. And it may be that you'll just get some fast briefing on CCH B. We might not even teach it again. I mean, there's so much to learn in CCH A. That has not been totally decided.

Nearly everything is fixed in an ACC, fixed very strongly and very unmovably. But when we all of a sudden discover a frailty, why, it isn't part of our fixedness to perpetuate an error forever. Do you see that?

Now, this unit's training is devoted mainly to cracking all the cases all the way south. It's not necessarily devoted to cracking cases northward at all, don't you see? CCH A actually contains all the processes you would need to dig anybody out of the mire and make Homo novis out of him if you used them exactly and well. It even includes Trio, a very redoubtable process. Then and Now Solids and some of the CCH B processes are very, very easy to do, particularly if you know CCH A. But auditing starts with CCH A, not CCH B.

Well, we have had one change in doing 8-C. We're saying—in the training drills it says it's not all right to touch somebody and in actuality we're saying now it is all right to touch somebody doing the 8-C drill. Now, I mean by that just that one little drill that precedes High School Indoc; perfectly all right to touch somebody and push them around one way or the other. And that's because there is a silent drill that we haven't any time for. And that silent drill simply teaches somebody to move a body around. So we'd better combine these rather than omit the silent drill entirely. That's just in the efforts of getting in a little more training, not in an effort to invalidate that particular drill. That particular drill is itself.

By the way, do you know, I noticed something today and it was quite

15 JULY 1957

amusing to me—do you know that it's rather more difficult to take a moving target for communication than a motionless target? And therefore giving the commands perfectly while walking around as in 8-C—one may have been able to give them more or less perfectly while sitting down facing a fixed preclear but walking around has a tendency to unsettle one a little bit. And you have to get used to this particular aspect of it, otherwise just the motion itself introduces error; quite amusing.

I noticed the most trouble—the Instructor noticed the most trouble in 8-C, the most trouble that was encountered was the consolidation of all the steps of the Comm Course into one process, see? One practicing process. They were having the most trouble with consolidating all of the steps of the Comm Course into one action, you know, and getting these things all squared away. So the touch part of it and moving the body and so forth isn't evidently what is needed most. We look at these training drills and we find out that 8-C is the first drill in which a person is using all of these steps in an auditing process, one right after the other. And it takes a little settling down, doesn't it? Of course he gets enough time during High School Indoc and the rest of it to get these things settled down well, but he really shouldn't be settling them down in High School Indoc. That should have been settled down.

It's quite an interesting observation; the first chance to get a sequence of communication, acknowledgment, would be in 8-C. And I suppose if we had a little bit more time, why, we would do that. And very well probable that, just to show you how things go in an ACC—it is all laid out; it is taped. And if it isn't better organized at the end of the course so that we could just that moment teach a perfect course, we'll not have gained a thing. You got the idea? We wouldn't have gained anything if we didn't learn anything. And so I'm right in there willing to learn with anybody else.

We do have the edge on it because we know the workability of these training drills; we know more or less how they should be trained. This is the first time we're taking a direct look at them with an absolute determinism there to get the most out of every drill. There's a high possibility, a very, very high possibility that the Comm Course should add—finish up with some sort of a verbal drill in place of the Hand Mimicry so that we don't run into this same cockeyed thing in 8-C. I mean, this is a debatable question; might be true and might not be true. But it may be that doing it by symbols, which is to say arm motions, doing it by arm motions rather than verbalization, may be what is best there.

These little touch-up points will come up from time to time, so don't be unsettled about them. If you don't understand why there's been a change, then you don't understand that there is a *reason* behind most all of these changes and that reason is simplicity and improvement on the student.

You could take this course just the way it has started and be very, very successful with it because these patterns are being very successful. But we don't for a moment believe that it could not be improved. We're perfectly happy to improve something. However, it is always unsettling to a student to have something changed in midflight; it's always unsettling. However, most of you are so used to this by now that it probably wouldn't bother you.

Yours is the uneasy track of the pioneer. The only difference between Scientology and pioneering is pioneering trails are usually littered with bones.

Male voice: Boring.

Yes, but ours aren't littering any trail, we're still here.

QUESTION AND ANSWER PERIOD

Okay, are there any other questions about these drills and so on?

Yes?

Male voice: Bill Fisk brought this up in class today; I'd like to ask it of you: why do you say in 8-C now, "Look at that wall," when "Walk over to that wall" is a brand-new command directing his attention to that wall for the first time. Why is it necessary to put "Look at that wall" in there?

It is a combined—you want to know why you want "Look at that wall" at the beginning of the process.

Male voice: Right.

This is a combined process which combines Locational Processing with a doingness and it is simply an improvement of the process. If you wanted to take—and I'll give you this now as an exercise, just you; you've brought this up. Given not—this is not as punishment, but you're interested in the subject and so is Bill, so I think the two of you independently should be able to do this. I'm not trying to punish you or make fun of you; it's just good mental exercise. Look it over and tell me how many processes there are in 8-C. This is one of the most complicated little mechanisms in Scientology and I ask you to look that over because you may spot a couple that we haven't noticed so far. There are several; a good many. It is simply an additional process.

There is a very simple process which is not too workable, which is the figure-figure end of 8-C which you might be interested in, and that's doingness. If you want to take somebody after a long automobile trip or an airplane ride and improve his morale and tiredness and so forth and make him in pretty good shape rather immediately, tell him to look around and tell you something that he wouldn't mind doing. Look around and tell him something he wouldn't mind doing. It's not particularly a good process; it's more or less an assist. And very funny, all the motions of the immediate ride he's been through and all the immediate labor he's been through just sort of go off and you'll see his body go twisting around and so on. And when he's been fixed in a chair over a period of a flight or something of that sort and he finds a scrap of paper and he says well, he wouldn't mind moving that scrap of paper.

And you'll find his perimeter of action goes out further and further and further and then collapses on him and then goes out much further and then collapses on him and goes out much further again on his doingness. But this is just one of the processes which—contained in that.

We hope the fellow will graduate up to a point of where he doesn't mind walking to a barrier. The actuality of it is that you're making the barrier walk to him. It's quite interesting. If you were to run 8-C on the basis of "All right, move—look at that wall. Good. Move that wall to you. Good," you'd get an entirely different process out of it. You'd never see so much figure-figure in your life.

It's true that when you move a wall to you, you would have to move, to keep the interrelationships correct, the entirety of the universe that several feet, wouldn't you?

Audience: Yeah.

See, you'd have to, to keep the relationships exact so that nothing would crumple up and fall down. But who said that there was any friction between this universe and the outside space? So maybe you do never walk to anything; maybe you simply move the whole universe, which can theoretically move frictionlessly. that many feet. It's something to think about sometime when you're walking down the street. Thank you, Al.

15 JULY 1957

There any other questions?

Well, I want to thank you very much for coming down here, staff, and I want to thank you in the ACC for being here. We're having quite a time here and I think this is the best course we have ever had in Scientology, bar none. I don't think anybody would argue with that very hard.

Audience: Yes. Right.

Our immediate future here contains five more weeks of slug, and I know seven or eight weeks from now you'll still be starting up at two or three o'clock in the morning and saying, "Okay! Okay. Okay." Or you will hear some ghostly voice around you saying, "Do it!" Yes, something like this could very well occur. But that's many weeks from here and the suffering of the next five weeks is something which I know . . . I'm very disappointed in this unit, by the way. We've only had breakdowns from about one-fifth of the unit; we've only had breakdowns on the part of about one-fifth of the unit to date. Only about one-fifth of the 18th has come unglued at the hinges for a little while. So that leaves four-fifths to go.

I'm going to check—I'm going to say, "All right, did so-and-so blow up, have any difficulty, threaten to leave, commit suicide or something? Jones here, did he-did he really-did he? Didn't he?" So I'll say, "Well if he comes to the January ACC I'll validate his certificate, so . . . Couldn't ever have gotten real to him."

16

Of course we're going on the basic premise, that—evidently, that all men are hysterical. And if this particular planet at this time wouldn't at some time or another cause you to react in an hysterical fashion, then you haven't found out you're blind yet.

I was being audited today, by the way—just a little point here—I've gotten myself twenty-five, thirty hours here in the last few weeks. I'm getting two or three hours at a crack, as work admits. And I had about an hour's auditing late this afternoon, just putting some more time in on it. And for the first time had "Body Can't Have" run on me. And it was quite amusing. I had run it on lots of preclears and I had lots of processes run on me, but I'd never had "Body Can't Have." You know, "Look around and find something your body can't have." Wow!

It's interesting that some of these processes will produce a reaction on me, for this reason: if they were simply inventednesses, you know, they were just invented, all that would run out would be my invention of them. Well, that has never happened. Never happened.

Now, of course you can postulate that a process will produce a certain effect and then do the process and then assume that effect. But if you're doing this unknowingly, you're nuts. This whole basic riddle of have is quite fascinating. It is based on the fact that the only thing that cures the problem is the problem itself. That is what have is. The only thing that cures the problem is the problem itself. But I'll tell you more about that one of these evenings; right now it's a very cool evening so I'll bid you all good night and see you tomorrow night at seven thirty.

Thank you.

Audience: Thank you.

CCH RELATED TO ARC

A lecture given on 16
July 1957

Well, okay. As usual the lecture I was going to give you isn't. But I'll think of something—think of something as you go along.

You probably haven't yet related training in the ACC, which is Academy type training to the ARC triangle. You probably haven't related it because the A is missing, the R is unstable at best, and the C which you expected to be inflow is almost total outflow.

Affinity, reality, communication.

I suppose you think we've left this a long way behind, huh?

Audience: Nope. No.

I don't know if you realize it, but A and R were designed and came about in July 1950 in Elizabeth. And C followed within twenty-four hours.

The ARC triangle is our next-to-the-oldest property. Our oldest property is a bank—the engram, the mental image picture.

But the ARC triangle recently did a terrific resurrection, not after seven days or three days or something, but after seven years it rose sturdily from the dead and again took its place. Only this time we call it control, having-ness and communication.

Affinity, reality and communication are an excellent description of the three basic things on which the universe is built, but without which in balance, life cannot exist. Affinity, reality and communication.

Without affinity—that is, some emotional or felt consideration of proximity—affinity is basically a consideration of distance, but it's that consideration which says that one likes it or doesn't like it. In other words, without some liking or disliking, having some things to avoid and some things to go close to, there would be no game at all.

And reality of course is that sequence which begins with postulates and ends with mass, which we originally defined as an agreed-upon thing. Reality was an agreement. And communication is of course—everybody knows what communication is, it's just communication. Everybody knows that. I mean . . . We didn't have to do any work on communication in Scientology because it was already well understood.

L equals MV squared by the square root of the sine gives you the electrical output of the input on the other side of the ruddy rod. It was the basic formula of communication that was used in the first half of the twentieth century. It was a very well worthwhile communication. It added up of course, naturally, to the fact that if you wanted to communicate with anybody you

16 JULY 1957

gave them an electric shock. At least this is the only extant text on communication.

If you go down to the library and look for texts on communication you will find electrical gimmicks and Western Union, and you'll find formulas and you'll find all sorts of things but no discussion down there about one being talking to another being because of course nobody had ever done that. So we had to introduce with this new simplicity this *radical* idea that one being could talk to another being, that an interchange of ideas could take place.

But if you notice, an interchange of ideas is not very feasible unless there is an agreement of some sort or another. The agreement can take the form of having a mass to talk to, so that we've got a communication via. At least we know what we are talking to if there is something there, and that is reality. And we can simply postulate something is there and talk to it—people do this in New York all the time. We see them walking up and down the streets talking to nothing.

But it works best, really, if we have a reassuring backdrop for our deathless prose. It works best. At least we can get the echo. So talking to something is preferable to talking to nothing, of course.

Well, when two beings are talking to each other here on earth you normally see the oddity of two bodies standing there, not confronting each other and not talking. But there's a lot of words going back and forth. But this is—the reality part of that interchange would be the mass. That is, the platform, whether it's earth or a sidewalk or something of the sort the two bodies are standing on, and the two bodies standing there.

18

Now space, so far as location is concerned, enters into this. Those are located somewhere—those two bodies are located somewhere and therefore we know where the communication goes to. And whoever receives it knows where to send the answer back to—very necessary part of communication.

And then we get this business of affinity. How far away does a fellow have to be to talk to you? Well, there's more to that under affinity and we have learned there is more under affinity than a consideration of distance.

Yes, affinity is liking and disliking and all the rest of it, but there is more to it. But nevertheless, therefore you have the basic bones of understanding.

Understanding requires affinity, reality and communication. And if any corner of that triangle ARC is lowered, the other two corners lower accordingly.

Now, any Scientologist knows this. It's the most interesting trick in the world that all you have to do to raise somebody's communication level is to hit the A corner of the triangle, affinity, or hit the R corner of the triangle. For instance, you see a policeman out there, he won't talk to you. Why, pick up a hammer, hit him with it—that's introducing some R, and he'll say something—at least "Ouch," something like that.

If you introduce reality into a situation, you could do it just this way. We know that reality is basically an agreement. We used to say it was basically an agreement. Actually we have today the Reality Scale. And that's quite important.

But we've always known all we've had to do—in Scientology we've always known it—all you had to do was introduce some agreement into the situation. You had to agree at least on what you were talking about in order to talk.

It's the most wonderful thing in the world to see a conversation being conducted without any established agreement about what it is being conducted on.

It's rather interesting. You go into a—oh, I don't know—I was up in the middle of a skyscraper one time, found a men's club that was about halfway up the skyscraper. They had soft-footed waitresses and so forth. It was very soothing, very soothing. After the fellow had lost his pile in a bull market or something of the sort, why he could go up there and, you know, cry in private.

And so you go in there, and one fellow would say, "Well, I sold 25,000 shares today of American Can."

And the other fellow would say, "Well, my wife doesn't like mink." And ...

The next fellow would say, "Well, my rug cost \$10,000—bought it in Brussels."

Very interesting place—I enjoyed the liquor. I didn't know—I didn't know that these fellows had hideaways of this character. I thought that they had them other places; I thought they had only love nests, but they have these places too. And anyway . . . Anyway, it was quite interesting, there wasn't any communication in progress simply because there's no agreement on anything. You'd have thought, well, they're all interested in the market or something like that and therefore they would talk about the market. Yes, you heard more comments on the market than you heard about any other thing, but none of them were sequitur. It was very fascinating.

And these fellows didn't know that the other fellows were there. You got that? Now, you would have had to have established the existence of one of the other people before a communication could have occurred.

It's quite interesting as an experiment to see three or four people sitting around in a room at a party. I did this, by the way, when I was over in London in April, and there were a couple of Scientologists present, and there were some other people too. And they thought this was very amusing—the Scientologists—but the other people didn't realize anything was happening.

I introduced a Miss Jones to a Mr. Smith, six times. I just kept introducing these two people. And they didn't notice anything peculiar about my introducing them six times—because that was the bet I had on with these two Scientologists. Will they notice? They didn't see anything—the girl at first explained to me, "Yes, I—I've met Mr. er—uh—uh."

And I would say, "Well, well, well, Miss Jones, I'd like to have you meet Mr. Smith." All over again, you know.

"Uh, oh, oh, yeah! Well, I—I've met him and so forth." That's all.

Mr. Smith says, "Yes, I—I know Miss er—uh—uh Jones."

"Now, Mr. Smith, I would like to have you meet Miss Jones."

They became inseparable! Nobody could get a word in edgewise the rest of the evening! They just snapped terminals, that was that!

Just a simple demonstration of the practical uses of this very, very old triangle that we have. We just put more R into the thing. We finally got an agreement restimulated in both of them that the other one was there. And they agreed upon the fact they were both there and both located, and thereupon certainly *must* have had some affinity for one another, and therefore could talk. See, two people couldn't be that close together without liking each other. That just—you know, it just follows. It just follows.

On the last couple of introductions I will admit that I moved Mr. Smith closer to Miss Jones. So it wasn't a pure test. Some A was being thrown into it there. But there we had it. Communication occurred simply by R. And a tiny little hint of A, you know, by getting them close together. All right.

ARC. Well, anybody knows about this. I had a girl who was weeping all over the HASI London. She was over from Ireland, and the hall porter came

16 JULY 1957

to me and he said, "Doctor," he said, "is there something you can do about these puddles of tears that keep occurring in the hall?" No, he did tell me, "She feels awfully low." He was Irish too.

Anyway, her father and her mother would no longer speak to her. They wouldn't write her. They didn't want anything to do with her. So I took her under an ironclad discipline on what she was to write to them in Ireland. And I merely told her to write a simple letter through saying that she was in London and that she was working and that everything was fine and she hoped everything was going well at home.

She says, "Under no circumstances would they receive such a letter! They couldn't receive such a letter because they are furious with me!" She had, I don't know, I think she had taken up the piano or something of the sort, and she wouldn't go through with her career and so they had thrown her out into the streets of Dublin. That's quite something to happen to somebody. Anyway—that's really something to happen to somebody. That's why we're having something to do with Ireland. We think there ought to be a country there.

Well, anyway, we wrote that letter and I said, "Now," I said, "just don't do anything about this. Don't worry about it." And she told me a few days later she hadn't had a reply yet, you know—spitting out her fingernails. And I said, "That's okay. That's okay. Now, write them again and tell them you are particularly enjoying your job here. And tell them how the weather is in London."

20

And so she didn't know about that, but I Tone 40ed it and she sat down there and she wrote the letter and she sent that off.

She got back the most carpingly critical, 1.1 series of slashes you ever saw, and she promptly went into tears and she was going to explain it all to them—explain it all to them, and she was going to dash off this long epistle. And I said, "Nope. Nope. Do you live with anybody?"

She says, "Yes. I have a roommate."

I said "Now, you write her that your roommate is a very strait-laced girl, and that you're very glad to have this roommate and so on."

And so she sat down under a great deal of Tone 40 auditing, wrote this fact back to them. And she received a letter in return saying, "Dear Blank, we are very happy that you are doing well. And we don't feel, however, that you should be rooming with that person." They had changed off any rancor they had to another person they didn't even know.

Well, this girl had seen through this—she had seen that it was totally a mechanical operation, that I was making her do certain things, and she all of a sudden realized that her parents could be handled, and—that was that. She stopped worrying about it and they continued to correspond and everything was all right.

Nah-hah! Well, there is more method than madness in what I am telling you right here. Because A, affinity, necessitates a control of attention. Well now, it's all very well for us to theorize and use in the workaday world, ARC, but let me assure you we've had an awful lot of processes more or less founded on ARC, and they have not in themselves produced *tremendous* results. They produce good results, but not just *spectacular* results.

We have seen a lot of things happen by reason of using just plain ARC. But we haven't seen anybody step out of the graveyard and doff his hat. There must be something about ARC which is workable, then, but there must be some counterparts to ARC which are more workable than ARC, since if we

know ARC is true, then how do we—and those are basic considerations, very basic—then how do we make it work in this universe, on this planet at this time?

Well, ARC is all very well for thee and me. We can understand A-R-C. We know that the three things add up themselves to understanding. We know how to promote a—understanding with them. But there are very few of us, in spite of our self-criticism and so forth, who have not been able to some degree to handle people before Scientology.

In other words, we were minded in this direction. And then we improved the direction we were minded considerably by understanding ARC and its understanding. Now, you know that's true. It simply clarified our understanding of understanding and its component parts.

But how would you make it apply to this fellow who is just about to be slid into the coffin or the lady lying up in the hospital with her head bashed in, in a comatose state, or the one-day-old child? Now, how do you get it into a processing level?

Well, in the first place you have to realize blindness when you see it, and you have to realize that south is an awful long way south. And the basic entrance of the ARC triangle breaks down to control for A. Bodies and the GE respond to this beautifully. Any preclear therefore would respond to it regardless of his tone level if you were processing him via a body, because this is the body's understanding—it is solid. So therefore A is control.

Somebody comes along and says, "Stand up straighter. Get your heels together. Suck in your guts!" You say, "The guy loves me."

Now, you might phrase it in some other way. You might say, "Damn that sergeant, I could kill him!" Which means, of course, at a GE level, "I love him dearly."

And we have havingness or solid mass in the place of reality.

And we have verbalization in the place of communication. Got that now?

I mean, so understanding takes place in terms of control, mass and communication.

Two nations wish to speak to each other, they start firing bullets. See? They're always surprised that they did that much harm, because they reduced or disorganized the mass. And they say that "We shouldn't have done that." Always after a war they shouldn't have done that. Just like they just that moment discovered, you know, that bullets made holes in walls. I mean, any fool knows this. But the—nations periodically find out that bullets make holes in walls. Someday they'll find out that they make holes in men too, and they'll stop recruiting armies.

Anyway, here we have at the level of MEST what understanding is. Understanding, MESTwise, always takes place in the framework of mass and location thereof, verbalized or electrical or vibratory interchanges. Got that? And for affinity, control.

Now, if you dislike somebody on a mass level, you could simply refuse to control him. That sounds silly. I mean, the choice at the level I'm talking about is to control or not to control. See?

But unfortunately where you have people very firmly connected with mass this is the level of interchange. So if people are going around in bodies, then this is the level to which cases respond.

Now, don't get me wrong, I'm not trying to rephrase or redo the ARC triangle, I'm simply telling you the action level of the ARC triangle when it *is* in action, or you *are* going to work with it on a MESTy level.

16 JULY 1957

And A, affinity, becomes control or lack of it.

The R becomes mass and its location or lack of it. See, the complaint is about no mass.

And C is some sort of a vibratory, electrical, particle interchange. Symbols flying back and forth and so on. Solid.

Ballantine Beer sort of thing, you know. They know how to communicate. You brightly, electrically ignite a sign and you slam it over TV and so forth. And I'm sure if you walked into their advertising agent, some punk up on Madison Avenue that got the account executives of the company fooled into thinking he knows something . . . Madison Avenue: that avenue of deceit where advertising is not done, but which we get on TV anyway. They work two or three years to find out that people responded to the fact that when you said "Dove soap is creamy" they bought another brand. Anyway . . .

I don't know if you've read the recent raves about the tremendous advertising job that was done with this new brand of soap, it was just wonderful. A Scientologist could have worked it out in about fifteen minutes and thought it was the least interesting puzzle he had ever had anything to do with. He would have simply shown people that it had mass and you would have told people that it existed, where to buy it, and you would have tried to get some attractive mass to go along with it so that it would communicate, you know. Then we'd try to give them some kind of a bonus for buying it. You know— you know? We would have just said, "Buy it."

22

I've listened to TV ads recently, and I was thinking in terms of what if we Tone 40ed a TV ad? I've been listening to the *horrible* 8-C they run. They say, "Mercury cars are so smurkery. Why ride when you can glide? Your Mercury dealer is located at a certain spot." And this is a communication? Get the dispersal connected with it. It's the same dispersal that we were suffering from when we were running 8-C the first time.

We said, "Do you see the wall?" You know? "Do you see the wall?"

The fellow says, "Yeah, I guess I see the wall."

And you say, "Well, fine." You know, all backwards. You know, don't offend him. Don't move in on him. You know?

And if you'd translated the ad into Tone 40, you'd simply say, "Buy a Mercury car from such-and-such a phone number, such-and-such an address, the price is so-and-so. Call at once, please."

Male voice: Thank you.

See, that's a communication. And people would. It's quite interesting.

Now, you start adding too much directness, however, at this very, very low level that I'm talking about, and you are liable to blow the mass up. Now, a thetan learns that. Every once in a while he loses a favorite piece of bank or service facsimile or something of the sort. He said exactly what he meant to the fellow, directly, with no vias. Got himself fired or something.

Well now, he was trying to communicate directly on a MEST level. And you throw any particles straight out with no slightest via on them at all and something is liable to explode. You have to have some intention with it. There has to be some livingness connected with it and so forth. In other words, you have to upscale it in order to make it.

So people who stick around at the lower end of control—don't want it. Mass—can't have it. Communication—it'll be said for me. People at this level when coaxed to put out a control, when coaxed to put out a communication which is absolutely direct and straight, discover something fantastic: that in

order to do this they have to go way up scale or shatter themselves in the process. And after they've been shattered a few times they hit the higher tone range. They say, "I belong up here. What am I doing grubbing around down here in the MEST?" That's basically what a fellow understands when he starts these training drills. It's quite interesting, quite fabulous.

After he blows pieces off of his bank, he finally says, "What am I doing talking *through* a bank? Why am I moving particles of electricity or something from here to here and saying it's intention? It's possible just to have them appear over here. Why shouldn't I do that?"

Well anyway, that's beside the point. The point is that ARC, to become extremely workable, has to be couched, where you're dealing with masses, in terms of control, havingness and communication.

Now, we've said CCH, by which we mean control, communication and havingness, or communication, control and havingness. And we haven't lined them up so that it's instantly discernible that this is another side to the ARC coin.

But you follow ARC down scale as per the Chart of Human Evaluation in *Science of Survival*—and if you go down, there is an area below the chart, about 1,000 feet below the bottom line of the chart—now, that has to do with mass.

We already knew that this chart went down to mass. See, we knew the lowest rungs of the chart would be getting solid, but when you get *that* solid, you know—when you get *that* solid you're about 1,000 feet below the chart.

In other words, to wrap up this whole thing, the only responses still extant at the bottom can still be phrased in terms of control, havingness and communication. That is, those responses do not entirely disappear. They get very coarse, they get very massy, they get very a lot of things, but they don't entirely disappear.

If life can be awakened into a presence, it will be awakened into a presence or a location by control, havingness and communication handled in one fashion or another.

Now, the first CCH process is a very, very old process, and hardly anybody has recognized its antecedent. We used to process—in 1949 I processed a cat until he'd eat an editor. It was a very remarkable thing. I mean, he'd eat the editor up and spit him out. Anyway . . .

I used to invite writers around to the house and they'd sit around and watch it happen, you know? He really did. I mean, I processed this cat up to a point where he would strike at my fingers. And he was a very timid cat, and I got him to reach for my fingers. And then I'd—each time he'd reach for my fingers, I would withdraw my fingers slightly and he would reach further. And he got more and more and more ferocious, and more and more and more ferocious, and more and more and more ferocious. And so I invited an editor over and he ate the editor up. Anyway . . .

Yeah. That's an exaggeration, an exaggeration really. He ate the editor's thetan. Anyway ...

Yeah, this is documented. Documented. The cat's name was Countess Motorboat.

Now, here we find ourselves processing an animal—a cat—just by inviting the cat to reach out, no matter how timidly, and strike at our fingers. And then, gradually, so as not to startle or surprise the cat, we make our fingers retreat and we get the cat striking. Well now, that's a communication line. Lines are solid at the bottom of the Reality Scale—lines are solid. So we are right there at the cat's reality. Cat can't have mass; the cat is below

16 JULY 1957

mass, and the cat is actually trying to connect antagonistically with a solid communication line. And so the cat does reach. Well, Give Me Your Hand is just processing the cat, that's all. Only it's a way to do it.

You say, "Give me your hand," and then the fellow doesn't, and we reach over and take hold of his wrists and we take his hand, and we thank him for having given it to us. And after a while he says, "You know, there is some dim, vague possibility that I might have had something to do with that. I wonder if I could possibly reach that far." Not, "Could I control my body?" but, "Could I reach that far over to your lap?" See? "Could I reach that far?"

Well, he finds out all of a sudden there. When he finds out he can reach that far, you've done it, you see? Now you got to get him reaching for the environment—8-C sort of thing. Well, you'd better reach for the environment in terms of barriers because you just got lines kind of recognized, so let's move him up now to barriers. So we have 8-C on walls; they're good barriers.

Now, when we get him up above that, well up above that, we put him back on lines again and we have Hand Space Mimicry, you know? Get him to locate the mass of the auditor. You got him to locate the environment, now have him locate the auditor.

Now we take him back up and we run such things as Location by Contact and other things. That's "Touch that (object in the room)." We're just making him reach again, aren't we? But he can't disobey these commands, and there's no thinkingness involved in it because there isn't any thinking-ness at that level, and if you're processing any it's a figure-figureness, not a thinkingness.

24

So that's what ARC becomes. After a long time an individual becomes a body; he isn't anything but a body, people are never anything but bodies, and bodies are dead too. And that's the way it is. A body is mass, so if the body is mass and one is a body, then the realest thing there could be to a body (providing he still had a body—you know he can be below that, we'll go down there in a moment) would be control, just outright control. If he had a body then control would be affinity. If he could control something, he would like it. I'm not talking about your parents. I'm not talking about some of your friends that stopped liking you when they stopped controlling you.

I never made such an enemy in my life one time. I knew a fellow, apparently he and I got along fine in a rather distant sort of way, and one day he said, "Well," he said "get your hat, we're going out to dinner." And I said, "No, I have to wait for somebody." He's been my enemy ever since. In other words, affinity was whether or not control could occur.

Well, now an individual who finds out control isn't killing him winds up liking his auditor somewhat. See that? That's an establishment of a reality level there, and the affinity level at that reality level is control.

Now, he can be way below that (being able to accept control) and kick back against it, and find out that it doesn't kill him and that he can't get rid of it, and he'll wind up liking you too. But it's upscale, it's not downscale. In other words, we use a good Tone 40 control on him, he'll come upscale to having mass, and he can have mass.

All right. Now let's look at what this does to communication. The individual, of course, is willing to talk, willing to say something and so on. He's also willing to receive objects and give objects away and so on. Interchanges can occur.

Now this is what we're looking at when we're looking at far-south processes. This is what we're looking at. We're looking at the ARC where

understanding takes place only in the presence of control, havingness and communication on a MEST level. Do you see that? Do you see that?

All sorts of cliches should at once become explicable. "I don't know what's gotten into that boy, I can't do a thing with him." That's a weird remark if you analyze it on a high tone. "I can't do a thing with him, so I couldn't know, of course, what's gotten into him. If I could do something with him, then I would understand what's in him." That's the reverse of it, and that doesn't make sense at all. But nobody notices that the other doesn't make sense, you see? State it in the reverse and it just doesn't make sense at all.

All right. This is the level at which machines of a MEST nature, automobiles and so forth, have to be run. An individual cannot adequately control his car, he doesn't like his car. What does he mean by "like"? Does he mean an emotion? No, he does not mean an emotion, he means an ability to control it. It's as solid and MESTy as that.

You wonder why some married couples don't get along, although she apparently does *everything* he says, exactly, snaps and pops at once, and yet you say, "Well, she seems sort of beaten down and so forth. And then you decide that you will get her out from under him or him out from under her or bust this up one way or the other. And then you find out they—there seems to be some feeling for each other. You know, just absolute control going on all the time and so forth. Yet they're not detachable. You know, you say, "What is this phenomenon? I just can't understand how she stands him or he stands her," or something of the sort. But what's the phenomenon at which you're gazing? You're gazing where control is affinity. That's how they express their affinity—they kick each other in the pants. Trying to gain control over each other by fighting, below that level, is lovemaking. "I'm going to control you or know the reason why." And the other one says, "I'm going to control you or know the reason why." And this is the sum total of the conversation. Upscale is "I love you dearly." You can understand a lot by just looking at what is understanding at the level of mass. What is understanding at the level of mass? It is control—controlling and being controlled. That—mass itself and communication, and that is understanding.

25

You know, like a calculus professor wants you to do, or something. No, that's lower than that, excuse me. Excuse me, that's lower than that. There's no mass involved there. That's an inverted figure-figure. "DY, DX—what is the purpose of this subject, professor?" "Humpfff!" You say, "Excuse me. How come the 'Humpff'?" Well, he just told you there isn't any understanding it. And you, being somewhat high-toned, go on with your stupid expectancy that things that are offered are understandable.

I used to try to teach people that psychotics were not understandable, which was what was wrong with psychotics—that's all. I can tell you right now how to understand a psychotic like mad. I can tell you what psychosis is all about, very rapidly, right out of exactly the same material I'm giving you at this moment.

Psychosis is something mocked up so that it cannot be handled. Psychosis is something that cannot be handled. You got that as the control factor? Some *thing—now*, that gives you the object that cannot be handled, that gives you the control. And of course "mustn't get in and handle it" gives you the communication factors, you see? But of course there's not much mass there, if there is any—psychos try to make nothing out of their mass all the time. They're a mocked-up nonhandleability.

Now, there's many a spook ally or character you have in the past that

16 JULY 1957

you run across every once in a while in session. Quite amusing. You run across this fellow in session, you say, "Oh, now there's Uncle Joe again. I'm sure he had some sort of an influence on my life, but I can't understand what it is." Well, that's what's the matter with it, you can't understand what it is. That would be the shallowest look at it, but that's still a look.

Every once in a while this person will pop up and you'll say, "Well, I know this person influenced my life somehow or another, but I can't possibly tell you how." It's just a little dim feeling you have that there was something there.

Well, that individual, I assure you, was always mocking up to you or around you things that couldn't be handled.

Dear sweet Grandma, you know? She says, "Now, don't go out in the rain because you'll get a terrible cold. Don't eat all that junk before supper because . . ." Got this sort of thing? Well, now that's bad enough, but there's still some affinity in it. She was trying to control it, but she kept mocking these things up that couldn't be handled.

Well, if there was some reason in it, or it seemed to—so that you'd be a better boy or a better girl or something of the sort, why, you didn't terribly object to it. You sort of took it with a small snarl.

But the person I'm talking about is a little further afield. This person that you can't quite tell what's wrong. You run across this person every once in a while in processing and you say, "Well, he—I know he was doing something, and—but *nahahh*." This person was capriciously mocking up things that couldn't be handled. Tell you about spiders, you know—spiders are under the house, spiders are poisonous. Or he'd tell you about there are snakes in the grass, or they tell you about diseases. "You know, there's a terrible disease known as polio. It must be pretty bad because the president had it."* It's pretty bad over there—bad over there.

26

But sometimes this person was sufficiently adroit that it didn't sound like it was bad over there. It was just that every part of the environment seemed to have in it things that couldn't be handled at all! You know, you better stay on the good side of this or you better steer around that or something. And they never paid you the compliment of thinking you could handle a cockeyed thing! So we get, theoretically, above 2.0 and below 2.0, and people who are below 2.0 mock up things that can't be handled, and people above 2.0 mock up things (when they do) that can be handled or try to handle anything. Now, there's the dividing line on this control.

People below 2.0 mock up things routinely and only which can't be handled and then brag about it. "Ah, these terrible headaches, they just come and go all the time. And I just can't do a thing about it! They sent me up to Mayo brothers and charged my husband \$8,672.23. I'm not cured yet, it's just terrible! *Ahhh*, it's terrible!"

Well, it's a very funny thing. Those people are way much further down-scale than you think they are. We say it's above 2.0 and below 2.0, which seems to be a precise line. But it's almost as if we're talking about two different universes.

Boy, when they go around mocking up things that can't be handled and bragging about it all the time, they give an auditor a pretty bad time. They sit in an auditing chair and mock up things that can't be handled. That's all they're doing. And they're just daring the auditor to handle them.

* Reference to US president Franklin Delano Roosevelt (1882-1945), who contracted polio in 1921.

Now, you start sawing through with "Give me your hand. Thank you. Huh." And they say, "This can't be handled"—something. They keep offering things that can't be handled and all of sudden this—so on, nothing is happening. Something happens there. You got it?

People who would do that sort of thing—don't go straining at gnats here, because the truth of the matter is, these people are pretty bad off. They are never really successful at anything. They're terrifically destructive. Sort it out, don't just assign this to everybody who walks up the street. Go up on Capitol Hill before you start assigning it. "Can't be handled, can't be handled, can't be handled, can't be handled." See? It's below apathy, it's a sort of a big brag, you know?

Well, that's what this MEST does all the time. They've Q-and-Aed with MEST, they become MEST, they do what MEST does.

MEST does all sorts of wild things, you know? You could learn the laws on which it is built as in physics and you're still nowhere. It's always doing something that can't be handled. Mountains are always falling over on people and, you know—I mean, hurricanes come along and so forth. So much so that nobody even gets sensible about these things anymore. They just say, "Oh well, that's nature." (Not meaning Serutan.) Now . . .

There isn't any reason why that hurricane, by the way, chomped up that much of the Gulf here recently.* They got lots of bombs to blow up in Nevada, but I don't know why they didn't drop one on that hurricane, the first hurricane of this year. All they would have had to have done was drop an impact of the size of any one of these Nevada bombs, and they probably wouldn't have had any hurricane left. But men are accustomed very much to this idea that things in nature can't be handled, and a hurricane is a great big thing. Well, household matches are also awfully big to ants—it's more or less the viewpoint you take on such things.

But here we—here we enter our understanding of life in realizing that there are people around who have no slightest desire to handle anything. Everybody has got something in his life that he doesn't think can be handled, or he doesn't think he can handle. But these people just mock it up all the time, something can't be handled, can't be handled.

Listen to some psychiatrist going on about psychosis. After you've been auditing for a long time you completely forget the actual mid-twentieth-century viewpoint on these things. Boy, "They cannot be handled." I mean, that's the thing, you know? "There's just nothing can be done about it."

Well, we had Book Auditors that were handling psychosis in 1950, but a psychiatrist knows it can't be handled! See, he's just Q-and-Aed with the whole thing, so he'd better electric shock it.

And you say, "Well, why do you electric shock it?"

And he says, "Well," he says, "well, you have to keep scientific records." I had one say that to me one day.

"No, no. Why do you shock the patient, doctor?" I said indulgently. I mean, I was talking at him just as though—could understand.

And he says, "Well," he says, "I—that's it!" He says, "You keep the records!" And he was getting frantic.

And I said, "No. No, no. Why do you shock the insane people who come in here? Because you've told me yourself they get out earlier if you don't."

* Reference to a hurricane which occurred in 1957 in the Gulf of Mexico, causing extensive damage and claiming hundreds of lives along the coasts of Texas and Louisiana.

16 JULY 1957

"Well," he says, "I keep the records!"

I gave it up. That's really the only reason why. Somebody had told him to keep the records, so he had to shock them to get a record.

Now, you go around, you dope, and you say, "Why doesn't this fellow understand something? Why can't he see my viewpoint?" Well, he—he's just goofy. That's being goofy in another way, not to recognize somebody who can't see a viewpoint. See, you just—you have to look at it and that's the proper estimation of it. The fellow is stone-blind and stark, staring mad. You say, "Okay, stone-blind, stark, staring mad." If you said it with a loud enough recognition, he would probably turn sane or something.

And you go on burrowing into this, you know, saying, "Why is this guy so crazy?" Well, I don't know why he's crazy—he's crazy! Who cares *why* he's crazy? I could think up more reasons why he was crazy than he ever could before he went crazy. We're not short of reasons why. You don't even have to get the right one. If you want to do something for him, why, run Give Me Your Hand, Tone 40 8-C, plow him around, square him up.

But he'll go on mocking up things that you are dared to handle. And the preclears that have given you a bad time have done that and only that. You cure them of one thing, so they mock up something else you can't handle.

Their whole game is the avoidance of control. Now, they know how to control other people. You get a service facsimile—you get a service facsimile, of course, which is unhandleable. And you handle these people by not permitting them to handle the service facsimile, don't you see? Sounds smart, doesn't it? That's reactive enough for any reactive mind.

Well, you can roughly divide people then, above and below 2.0. Some of them mock up things which can be handled, and try to handle other things. These are the people who keep the world running. They don't build clocks that can't be fixed. And the rest of the people who are trying to get membership in the human race—that's pretty interesting, trying to get up high enough to take membership in the human race. A fellow needed a stepladder to reach bottom. These fellows simply keep on mocking up things that can't be handled.

And every doctor, and every asylum, every practitioner of any kind is confronted by these people all the time. Because this is the dare.

"Ah, there's somebody going into practice over there. *Ah, ha, ha.* No, no, *heh-heh-heh!* He'll never be able to get to Aunt Bessie's cough. *Heh-heh-heh-heh-heh-heh-heh-heh!*" "Well, it's no better today, doctor. *Ah-huh.*"

Now, you recognize this as human behavior at the slimier end of the human scale, don't you? All of us have something which we hope nobody can handle. Keeps thetans from getting into our skulls. Once in a while we—once in a while we miss and we forget how to handle them ourselves. Everybody plays this game to some degree, but I'm talking about a dedicated profession. Very well.

ARC becomes control, havingness and communication. Now, you recognize that control, havingness and communication are not the bottom because they invert and become no control possible of any kind. Now, this is the "can't handle it," see? No mass admissible or viewable. And no communication of any kind acceptable; therefore no understanding possible.

Now, that's where it goes. But the funny part of it is, is we've discovered that rung which solves the inversion.

Now, just as we can raise anybody's communication by raising his affinity and reality, just as we can raise anybody's reality by raising affinity and

CCH RELATED TO ARC

communication, just as we can raise affinity by raising their reality and communication, so can we do all of these tricks at the bottom.

We can remedy control, inability to handle and so forth in his life and vicinity, simply by remedying his havingness or by talking to him or by using straight control.

We can raise his lack of mass by control and communication. He can't have anything, and we want him to be able to have a few things in life—at least our processing—and so we just run control and communication on him. Just—that's all. And we'll find out his havingness will pick up.

You'll find some odd considerations, very complicated, are in the road of all this, and will blow off as cognitions which he probably will never mention. But he will eventually come up to CCH.

Now, if a person has got to be identified as mass and connected with mass, he's in terribly good condition when he is at CCH. He's in terrific condition when he's at CCH if he is there as mass, identified as mass enough to have a condition. So therefore, CCH is pretty high, not low at all. But CCH handles all the inversions of CCH, and this whole mysterious strata, the bottom substrata of the ARC triangle is revealed to view and becomes workable in the hands of an auditor.

Control all by itself will level out all lower inversions on the subject of control, havingness or communication.

Now, the right kind of communication all by itself will do something for havingness and control. Hand Space Mimicry is a solid line. He'll eventually have an auditor.

And Can't-Have on Others, and Have on Self, or the three steps of Trio run one way or another on somebody, "Touch that wall," that sort of thing is a Havingness Process—it's also a Communication Process and so forth, but if you could run "Tell me something your mother can't have," and get a straight answer, why the havingness comes up, so comes up his ability to control and the ability to communicate. So you can hit CCH at any one of its corners and get the other two to some degree. Which is quite remarkable because it permits the auditor to directly address the body and have something happen to a person.

Now, people have tried to do this a number of times in the past. They've put bodies on white tables, put masks over their faces, dropped some ether in and cut out their gizzards. And the fellow is supposed to say afterwards, "I feel much better." And get a big bill. Well, it made him feel better to the degree that somebody took him and placed him, and then lost him, and didn't speak too crossly to him while they were administering the anesthetic, you see?

He got an awareness that something was happening, and just to that degree the operation probably did him some good. Oh, standing them up in the corner and kicking them in the shins for a half an hour would do the same thing as the best operation on earth. The fellow—the fellow would recover from it much more alert. You think I'm joking now, but that's true. I said it's better than an operation.

Now, CCH then should be viewed by you as simply the workable factors at the lower end of the mass scale. You get to—talk to you about reality scales and a lot of other things of this character, but you're just studying this rather high level which solves all of its lower inversions. A fellow who can communicate, who can have, and who can control and be controlled, and is still a fellow and identified as such, and not exteriorized worth a damn, would still be in so much better condition than *Homo sapiens* that we could call him

16 JULY 1957

right there Homo novis. But he'd certainly be at the borderline; he would be a terrific guy compared to most people walking out in the world today.

So CCH is a pretty high level, but it's a description also of all lower levels, the harmonics of which are processed by straight CCH.

Thank you.

THEORY AND DEFINITION OF AUDITING

A lecture given on 17 July
1957

This is third lecture, 18th ACC, July 17, 1957. Just so you'll know the date. Come on up to present time.

I—my goodness, there's change in you people. Yeah, what do you know. I take that back—you don't have to come up to present time, you're here.

Okay. Tonight—tonight we're going to cover some material which has never been covered before in any lectures. And quite interesting that we would have basic material kicking around that you hadn't heard about.

First and foremost of these is the theory of auditing. What is Scientology? What does it do? Well that's fine, we know we audit somebody, by which we mean we process them—process them, exercise them in some way mentally so as to achieve some goal or another.

But what is this thing?

It's very fascinating, it's very fascinating. Something we do all the time and something we don't discuss.

Auditing, originally defined as somebody who—an auditor was defined as somebody who listens and computes, hence the word *auditor*. And auditing therefore would then—very early in Dianetics, would have been listening and computing. And I suppose most of us were just listening and computing.

But times have changed. Times have changed but the theory of auditing has not changed. Theory of auditing is actually covered in writing in *The Original Thesis*, wrote in—written in 1947 and it has to do more or less with these rules.

The preclear, the person being processed, is equal to or less than his bank or he wouldn't have one—by which we mean his engrams, his mental image pictures, the things that go boomp in the night and scare him, that he didn't know where they came from until we came along. He is equal to or less than this or they wouldn't be there, just by definition.

If he was greater than they, they would never trouble him. Well, the auditor is greater than, equal to or less than the surcharge, it says in that book, in the engram bank—that is to say the mental image picture collection. And he might or might not be greater than, you see.

But certainly, auditor plus preclear are greater than the engramic content of the preclear's bank. And that's the theory of auditing.

As we hook a booster engine on long freight trains to take them over the Continental Divide, so we hook an auditor onto a preclear and he can get over the hump too.

17 JULY 1957

Now that was the first statement made on this subject. Hence this thing called processing.

But there's other material as covered in the Student Manual and new things have opened up as the years have gone on until we can say at last that a preclear or a person being audited in Scientology cannot possibly audit himself. That would be the thing he could *not* do.

Now that's very interesting, but enormous numbers of tests have been carried forward on this and these tests have rather conclusively demonstrated what I am about to say: that a preclear cannot audit himself. The best he could do would be to *handle* a mental image picture which was seeking to handle *him*. To *handle* people around him, to *handle* the physical universe, but not to handle himself. That's impossible. In order to audit himself a person would have to set up some sort of a bypass speaker system (shades of Elizabeth, 1950) whereby he'd get in one corner of the room (this is a direct quote from that lecture*) and in a telephone box there, speak, and then the words he spoke would go around a wire and come back into the earpiece. Now, did you ever talk to yourself in a telephone?

Now, why is this? Because a basic ingredient of all auditing is communication. Now a person cannot talk to himself—he *is* himself. The language is sown with these absurdities. A person talks to himself? No. A person however could go in the corner in a telephone booth and speak into the mouthpiece and it could be run around the rest of the room and it could come out the earpiece. And if somebody put a delay on the circuit he could seem to be talking to himself.

Ah! But auditing is a process to get somebody into present time. And self-auditing must always have half of the conversation out of present time. So the auditor and preclear (and a person auditing himself, if you can imagine that) are in two different intervals of time. That's the first absurdity.

Now it is possible, and this by the way—this statement carelessly made in an article by me many years ago, got an awful lot of people into very serious trouble. It spoke about the great god Throgmagog and it said anybody can set up an analytical mind alongside of himself which can solve his problems for him. And that appears in *Dianetics: The Evolution of a Science*.

A fellow took this and he said, "Well, if that is the case then that is the way to do it." I've forgotten what he called the thing—he called it something or other. He didn't bother to read the next few sentences. And a whole bunch of people got to doing this one way or the other and it finally damped out or they died off or something.

But the truth of the matter is, it accomplished, in the final analysis, nothing. Self-auditing is just as absurd as, I stand on this side of the stage and I say, "How are you feeling?" Then I stand over here on this side of the stage and I say, "Oh, I'm all right—not too bad. How are you?" "Well, pretty warm but not too bad." Now, you could just go doing this on one side of the stage and the other side of the stage and so on, we could have a long and involved conversation, all of which would eventually amount to exactly nothing.

Now that should tell you something. In other words, somebody could mock up what we call a circuit: some kind of an electronic gimmigahoogit that talks back. Valences—the combined package of a personality which one

*The lecture referred to was given on 7 July 1950 and is entitled "Operation of Valences and Demon Circuits." It can be found in *Research & Discovery Series* Volume 3.

THEORY AND DEFINITION OF AUDITING

assumes as does an actor on a stage, except in life one doesn't usually assume them knowingly. Generally he did at first and then after a while he was stuck with it. He doesn't know why he talks like Grandpa. He doesn't know why he chews snuff like Grandma. He wouldn't be able to tell you the answer to those things.

But an auditor could come along and say to him, "Did you know somebody that talked like that?"

And he says, "Oh, I don't know. *Hm-hm-hm-hm*. Nobody but Grandpa."

"Can you recall *one* moment or an instant of time when you heard Grandpa talking like that?"

And the preclear says, "Well yes, yes, as a matter of fact I can."

That, expertly done, would finish off that valence.

Why?

Because it can only operate if it's out of present time. And to snap the preclear off that operational spot and snap him into present time is to finish entirely this *lag* in the telephone wire of the fellow talking to himself in the phone booth.

Now, a person then takes these past moments or incidents of one kind or another and uses them later on to feed back to him from then. And then he forgets where they're coming from and he doesn't know or he forgot purposely and he says, "Something is talking to me" or "I am receiving an *effect* of one kind or another from the bank" or "from the mysterious past." Or he says something—usually he says, "I don't feel happy, I'm not well." As much as he could have articulated it back in '46, '47, '48, '49. He just didn't feel happy about life. He had compulsions and impressions and psychiatrologus and he had various things.

What did he have? He had something which was giving him orders out of present time. And a person, when they take up self-auditing, use *these* circuits to feed back to themselves this material in some fashion—and it busily gets nowhere in an awful hurry.

Now don't read this incorrectly. I'm not saying that a person cannot handle his bank, his body, the bodies of others, life and the environment—a person *can*. He can even think a thought or decide to change himself and change. You understand?

But to undergo a process of auditing administered by himself would be to the end goal, not so much of handling the bank, but as to *change* himself in some fashion or another.

Well now, self-auditing was almost possible under Dianetics because in Dianetics all one had to confront was an engram bank and that was all there was to it. And naturally an individual said, "I can handle this bank" and a Scientologist today, when he receives a bird or something like that usually goes off immediately someplace where it's quiet, runs the thing out and comes back to the party. That's the usual thing he does. Somebody gives him an awful emotional shock, he's liable to stand back for a minute and make it more solid and come up to present time on it again.

But please understand that that is a process of handling mental image pictures. Now people make these pictures all the time and they get strewn across the past and then they finally comprise the past and that's it. And an individual could always handle these things. But that isn't auditing himself.

Now, the liability of a person all by himself handling this unknown, double-forked bank is that he didn't handle the worst moments in it when they occurred and he's got two strikes on him already in handling them all by

17 JULY 1957

himself later. You see that? Because the only moments that are giving him trouble are the moments he didn't handle. Now he gets the pictures of the moments he didn't handle, he tends to go out of control, and he says, "Oooh, I don't want anything more to do with that. I'll just skip the whole thing and boil off."

Well, an auditor is necessary because at that moment he should be kicked in the shins, given an acknowledgment, brought back to the pitch, made to confront it and be pushed through it and that would be the rest of it. The mechanical side of this is not what I'm stressing. It's just that an individual cannot audit *himself* because he is himself.

Now a circuit can audit *him*, he can audit a *circuit*, but for an individual himself to get auditing, it is necessary for a second person to be there! And this is one of the most remarkable things that some people discover, is that with the other person sitting there auditing them they can handle anything apparently without any worries at all. Now, out of session they say, "Well, I didn't have any trouble with that railroad train that ran over me—I'll just take another look at it." Auditor picks him out of bed the next morning, you know, with wheel tracks on his face.

Now, what is auditing then?

It is more than just assisting somebody to do this. Now we could get that old-time 1947 definition: auditor plus preclear can handle the preclear's mental image pictures, past experience, body and so forth. This is easy.

But this is not Dianetics. This is Scientology and there are a lot of people who haven't learned that thoroughly. Dianetics handled an engram bank, the mental image pictures which composed what we call the reactive mind. We had a concept of two minds. One was a machine called the analytical mind—a computer, something of the sort. And the other was a buried, hidden, reactive mind. Now Freud and various quacks and so forth on the track have had a holiday with this very visible reactive mind. It's—nothing very horrible about it—a collection of pictures of experiences which a person couldn't handle which get locked out of sight. And this then becomes the subconscious, the reconscious, the deconscious, the Freud-onscious. See, I mean, you can sell an awful lot of—you know, you can sell an awful lot of goldbricks and wooden nutmegs to people when they don't know what you're talking about. And the only reason Freudian analysts—they didn't hate me originally, they as a matter of fact have been very, very kind. They only swear silently now. They had a beautiful racket. They were the only pilots through this mysterious realm, all of which was based on sex.

And we come along and we say to people "Now look—look..." Terrible thing to do. Put a big economic dent in things. I don't know if you know it, but a Freudian analysis cost—a basic Freudian analysis on the average in the United States costs \$9,962.53. That's what it costs. That's for true. You can go around and ask analysts what they charge, how many hours it will take and all of that sort of thing and they give you this "Well, it'll take me a year to find out if I can help you and then another year to do something for you, at three or four hours a week at so much an hour." And it is really a huge figure.

Somebody comes along to you and says, "Well, you should never charge several hundred dollars for a twenty-five hour intensive"—I don't know! What are they trying to do—work for the analysts? The analysts thought nothing of charging nearly \$10,000 for putting a fellow into reverse!

Now, this is an economic fact—I'm not just talking. But here was all this hidden mystery, nobody knew what it was all about or possibly they would have said so. The world, after all, is not composed entirely of dishonest men

THEORY AND DEFINITION OF AUDITING

in the field of healing—the old subjects of healing, you know, like barbers and so forth.

Hey, you know what those barber poles are? You do know what the barber poles are—it's the blood running around in a circle into the basin, you know. And the AM A—the AMA won't let their doctors cut hair anymore. Because they never did a good job of it! Anyway, they got them into cutting bodies as being more profitable.

Anyway, here was this world of the past. Now something had taken pictures of everything that had happened in the past and these pictures got hung up, particularly those that couldn't be handled by the individual, and this formed the reactive mind. And because he couldn't handle them *then*, the pictures continued to give him orders *now*. And all sorts of orders and perceptions are contained in these things. This is the most wonderful wonderland anybody ever got into. And if you want to know more about it, why, read Book One and do some Dianetic auditing. That's not the subject here. *Dianetics: The Modern Science of Mental Health* covered it fairly well.

Now, here—here was the Dianetic angle on auditing. The Dianetic attack was upon that reactive mind to make it known to the individual. Which is to say, to make him understand that he could do something about it and it didn't necessarily have a monopoly on doing things to him. And thereby making somebody free of those hidden sectors in his own past. And when a person was free of these things he couldn't handle, why, Dianetically he was called a Clear.

All right. Now, the whole thing turned around and went the other way toward the end of 1952 when we got Scientology. Scientology's a different approach.

We put the person himself in good enough condition so that he can then handle anything. And Scientologically we'd call *that* fellow a Clear. Not a blank bank, but an individual who wasn't stopped dead in his tracks by life, you see?

So the Scientology approach was to make this individual sufficiently able that he himself, *after* the fact of auditing, could then handle anything else that came up. Now this is just reverse end to. Dianetics made the bank so it could be handled—these mental image pictures in the past—that made the *bank* so it could be handled.

Now, Scientology turned around 180 degrees on exactly the same proposition, included the physical universe and other people into it, and made the fellow capable of handling the bank, body, other people, environment, don't you see?

So Scientology demands that an individual be audited. There's a considerable difference there if you look it over.

In other words, there was some possibility of self-auditing in Dianetics. See, you could handle mental image pictures and chew up energy and do all sorts of interesting things. If that was the goal of Scientology, it would still be the same thing. There are a lot of people in Scientology that still believe that's its goal. And that's not true. This is the other side of it: we want this person to be able thereafter to handle such things, and to do this we sometimes even give him more trouble than he's got! And he learns he can handle it.

But that is auditing an individual. And therefore, the auditing of an *individual* takes precedence over the auditing of any item or inanimate object or picture. And any way you look at it, an individual cannot audit himself. Now that's one of the more remarkable things because it leads us then to the necessity of asking this one question: "You mean he's going to have to be in communication with other thetans forever? You mean he'll never be free of

17 JULY 1957

this in any way? You mean if he got all bogged down again and he didn't run into a Scientologist he'd be in bad shape?"

You could ask all sorts of fascinating questions. Fortunately, you don't have to answer any of them because the answer's quite obvious—terribly obvious. We said in Dianetics that in order to get out of something you better go through it. In other words, there wasn't any running away. That's true. That's very true. But how does this apply in Scientology?

Well, it applies very succinctly indeed. It was *communication* which got him into all the trouble he's in. And that was communication with somebody else. And the only thing that will get him out of trouble—of the trouble he's in—is communication.

And if he can't talk to himself, therefore communication is not possible in the absence of somebody else. You follow this?

Well, if it's not possible in the absence of somebody else, then please . . . Isn't it true then that he'll just get audited and then he'll just talk to somebody else and then not talk to them anymore and go into the same amount of trouble? No.

He went this thing stone-blind from the beginning. He knew none of the rules—he was making them all up as he went along. And he got them all fixed into agreements and solids and other interesting things and those are the things that are wrong with him.

The things that are right with a person are the things that are wrong with a person. The things that are wrong with a person are also the things that are right with a person. And this is the most fantastic riddle. If you walked up to the Sphinx and asked why this was, she'd probably crack a couple of stone chips off trying to figure it out.

Apparently, everything that is wrong with a thetan is what a thetan can do. Everything that is wrong with a being is the being. That's rather a fantastic riddle. You'll understand this much better in about two seconds.

There are numbers of scales in Scientology, as there were and are in Dianetics. And the Dianetic and Scientology scales are all of them graphic explanations of existence. You notice they're always drawn vertically, and lower on the scale means lower toned or means in worse shape. Almost all of these scales could be drawn as a V or an inverted cone of one kind or another.

Now why is that? Just something in my bank? No. I thought it was once, and then found out—found I was making a little game of happily trying to find cause for it, trying to explain it.

The truth of the matter is—distance tolerance is the key of the affinity scales. Chart of Human Evaluation as in *Science of Survival* is based on affinity, quality of emotion. And you will find out that distance narrows as a person gets into worse and worse condition.

Now, let's take the reality factor of that and we find out that the reality factors are real to him when he is closer and closer to them. In other words, as he gets worse and worse off he has to be closer and closer to something to know that it's real. This is the distance factor at work with regard to mass or another person or a terminal.

Now, high on the scale, a tremendous distance can be tolerated. And at the same time, a high level of trust and affinity is possible on the part of anyone. And at the theoretical bottom of the affinity scale in the Chart of Human Evaluations, we have *no* distance tolerable. The distance he can tolerate is *no* distance, and he can't tolerate that! And he's more or less on an inverted distance. Do you see this?

THEORY AND DEFINITION OF AUDITING

So when we go up in numbers (although the numbers are arbitrary on these scales) from zero to let us say forty, we actually might as well be saying zero feet and forty feet. Of course, that's not accurate either because it'd be zero milli-millimeters and forty trillion light-years cubed. See? The scale isn't an exact V—it'd flare out like that. You see this: that a person's ability to handle things always has to do with his ability to handle distance. He interiorizes into those things which he distrusts. The more he distrusts them, why, the closer he goes in until at length he is it.

You could set up the proposition—you could make somebody distrust a bedpost and just sit there and decide they didn't like it and so forth and they'd actually feel themselves pulling right in toward the bedpost. And the next thing you know, why, they'd be in the bedpost. And there are many psychos in institutions who *are* bedposts. You ask them what they are and they'll tell you they're a bedpost. It's quite interesting.

In other words, a person can control at a distance. He has some faith in his communication and so on and he's capable, even if he's some distance away from something. And as his control diminishes, he has to shorten up the distance to make the control possible, doesn't he?

So the more distrust he has, the less intention he can throw out, the less he can reach—any way you want to say this—the less competent he is. And we measure that off in this thing called tone. We say tone 40, that's competent, and tone 0, that's dead. How wrong can you get? Dead. How incompetent can you get? Dead. How low an affinity can there be? Dead. Only we know—we Scientologists know we can go way below death.

All right. It's just bodies that can't stand death. I'm going to have a talk with a body sometime, a dead body, something of the sort, and find out why this is—why it quits so quick.

Anyway, the graphic analysis of life and its behavior first came from a postulate I made, fortunately for you and for me, back in Bay Head, New Jersey when I was writing *Dianetics: The Modern Science of Mental Health*. I had about two or three chapters deep and I was sitting there—Countess Motorboat, the cat I had, she always sat on the bed right alongside of where I wrote. I remember well writing *Dianetics: Modern Science of Mental Health*. I'd take a sheet of paper out of the typewriter, move it over, Countess Motorboat would pick up her paw off the pile of paper, I would put the paper down, Countess Motorboat would put her paw back down as a paperweight. And she would just lie there by the hour always lifting her paw for the new piece of paper and always holding it in place. Well, I was sitting there in the wee small hours and the Countess Motorboat was being a paperweight and it was very quiet and I could hear the far-off boom of surf and I was all tangled up. I was trying to graph survival. And that graph you see to this day in this—in Book One. And I found out something, that—in trying to graph it, I found out that if I couldn't make a two-dimensional picture of it, of a theory or an idea, then there was something wrong with the idea.

Quite amazing. Quite interesting. I found out if I couldn't make a clear picture of it, it wasn't clear in my own mind. I wish somebody had taught Freud to draw!

And I would have to reevaluate the basic theory, then, until I could finally commit it to a graph which would then communicate to somebody else. Aha, what does this mean? It merely means I had found out that if I couldn't communicate it, I didn't understand it really. And the method of communication of the thing, the shorthand method of communication of it

17 JULY 1957

was simply drawing a graph. And if I couldn't draw the graph easily and accurately and show it to somebody else and have him get the idea off of it, then the idea was in some fashion or other incomplete or faulty, because it wouldn't communicate.

All right. That has held true with all of our graphs and charts from then till now. And the first one that this struggle occurred on is the Chart of Survival, that very elementary chart right in the beginning, there, of Book One. About fifteen or twenty pet theories of mine went straight out the window when I tried to draw that thing. They just wouldn't graph. So I knew there was something wrong with them and I kept twisting them round and finally found out, yep, there's something wrong with that. That doesn't jibe with something else. Next thing you know, why, here was a very simple graph of what I was trying to say about survival.

I found out survival had to do with perpetuation—a continuation into the future and so on. I didn't know that at that time.

Anyway—these people in PE Courses almost blow their brains out trying to define it, so I was in there ahead of them, that—wee small hours of that morning. I was really trying to blow my brains out.

Anyway, survival or anything else can be graphed. If it can be graphed, you understand it. If it can't be graphed, you—somehow or other, you're foggy on it. There's something foggy about the whole thing. I mean, there's a mis-understood or not-understood sector in it. Now, reading a graph—if a thing can be graphed, you should be able to get what the graph is trying to communicate.

38

Therefore we take up these scales now. We say, "What is auditing?" Well, auditing is an expansion of distance, period. I'm sorry, I could have made that much more complicated.

When you first start to audit somebody, why, he has a tendency to practically sit in your lap or back out the window. If he's trying to back out the window away from you, he's on an inversion. He's trying to get the distance, you see, on an inversion. He can't confront at all. But the first moment he can confront, then he'll start to close in; and eventually when he can confront, *there* is the first real recognizable distance. Up to that time he has no recognition of distance. He recognizes this distance, and he would feel real comfortable when he was real close to his auditor, preferably with the auditor's hand in his or his hand on the auditor's, see? Good solid communication line there.

But a lot of people below this level that cannot stand distance at all are dead in their heads or spattered all over the universe because they couldn't be anyplace or recognize any distance and so forth; they become very nervous when the auditor puts his hand on theirs or touches his, see? They can't tolerate proximity. So they come up scale, but they have no concept of distance while being unable to tolerate proximity, and this is a case of no place to hide.

US government and its A-bomb. It's a case of no place to hide. They've just created one. No place to hide. There's no concept of distance and there's no distance you could put between anything and you, is there? Running away from things, oddly enough, isn't. And that is the oddest thing that you ever heard of. That is the complete puzzler of all time.

Nobody ever runs away from anything because he didn't want to be near it. This just sounds absolutely fantastic. We get a picture of a bear in the woods and the fellow comes up the road and he sees the bear and he doesn't

THEORY AND DEFINITION OF AUDITING

want to be near the bear so he runs away from the bear. I'm sorry—an auditor, maybe a hundred years later, auditing this particular preclear will find out that he never ran away from the bear. Isn't that an oddity?

Now, you might ask why it is in military matters when a body of troops turns tail and no longer confronts another body of troops, why they go all to pieces. I mean a rout is really a rout. You say, well, a few companies turned around and ran away and they got some distance away from the fight and formed up again and everything was all right—except this never happens. The few companies turn around and run away and go to pieces, and in Roman times the end product was a bunch of assorted miscellaneous and mismatched arms, legs and heads lying around the terrain with pieces of broken tinware interspersing the scenery. It was a case of everybody dead.

You say, "Why is it that when a few people turn around and run that they are no longer able to sustain discipline?" Now, you can back up here a little bit in order to move in there a little bit, but for sure you can't run away. Always a part of you stays there. And that is the mental image picture in its most serious state, is the part of you which remained.

You see, the basic truth outed the other day and there is no such thing as a mental image picture. Funny piece of news to give you after all these years. There's no such thing as a mental image picture. We'll go into that in a moment. That's why we have ACCs every once in a while.

Now, the individual walks up to the bear, he doesn't want to be there, he then has a part of the universe that he cannot occupy. Being unable to occupy that part of the universe, the only possible state of mind open to him from then on is dispersal. Nobody ever ran away. Now I'm not just trying to prove up this distance graph, I'm just telling you that the distance always closes, no matter how far you run. Actual distance I'm talking about, between the person and the thing always closes, it never opens up. Hideous, huh?

Well, the one thing that proves that is the answer to it—which just knocks track out, straightens things up just like that—is confront. Confront it. Brace up to it. What part of that thing could you confront? Bing, bing, bing, bing. All of a sudden he's no longer there—no longer stuck at that point. Do you see this?

So the distance into mass or to another being, in actuality closes, even when it *apparently* goes apart. You'll find somebody who left his wife because he couldn't stand her, eight years later in his sleep talking to her—mutter, mutter, mutter, mutter, yap, yap, yap, yap. You go in a bar, a bunch of drunks have had a fight, haul them outside, and they're still in the bar having the fight! You've noticed this? But very seldom is the winner still having a fight. Only the loser.

I knew a fellow one time—was always going to write the great American novel. And he could never make the grade—never get down to the typewriter, pick up the pen. Very apathetic state. Responding to a little bit of auditing, was quite amazing—he was still trying to write the great American novel. He'd never been able to confront this thing and he was still basically in the engram bank trying to confront writing the great American novel. Not very engramic, but he was still trying. Only he had given up trying, but he was still trying. Never been able to confront it at all.

Knew another fellow one time that had written the great American novel and never said a word about it. Couldn't have cared less. You had to jog him two or three times and say, "You remember that book you wrote?"

And he'd say, "Which one, you mean about the pigs?"

17 JULY 1957

"No, no, no, no, no. You know that. . ."

"Oh, oh, yeah, yeah, that book. Yeah, it's all right. You know, I'm thinking of writing . . ."—you couldn't keep him on the subject.

He had confronted it and he'd won across the boards, don't you see? He'd never had occasion to run away from that book and he was never stuck with it. He'd fronted up to the situation.

People are never troubled with those situations to which they have fronted up. They never have trouble with situations that they themselves have confronted. They only have trouble with those situations from which they ran away—because the closure is always toward zero. And as the nearness with which they can approach a situation becomes more and more impossible, they approach it closer and closer, and we get such mechanisms as "that which they resist they become" and all kinds of other mechanisms of one sort or another. But that's the basic mechanism of this.

The Tone Scale, clear as a bell, describes somebody closing distance. The Subzero Scale shows him opening it up again on a falsity. This is the apparent runaway. This is "I'll kid myself, I'll forget all about it, I won't ever remember that anymore. I will block it out, I'll get even with bodies for having done that to me," anything else you can think of but they're trying to—they're trying to open up distance which isn't there to be opened because they closed it long before. Don't you see?

40

Fellow says, "I'll never, never, never, never, never, never, never be a soldier. I won't! Under no circumstances will I ever be a soldier. Won't go near soldiers. Won't have anything to do with soldiers! I hate soldiers!" One day he goes down and enlists. We had a case of that right here in Washington. Didn't we? And he even wrote congressmen about the horrors of conscription—be a son of a gun if he didn't go and enlist.

Now, how about this fellow that when he sees soldiers it just makes him boil. He'd just love to kill them, that's all he can think of. It just—you know, it just makes him boil and so forth. Well he's confronting late, that's all. Just a little bit late. I don't know what body of troops he didn't walk up to, whether it was the British grenadiers or the fifth Roman legion or the Hun that came into Europe. Some body of troops that he's still not faced up to—and he hates soldiers. Now this is what makes emotional tone. It's the closure of distance. This sort of thing is graphed—the ARC, the Factors, the ARC triangle, affinity, reality and communication are placed in those graphs very prominently. Almost anything is graphed if it is understandable. If you haven't got a graph on it then I don't know what I'm talking about—yet.

Give you some small idea of the number of graphs there are in the Student Manual—scales: there's the CDEI Scale, the Reality Scale, the Effect Scale, the full Tone Scale, the Subzero Scale, the dichotomies, the top and bottom buttons, the Chart of Attitudes, the Cycle of Action Scale, the Scale of Related Experience, the Know to Mystery Scale, the Havingness Scale—I mean there's a lot of these scales. And all those things are, are simply graphs of the ARC factors. How massy is mass and how distance is distance and how much communication does it require.

Well there's only one thing which establishes distance—only one thing establishes distance, and that's communication. So don't be startled. Don't be startled that communication pulls a preclear up out of the depths rather easily. But it has to be *real* communication. Not via, via, via, via—"I'll evaluate for you, and what's wrong with you is your little sister saw you naked

THEORY AND DEFINITION OF AUDITING

when you were two and that'll be another \$10,000 and two more years." I mean, that's not communication.

It has to be communication *to* the person. Well, if it has to be to the person, you'd have to know what the person is and they didn't know that before. Psychology thought right up to the day of its death that a person was a body.

Now, communication is distance. The definition of space in Scientology—you'll find it in *8-8008*—is space is a viewpoint of dimension. Space is a viewpoint of dimension.

Well, what's that but some lookingness, huh? Well, what's that but some communication? So therefore the whole scale is established by degree of look. But look is a sort of a circular communication. You look at something like a radar and it bounces or you do something—if just *you* are there to look at it. So it has a closure factor with regard to it. So that just plain looking hits this bounce factor but doesn't get into communication, really. Not two-person communication.

Now, two thetans start talking one to the other and they can hold the distance gained. They're not just bouncing something off somebody's nose. They're talking to each other. They hold the distance gained. And actually they go up scale rather rapidly if real communication is occurring. Real communication, meaning is there a certainty of communication. And so they go up scale.

So here you have two live beings communicating, and you have distance opening. In other words, they could be further and further from each other and feel finer and finer about it. Now, if people, the longer they talk, smash closer and closer together, then one isn't talking to the other somehow. There's a mess-up on that communication line. They can talk further and further apart until they can get like a Kentucky mountaineer. All these mountain countries where the people stand on one hill and—it would take three hours to walk across to the other fellow's cabbage patch, so they just speak across the gap, you know—over the ravine and so forth.

Well, they're not necessarily trustworthy but they're sure loud. They're trying to get distance into communication.

Here—here you have this oddity—the basis of the graph, and you have this oddity, processing or auditing. And the basis of the graph is—I don't care what graph it is, it assumes that a certain condition existed and then finished a cycle, worsening. Or was very bad and reversed the cycle and became good. But in all cases it would be how much distance can one tolerate actually between the object and self. If he could tolerate total closure or total width or distance away from it, he certainly would have total communication concerning it, wouldn't he? Well, here's—if he was just obsessed and pushed in closer and closer and closer, why, he'd have a bad time.

Now, people can understand things and communicate to them. People can know vaguely what something is and communicate to it. But when people don't know really what something is, they have an awfully hard time communicating with it. Now, is it real communication between the individual and his engram bank? Well, there's a bunch of spooks and ghosts and shadows and pictures of people and all kinds of things in this bank that apparently talk back one way or the other. But he himself is having to energize the circuit in order to get any reply back at all.

So he energizes this bank and this bank kicks back at him so every time he starts to communicate, the bank energizes and slaps him for communicating. And he gets convinced after a while that he's being punished for

17 JULY 1957

speaking, punished for communicating. Because every time he tries to communicate, why, things wake up around him somehow or another, and he doesn't want them awakened because they bite. He has pictures. He has facsimiles that snap back at him.

Well I told you I was going to say something about these facsimiles and how they weren't. Now, we conceived originally and basically *a* tremendously complicated explanation in Dianetics. We had to figure that there was some sort of a camera machine that took a tremendous number of pictures and laid them on the track for a person to have this many pictures. I've been working at this mathematically for years and I discovered something very fascinating: that it was utterly impossible for a person to store all the pictures he took. But he had them. So we had to figure out there must be a machine there and as an individual went through life, this machine took all these pictures and then he stored them in some peculiar way and we even had a file clerk to get them out.

Well, all that's all very good. It communicated. Nothing wrong with that. The file clerk was there. They would shuffle out into view. But what do you know—they're not pictures! There is no such complicated mechanism. There is no such complicated mechanism as something that takes pictures and then stores them and all of that. There is no such mechanism at all! The *object* is still there, *grown thin*, and that's a picture.

If you could look at the wall there and then conceive of the wall as solid now but immediately dim, you'd probably have a picture of the wall. Got that? All right, now let's retain the color of the wall, but we see the wall solid now and then immediately afterwards, although in full color, lacking mass. Got that? It lacks mass. You see it, but it lacks mass. All right. Now take that—take that thing you made of the wall—you conceived the wall as suddenly thinning down and lacking mass. All right, now just look over there and make it a little more solid. Now, how come that makes a little more solid that easily? You didn't add any energy to it.

It means that every consecutive moment of the universe from its beginning until now is potentially as solid as it was then, and *isn't* because you don't want to confront it. So you thinned it down. And people really only have pictures when they ran away. Those are the serious pictures. Those are the reactive pictures. When they actually almost physically ran away, boy, have they got pictures. The engram bank, the reactive mind, is formed by running away.

In other words, one struck situations, environments that one could not handle at all, and not being able to handle these things he wound up the victim of them. He didn't confront them, and the final result is some kind of a foggy murred-up (quote) "picture." You'll find out that was the way it looked to him at the last moment of duress.

Well, that feels like a pretty heavy load for you to be carrying around. We had a lot of mystery about how one carried around these pictures. Feels like an awful heavy load if they're all solid universes, every one of them. The whole universe in its totality is still there for every consecutive moment from the beginning of time. This sounds awfully heavy.

Well, I don't know why it's heavy since it's only a problem in change of space. You aren't carrying the pictures anywhere. But you left a viewpoint there when you didn't totally confront them and it's still looking. And when you run up and down the track or run a preclear up and down the track you are simply doing nothing but change space.

You got a picture of the old hometown. Well you can get almost the same

THEORY AND DEFINITION OF AUDITING

phenomena as we learned in the 1st ACC by simply saying to a preclear, "Be in your hometown, be in the room, be in your hometown, be in the room, be in the hometown, be in the room." Boy, you got pictures. Certainly he got pictures, because that's why they were pictures, only they aren't pictures, they're the thing!

So we do have one improper word in Scientology and that is *facsimile*. I don't know what we'd call it—call it a *thinnie*, I guess.

All it is necessary to do is to bring one into a state of mind himself whereby he is willing to confront those pictures—thinies, old universes, old places where he wouldn't be before. All we've got to do is put him up into a state of mind, either by confronting them or by some other artificial means whereby he's willing to confront them, and we have a Clear. Boom!

It's as easy as that. Before this course is out I'll show you how to do that. But the point I'm trying to make here is that auditing is a communicating process or a communication process with the end goal of raising the ability of another person so that he can handle his bank, body, others, and environment in general. And that's what auditing is today—it's a communication process. You should realize that it is, if we spend all the time that we spend on communication itself. And you shouldn't be a bit surprised when communication itself becomes (quote) "therapeutic," and people's heads blow off in Comm Courses and things like that, just saying "Okay" to other people. Because somebody's making them stand in there, confront it and say "Okay" to it—and it's probably the first time it's happened for centuries. And somebody just goes boom! Like to blow his head off.

You are sure, I am sure, that you have many moments and will have many pictures of the ACC unit in which you are now enrolled. I am sure that you will feel that you will be stuck all over the track by the end of the unit. Well, I'll leave that up to you to find out.

Thank you.

WHAT SCIENTOLOGY IS ADDRESSED TO

A lecture given on 18 July
1957

Thank you. Thank you very much.

You look unusually—well, let's just say unusual, let it go at that.

This is the fourth lecture of the 18th ACC, July 18, isn't it? Nineteen fifty-seven. Beg your pardon, year 7 AD. After Dianetics.

Well, these lectures should follow a very orderly course. Each one should take up in turn exactly what should be taken up at that moment. And the outline which was going to be used for these lectures was the Student Manual, but isn't. Because I looked over the Student Manual very carefully on its table of contents and discovered something fantastic: the Student Manual spoke for itself. All it is, is all of the exact data of Scientology, all of the exact data: the old Dianetic Axioms, the Prelogics, the Factors, what auditing is, how it is done, all the TRs, how you sign up a preclear. You know? Just...

And I was so overwhelmed (that's different than being overwhelmed, you know—that's *really* it, being overwhelmed) that I hardly could make any lectures at all. So I'll just have to go along here on my own steam somehow and muck it out one way or the other.

I take that as a vote of confidence.

Well, the lecture this evening is—could be clumsily stated, what Scientology is addressed to, or what it is shot at, or what it is done to. You know, in this day and age, a subject which has no application is only in favor in the universities. And they teach them there, but people who have to get along in the world and who have to get things done can't allow themselves this luxury.

So Scientology is shot at something. And let's just take a very fast look at what it is addressed to. It is addressed basically, fundamentally and accurately to you. And on that via is addressed to the physical universe, the forms of the physical universe (including live forms) and to all other beings in the physical universe regardless of what they may be, and is also addressed to the nonexistence of many beings who aren't. You got that? It is also addressed to beings that aren't.

Now, there are a lot of imaginary and legendary beings and beasts just like there were in the Dark Ages. The way the ancient mariners kept people from coming over and trading with the American coast was quite interesting. We read it that every mariner of Columbus's day believed that you just sailed so far and then fell off the edge and that there were terrific monsters and beasts of one character or another who would devour you if you set sail and

18 JULY 1957

sailed beyond the sight of land. And this was an excellent way of tying up a monopoly on the part of Icelandic, British, Danish, French, Spanish and some Mediterranean sailors—the entirety of trade with America and the codfish banks. Those Grand Banks up there were quite well known; that's where Columbus found out about it, you know.

So a great many beasts have been invented—not only to debar careless voyaging into somebody else's hunting preserves.

By the way, somebody might be caused to doubt that. It's an interesting thing. It's well known in the Explorers Club, and it's one of the biggest jokes in the Explorers Club is the derivation of the word *America*: there are seven sources for the word *America*, none of them America Vespucci. There were the American Indians. There were all sorts of things.

There was a great deal known at that time by a specialized few who wanted a monopoly. And therefore they peopled their preserves with imaginary beings and thus kept out interlopers.

Now, I am not going to tell you that the field of the mind has been *only* inhabited by imaginary beings. But something of this order is done by the fellow who invents a tremendous nomenclature of the brain or a tremendous nomenclature of the bone structure or something like that and then says you have to know all these names before you can know anything *about*, and then says each one of these parts of the brain has a specific and peculiar function, and adds to it, "Nobody should tamper with the mind because it bites." You see? I don't say that that is the same thing as the Spanish sailor did with the sea in order to keep guys like Columbus from discovering things. See, I don't say that for a moment. I merely insist upon it!

Now, we have here a functional subject. And in view of the fact that it is a functional subject, it must perforce carry with it a great many routes or tracks or ways to go. And if you have routes through the primeval forest or the raging seas peopled by monsters eighteen times as big as Texas, you get a very snide idea of the sailors who peopled it, you see, with imaginary beasts so as to keep others out. You say, "Somebody was telling fibs." That would be about the least you would say.

You've been told, "Never go across that field over there because it is full of snakes." And then you finally one day by accident in a rainstorm find yourself in that field and you look around carefully and you find all of these snakes are stuffed dummies, fixed so that when you trod on their tails they shoot out their tongues. You can't possibly imagine that they got there by some agency that didn't want trespassers. Oh, no, nothing like that. Oh, no!

But I don't happen to admit ownership of thee and me and any equipment we have come by, by fair means or foul, by a bunch of fellows who think it's their private preserve.

There's one thing that people voyaging early in the levels of the mind (so they said) overlooked, is: you have one and I have one and other people have minds and they aren't locked up in any safe anyplace, and all a fellow has to do is look right where he is and he will see something about the mind. But if he's been told it's very dangerous to fool with the mind or do something with the mind and he doesn't know that those snakes are simply dummies and those raging sea beasts were simply mocked up to keep fishing preserves, why, he says, "Well, I better not look; I better not look," he says, "I better go blind."

Well now, when anybody gives me the alternative of walking on his private preserve or going blind, his toes are going to hurt. Because I'll walk close enough to step on his toes, too.

WHAT SCIENTOLOGY IS ADDRESSED TO

And that is exactly what happened about twenty-five years ago, right here in this city. "I was told that the mind was not a subject which should ever be addressed by anyone from the engineering department. Hah!" Unfortunately I was also associate editor of the college newspaper, and after that made it my business to write numerous articles about the psychology department.

However, I wasn't just rebuffed—I was, you might say, failed in line of duty. I was studying the smallest possible particle in this universe. I was studying wavelengths of light. And in studying wavelength I found that the wavelength of ultraviolet still left holes between the particles. And I wanted to know if anything ever went through those holes, because I had reached the highest end of the visible spectrum. Now, obviously we didn't have anything solid yet, and the first application of this was a microscope. I wanted a microscope that would show up virus and show up other things. Very legitimate engineering problem. How do you build a microscope that can see tinier than anything else, than any other microscope ever has? And I tried to get some means, then, of focusing ultraviolet light and making it visible, found out that the ultraviolet light so focused burned anything up that you wanted to look at, and this was a very poor microscope. It ought to only be used, I would have said in later days, on psychiatrists.

But here—here is this problem: what is the smallest particle of energy and where would it be found? And I did a computation (a lot of you have heard me talk about this, but I've never said very specifically anything about it)—I did a computation and I found out that there was a possibility that there could be holes in protein molecules, and something could be stored. And so I just thought of some arbitrary figures and I said, "Well, if there were a hundred holes in a protein molecule and you put ten memories of an exact still picture in each hole ..." I already knew—I just took those as arbitrary figures so I could compute the rest of it for probability—I already knew there was, I've forgotten, 10^{21} I believe it is, binary digits of neurons, or punched protein molecules, in the skull. And I added this up: if there were a hundred holes and ten pictures in each one . . . Then I did a computation with an old Brownie box camera which snaps at a fifteenth of a second or thereabouts, and I did a computation as to how slow you could snap pictures and still have mental image pictures—which, by my way of thinking, was memory. Because everyone I asked if he remembered something, he said so-and-so and so-and-so. And I'd ask him, "Well, do you have a picture of that?"

And he'd say, "Yes. Yes, I have a picture of that."

And "Well, is the picture in motion?"

"Yes. Yes."

The picture's in motion—oohhh! How do you get a picture in motion? Well, a fifteenth of a second will give you enough frames to get a picture in motion that doesn't flicker, much. See, I was being very, very, very generous about this whole thing. And everybody I ran into had these pictures. And these pictures were memories as far as I could see. And I wanted to know where they got stored. Because all I had to do was tell somebody to get a picture, he'd get a picture. And I'd say, "Fine, throw it away," or something of that sort, and he'd put it away somewhere, and I'd say, "Get it back," and I—where is he storing the thing, you see?

So I went over to the psychology department to find out. And I'll be a son of a gun if they knew anything about the pictures! "Pictures?" they said, "Pictures? What pictures?" Right now we know what they were: they were

18 JULY 1957

invisible cases or black fives. They didn't have any pictures. They didn't know anything about pictures. "What are you doing with pictures?" they says to me. I said, "What are you doing without them?"

"Oh," they said, "there's some little-known authority that cursorily wrote at the tail end of a book that was published someplace else and isn't accepted by us, on a subject called eidetic recall. There is something about that, but don't believe that!"

Well now, here was a fellow trying to compute the smallest particle of energy and he found a whole bunch of pictures and he knew they went someplace. And the confounding part of it was, is I couldn't compute a small enough particle of energy to be a picture that could be stored anyplace for one very excellent reason, is that anybody I asked had pictures more than three months' worth—had more than three months' worth of pictures. And 10^{21} binary digits, each one with a hundred holes in it and ten pictures per hole, didn't store up three months' worth.

Now, this later on came back from Vienna as a theory. It went as a disproved theory, and the computations in it were very exact. And it came back from Vienna about 38 or 39 or something like that, as a fact. And I would have said, "Well, somebody has done independent work," except he'd made the same arithmetical error I had made. All right. I conceived, as we would have said later, that there was a camouflaged hole in this subject. A camouflaged hole. And then I found out that it was a very dangerous and reprehensible thing to look into or have anything to do with the mind. And if it had just been the fact that these chaps were ignorant, I never would have said a word in criticism and you today wouldn't hear me say a word in criticism.

But routinely and uniformly since, I have had them behave in no other way than to make me believe or try to make me believe that I was poaching upon some private preserve, peopled with bogeymen who would bite me. They were pretending ownership of this! And I never had one produce a bill of sale for my head.

Now, I learned more than this. As the years went on, I learned that they were supposed to do things with the mind across this basic premise—this basic premise: that IQ cannot change and personality characteristics are unalterable. Well this, if you please, is a defeatism. They only could be justified in existence if they could change characteristics or IQs. If they can't *change* something, why *are* they? If they can't get anything *done* in this society and if they're sitting there saying, "Under no circumstances must you poach," looks to me like we've struck a third dynamic mental block in the field of the mind. Nothing more than that. They say, "Nothing can be done and you mustn't do anything." And saying these two things at once was adventurous; they should never be said to anyone with red hair.

Now, I'm not damning these people particularly. They undoubtedly have reasons of their own for their dishonesty. Basically it possibly is something on the order of, if anyone got into *their* heads they'd find out what they did when they were three, and it was nasty.

But I do not consider they have any right to the brains or sight of thee or me if all they would do is tell us that nothing could be done. Therefore such a group would condemn us to blindness. My total quarrel. Because we refuse to be condemned to blindness, we are here.

All right. Here I have given you a blasphemous picture of the mental sciences of long time ago in the dark ages of man. They failed because their subject wasn't really functional. It wasn't practical and didn't invite anybody

WHAT SCIENTOLOGY IS ADDRESSED TO

to make use of it. The total function was to study. And I suppose someone who is obsessed with the idea of studying can see that as a total function.

But engineers are not oriented in that fashion. They study to *do*. Got the difference? It's studying to *do*, not just studying.

I was auditing Mary Sue one day and she told me about a great big place up someplace in the universe where everybody there—great big building, tremendous desks and everything in it—and everybody in there just knew about everything. And I said, "And what did they *do*?"

She said, "That's it, they just *know* about everything."

I said, "Yes, but what do they *do* with this?"

And she said, "That's just it: nothing. They just *know* about everything. They just catalog all of the things that go on."

"Well, who do they catalog it *for*?"

"They don't catalog it *for* anybody."

"Well, who do they send it to?"

"Well, they don't send it to anybody."

So naturally you and I don't know about this place; it's totally out of communication.

Well, it's quite interesting. It's very interesting that Scientology has more background than psychology. It has the background of the Greek, Roman thought, Middle Age thought (which was more or less sparked up by Saint Thomas Aquinas), fifteenth century faculty psychology—these are all backgrounds—the basic philosophies of Hume, Locke, on up to William James and on up to now. It is a consecutive track of development which we have tapped in on, understood, sorted out and made workable. Our findings today are in no great disagreement with the earlier Greeks or a very little-known fellow who lived in the day of Julius Caesar and who wrote a book about the nature of things. There's no great disagreement with these great philosophers up along the track. We are not, then, really in scholastic disagreement or basic disagreement anywhere.

You would be quite amazed at the works of Saint Thomas Aquinas, about 1265, 1275—I've forgotten exactly when—it was June, I think, I talked to him. Well anyhow, his comments on the subject of knowingness are of great interest to us today. I invite you someday to, if you're in a library or something, to crack a book on Saint Thomas Aquinas and read what he had to say about knowingness. It's quite interesting. He had some curves, he was trying to convince some people of some things, his work was definitely biased in some degree; but we find in his work the early ghost of Spencer's knowable and unknowable theory—we find right there.

And in Dianetics we more or less started out on the premise that there were a lot of things that were knowable and there were probably a lot of things that were unknowable, and we didn't have to know any of the unknowable things to know about the things that were knowable. And that was an advance on Spencer because he just sort of dropped it right there, you see? He said, "Well, they're unknowable and nobody will ever know about them."

And Kant went further than this. Kant says transcendental—I don't know, exteriorization or something. Transcendentalism, I think, that horrible subject is. Yes, I remember. I missed every lecture on the subject at his university. Anyhow . . . Nobody could ever keep me in.

Anyway, this fellow, the great Chinaman of Königsberg, he was sort of adrift but nevertheless he's on our track. I mean, the things he was saying

18 JULY 1957

about the innate moral nature of man. He—in *The Critique of Pure Reason*, why, the fellow demonstrates conclusively that there is built into man a series of moral factors, and then he wrote another book which proves conclusively that there aren't. Then he says that these moral factors are something you never get paid for, and then he says in another book that these moral factors are there because you're paid for them and if you aren't paid for them, they're not there. It's quite interesting. But he nevertheless was trying to shake apart some of the basic data of the universe and understand it. He was trying to hang things together.

We actually are working in direct succession, very direct succession, from somewhere in the neighborhood of twenty-five to three thousand years of what's considered formal philosophy. We don't vary anything off of this line at all.

But there *has* been a variation within the last century. I'm not just pounding something down here, I'm just kicking it in the teeth. In the last century there was a tremendous departure from formal philosophy. Psychology has always been the study of the mind or spirit. And *psyche* is Greek for *spirit*. And you will read in all of the textbooks (which, before they were burned, were quite informative) on the subject of psychology that psychology has nothing to do with the mind or the spirit or with man's soul or anything, but is simply some kind of a dissertation on brain cells or brain functions. And demonstrates conclusively that all thought comes from mass and that man is an animal and that's that.

50

And these words of great wisdom, at complete variance from anything that had been said in all the centuries preceding, were uttered by a chap by the name of Wundt. He was the only Wundt in Leipzig, Germany in 1879. And he is the direct father and the direct descendent of all psychology taught today in every American university except, perhaps, Catholic universities. He's the only authority for modern psychology as taught in universities. And he has no bearing whatsoever on anything else man has ever thought on the subject of his own livingness and beingness.

Now, that's perhaps to you an extravagant statement but it is not extravagant. I studied it carefully before I made it. And I have read the fellow's lectures and his textbooks, and it was strictly "from what universe?" There is nothing of the tradition of man's thinking or man's philosophy over the ages to be found in that work. But that work, because it is degrading and animalistic, was accepted for reasons best known to somebody else as the formal study of psychology.

And when somebody in the government says the word *psychology*, he does not mean faculty psychology taught in 1500—and a pretty good psychology it is, too. It's quite interesting; you read it over, they almost tell you about an engram.

Female voice: Yeah!

Yeah. They almost tell you about a lot of things. They add them up—it would make sense to a Dianeticist. But nothing of this other school would make sense to any of us.

Now, I don't know whether man at large just gave up on the subject of himself and quit, or not. But I know that nobody had any right to quit as far as we were concerned.

Now you, a Scientologist, think of yourself, undoubtedly, as being something new under the sun. And this is *not true*. You are in the best tradition of man's philosophy on the subject of man. And just because the data has been summated and pulled into sharp importances which evaluate and then which

WHAT SCIENTOLOGY IS ADDRESSED TO

do more for man than philosophy had done before, does not divorce you from this very long track, at least twenty-five hundred years in direct, consecutive length to the earliest records we have on thinkingness.

I mentioned Buddhism: that is actually the formal entrance of philosophy as far as written history is concerned. It was mythology before that time.

Now, here—look here, then: can it be that man was subjected to a raid of some sort or another where all of his information was swept away from him, he was disenfranchised of what he knew basically was true and then somebody supplanted it for activities to their own selfish benefit? Could that be?

But you are in the best tradition. The very best tradition. You will go back and read something by a well-educated man in 1805 and you will find him discussing the possible uses of religion in the control of populaces. And this fellow is not drawing any wool across his eyes—he's talking quite intelligently. He's thinking, he's understanding.

Read something like the work of Edward Gibbon, 1790 or thereabouts. And you find that this man is well in command of an understanding of his fellow man and he is not at any time trying to vilify his fellow man with being an animal and degrading him utterly, even though he's cutting to pieces the totality of Christianity. He didn't forget himself so far as to abandon all formal knowledge of life. Quite informative.

Take an educated man of 1950 and you found him with no command of basic philosophy, no feeling of humanity or understanding of the human race. Something had happened.

An educated man of two centuries ago was expected to know a great deal about human behavior and livingness. But something happened in between there.

Now, it's very gratifying to my ego to stand before you and say, "Well. . ." (That's a Greek word, not a Freudian one.) And it's very gratifying for me to say, "Well, I thought this all up and actually it's just me, you know, it's nobody else; I mean, nobody else had a hand in this." Then we change the violin off to the other arm and play "The Great I Am" on that one. That'd be very flattering, wouldn't it?

But it's basically not true. This work couldn't have been done at all if people had not been thinking in the times of the Greeks, if Buddha had not been writing and talking in his day, if the faculty psychologists had not opened up. And if modern psychology hadn't convinced me to such a degree that they were working an operation, not doing a subject, we wouldn't have had any Scientology.

Now, some important things have happened in Scientology. Basic importances have been sorted out so as to evaluate other data and make a consecutive, organized whole of observations of life. And when that was done we had a tremendous resurgence of information on the subject, our power of observation became tremendous. And it became so large that it dwarfs a power of observation immediately before the point. But it couldn't have been done if Pythagoras hadn't been thinking and talking, Anaxagoras hadn't been in the picture and if Buddha hadn't been energetically walking fifteen miles a day just to talk to some people—we'd never gotten there at all.

It's true of all civilized status that things begin rather slowly and then as you pick up a larger amount of data, you get a sudden integration of things.

The advantageous spot which I occupied was being trained in the East and then being subjected to—also against my will—to Western engineering,

18 JULY 1957

philosophy and mathematics. This puts you onto a logical pattern like a highwayman puts a pistol in your stomach. If—it says, "Be logical." It says, with the most critical air possible, "You're wrong." It tells you and teaches you this philosophy, which has never been heard of in the East, that those things are true which *work*. It ends speculation with application.

Now, when you add that tradition to twenty-five hundred years of formal philosophy and some understanding of the Eastern philosophies and you take a hard look at it, something is bound to happen. Well, it happened. That's all—it happened. And we're here. And we know how to do things. And we probably could have given a witch doctor—if we could pluck a witch doctor out of two centuries ago and set him down here, he could probably show us "*Poga-poga*, and you show him the magic eye and you do this, you do that. . ." And we'd have probably said, "Well, walk over and touch that wall," and he'd have run out his witch doctoring, you know? I mean, we could have given him cards and spades and probably beaten him at his own game if we applied our own wits to it. You understand? Because we would understand what his witch doctoring was all about.

Now, I'll give you a graphic example of that. The juju of Africa was of great interest to me at one time. And I almost decided I would take it up one day to find out why the dickens these people were actually able to put curses on people with such ease. We have the answer to that. The second you saw any juju boy working on the native populace to extract a few coppers (or his wife), you, a Scientologist, say, "Ha-ha-ha, that's pretty good application of that axiom; yeah, that's pretty good." Or "That mechanical principle is—that's dead easy."

Actually they walk up to you with a long horsetail switch—it's a horse's tail on a little handle—and they fill the horse's tail, see, full of fleas. And they walk up to you and they switch this all around your face, see? And right in the middle of when they're doing it, they say, "Die!" Confusion and the stable datum, nothing else. And of course the guy will—this is done to, is—of course, seizes onto that single clear statement in the middle of all the confusion: he's got it! It's the nicest little engram you ever observed. And there are dozens of them like this, all of which would be easily understood by a Scientologist.

But the funny part of it is, they're not understood by a witch doctor. They're not understood. He just knows that if he does this it works. He's gone on total workability with no understanding.

All right. There are many auditors around who do a certain process for its workability only and don't understand it at all. They go through the mystic rites of 8-C and something happens. And they say, "That's good enough, why understand it?" But the understanding is available; it is there.

Now, you could consider that I am a very—very much of a madman indeed to run down psychology, to run down these other formal studies. You say—I've had it said to me that this damages our position. I'm afraid I was too good a cavalryman once not to understand more about tactics than that.

I used to have a letterhead when I was writing down in Hollywood. Everybody had a fancy letterhead of one sort or another, so I had somebody draw me one of a cavalryman at full charge with saber outstretched and so on. And I omitted the motto under it because it would have been too much for the boys out in Hollywood. And I used to put this on the heading of—make it first page on my MSes and turnovers. They kind of got the point. The motto that went under it was "Ride over everything you come to." Which is, by the

WHAT SCIENTOLOGY IS ADDRESSED TO

way, a tremendously workable philosophy. If you ever feel utterly downtrodden and you can't possibly make the grade, why, just grit your teeth and somehow or other get up to speed on the idea that you can ride over it. And you could make it.

What is that saying, in essence? You understand that at once: that's saying, "Communicate like hell if you're worried about it." But *at* it. Not to somebody else.

All right. It would be a great error on our part to remain quiescent in the face of considerable counterattack which has come from the various psychology organizations at this time.

If you do not know they are under attack, you could find out fast enough simply by calling up some outfit and asking—you, a Scientologist, don't announce the fact, just ask this university, "What about this thing called Scientology?" And you hear blue smoke and raves and sour grapes, and you might even hear your name as being one of the offenders in the local area. These people, for instance, are always turning us in to people like the Better Business Bureau and so forth in an effort to really do something to quash this down. But they're still mocking up ogres; only they have us to some degree mocked up as ogres.

Well, I'm going to give you something that would help you if you ever confront that, and that is: they don't mock up very well.

Now here—here was the battlefield that Dianetics and Scientology walked upon, and here is the battlefield on which it is fought. And don't get an idea that it isn't a battlefield because it is. It's a great mistake to walk out between two lines of soldiers who are shooting like hell at each other and pretend there's no battle going on; you can get hurt doing that. There *is* a battle going on. It's a worldwide battle. And the target of that, the end goal of that, from the communist point of view, is ownership of the mind of man. And they have announced this over and over and over and over: 1933, 1935, 1938, 1940, 1945, 1950 and 1957. Their communiques and party line contain this over and over and over again: that they are not going to invade with arms, that their total conquest is the mind of man. Why, just—just this last week it was in Drew Pearson's column that they were giving up over in the London conference because they'd already said their best target was the mind of man.

Well, they conceive this as something that can be owned. They believe that communist philosophy can somehow or another give them dominion so that men can become slaves. Now, that is the battle which is going on in the world at this time and should be understood. They have all sorts of mechanisms by which they do this. But it is a battle. They believe in hypnotism, fixed loyalties of one kind or another, and an idea that nobody can do anything with his mind anyhow. They believe that man is an animal, that he thinks with his brain. They believe that—and teach people (because they know these teachings are destructive)—that all thought emanates from force only, that man has no soul and he has no mind. They had to fight the Catholic Church and the Greek Orthodox Church and they adopted these things. In other words, they're winning with Wundtian psychology. There's not much differentiation between these two subjects.

All right. The world, then, in which you operate isn't just going along stupidly like a bunch of somnambulists. No, no—that's not what's happening. There's somebody in there pitching all the time, saying, "Manhood, *thaah*; courage, blah. What you are—you should be a cell member, blah." You'll hear

18 JULY 1957

this one around you these days—quite interesting little operations, these are—this one is a killer: "It's been thought of before." See? "The cult of the individualist." You'll see this country coming into the grip of these things. They already ruined Russia.

Now, it is a world, then, in which a great deal of propaganda about the mind is flying around. And we're actually doing a cowboy in the white hat and a cowboy in the black hat, like the kids watch on TV. We're actually doing that. There are always two great forces at work in the world: black forces and white forces. Now, there—to get very mystic on you and tell you what I was taught up in the Western Hills of China, there are always really *three* forces. There's the baddies and the goodies and the gold lodge. And the gold lodge referees it. The black, the white and the gold. And it's quite fascinating.

Now, we could easily flip over into the role of the white in this particular fight because we're the only people on earth fitted for it today. But the truth of the matter is, that isn't where we belong. We belong over in the gold.

Why?

Because we have *a* belief in the self-determinism of man and his essential freedoms. We've got that so strongly that today we can put him under very heavy control and run it out and make him free. We can even free him from control today. That's quite remarkable.

Therefore we are dangerous. Therefore we are dangerous. We're dangerous to any slave maker who walks up the street. We're dangerous. Because we can bust all his charms, we can turn the spotlight on the monsters in the sea and show that it's an empty sea. We can open the gates on his private hunting preserves that belong to us and walk through. And such people are always dangerous.

Now, fortunately, the subject only works as long as it's used for good. That's very fortunate, you know? Because if we only do good with it, we become not merely dangerous people to have around, but utterly formidable. Utterly formidable. Nobody could do a thing! We occupy a position from which we could not be thrust, to the degree that we have done good and benefited man. And the funny part of the subject is it only works when it is—does good and benefits man!

What kind of a rat race are we in here? Well, I'm afraid we're in one of these rat races that can only win. Besides the Great Okay, we have the Big Win.

Now, all right. Now, Scientology is a doingness subject. I don't think that an auditor could run an engram *into* anyone. He just doesn't operate that way, basically. But I have seen somebody sort of grit his teeth and decide he better had, for the good of the race or something of the sort, and wind up by processing the fellow. You know, he decides if he added enough Code breaks together and he did enough other things, somebody'd get really dazed and wouldn't be so efficient.

Well, I made a test of that one time, and I found out—this is terrible; I hate to tell you this. It's terrible. It'll show you why this is the Big Win. We decided that by restimulating people we could reduce their ability. So we conducted a long series of very expert tests. And they went this way: we gave the guy an IQ test, ran him into a very heavy engram, snarled him in but good, didn't relieve it at all, and then while he was still grogged and stuck on the track gave him another IQ test and had him finish that one. And his IQ always went up. That's an old-time one.

Well, we increased things to be aware of and increased his havingness and that did it.

WHAT SCIENTOLOGY IS ADDRESSED TO

Now if you turn around the other way and you strip down his having-ness, you *can* fog him up. But the fogged-up doesn't last very long; because it's artificially done, it wears off rather rapidly.

Oh, I'm not saying that if you put a bullet through somebody's head you wouldn't do something to his IQ, you understand. But I'm using Scien—— I'm not using psychological, but Scientology processes, to demonstrate this.

The whole subject of the mind must continue to be a free and open and inspected subject. In other words, the information known about the mind should be available to anyone.

Why?

Because nobody owns his mind but himself. You see, there's no such thing as an army composed of a whole bunch of minds that are owned by a general. Now, there can be a whole bunch of soldiers who owe their allegiance to a general and who think in coordination to serve a cause. But to say then that they are owned is to say that they are slaves. And we know at once that this is nonfunctional, since there is no slave-owning state or any state supported by slaves, prosperous or in good shape or alive today on Earth. That's quite a remarkable condemnation of this principle of making slaves. It's a very fast way to go by the boards; just make some slaves. They cave the society in faster, much faster than if it's just left alone. Nobody needs slaves. You need slaves just like you need a glass of cyanide.

All right. The subject of the mind is a personal thing. The contents of your mind may or may not be, or may or—should or should not remain a personal thing; that's beside the point. That is not even a question that could be answered in any other field, save debate or philosophy or something. You know, whether or not you have a right to all of your own engrams and secrets or whether or not they should be aired or something of the sort; you could debate this thing one way or the other. But in view of the fact that you continue to *have* your mind, no amount of legislation or debate or anything else could disturb the fact that you *do* have your mind. You see?

And if you *have* a Ford car, you're certainly, by my thinking, entitled to a how-to-fix-it-yourself book about it. You're entitled to an instruction manual for the machinery you're expected to run and keep in good order.

Now, the state holds everyone responsible for keeping his mind in good order. Well, if you let an engram about kleptomania slip into shape and hook the jewels off the counter of the jewelry store, the state says, by throwing you in the clink for a year or two, that you didn't adequately handle this machine called the mind.

Now, if there's going to be such a thing as social punishment or social criticism, then certainly it would neither be just nor equitable if people did not know how to handle that for which they were being criticized. Do you see this? I mean, if you can get arrested for it, then it's yours. This is an admitted responsibility. And if everybody admits this responsibility for everyone—or no, by anyone for himself—by punishing people for doing what they do, we see at once then that everyone's mind is his own mind and isn't owned by anybody else. Therefore, knowledge concerning it must be available. And anyone which prevents such knowledge from being circulated and so on must have a very queer idea of justice, to say the least.

In other words, they have advanced a very unworkable proposition. They have said, "Now, if you don't think just right then you are going to get punished." Well then, they've said, "You have the responsibility for thinking just right."

18 JULY 1957

Well now, we know that we can't give people responsibility without giving them some authority. Doesn't work at all. Any army says this. Any court of law says this. So it must follow that knowledge concerning *you* must be *yours*. Isn't anybody else's. It never will be anybody else's.

Well, very well then. If this is true, all the people with whom you associate and to whom you will speak and so forth *also* own a mind. And if that is true, then they have a right to know what you know about it. And then if you tell them that, they meet somebody else who owns a mind and then if this other person owns a mind, then they have the right to know what this second person knew about it.

This is why I call it the Big Win. It's the Big Win for sure. We've had road maps and they're pretty good road maps. We haven't had excellent road maps for caterpillar tractors or the caterpillar tractors or bulldozers to run on those roads, but we have them now. In other words, we not only, today, can draw a road map—we could draw a new map and make sure the roads fitted it. So this is a brand-new sort of a picture.

Well, all right. You expected me, in this lecture, to give you some data you didn't have, and all I've given you is propaganda. But the truth—the truth of the whole thing comes down to this: Scientology could not be addressed to anything else but *you*. Because any time you address Scientology to anything, it is somebody being another *you*. You got it? So its address is to living beings, basically, each one of which has a vested interest in being alive.

56

Now, maybe these people are entitled to hope or help, or they're not entitled to hope or help—that's beside the point. If you're going to tell these people that they must behave, which is the greatest cliché on the tongue of man, then you have no right to withhold from them the mechanisms by which they behave. Do you understand that?

So, what is it addressed to?

Well, basically, it's addressed to life. But what is life composed of?

It's basically, from your viewpoint, composed of those things with which you can communicate. And the most vital thing with which you can communicate, of course, is another being.

Now therefore, Scientology directly addresses to livingness and secondarily addresses to this universe and one's own universe, the other fellow's universe—it addresses the associations amongst these things. And you evolve out of this the eight dynamics. And it addresses to all of these things, whether they are there or not.

And out in the final analysis, then, we find out that we are dealing with the most personal subject that we could possibly deal with. Now, Freudians believe that sex is, but that's not true; Scientology is. It's the most personal subject with which we could talk to anybody—about which we could talk to anybody. Very personal; talks about *them*.

But if we expect ourselves to get along in a world or expect there to be a world in which to get along, why, we haven't really any choice but to go on and use our information.

Now, today Scientology is called "knowingness, study of." But "knowing how to know," that's a sort of a nondynamic definition. Scientology could better be defined as "summated and organized information about you." It's everything that has been known about you for twenty-five hundred years at least. But it's summated so that it's communicable, so that it's applicable and so that it gets some definite results, and then, way over and above all these other things, is capable of changes. It can create changes. And it can create

WHAT SCIENTOLOGY IS ADDRESSED TO

changes for the better. And it can make things look better and act better and gives one a much broader understanding of life.

We're just on the verge, by the way, of discoveries on the way north. There's less than a third of Scientology wrapped up, to date. But that third includes any being on Earth, and it's just that beings on Earth do not necessarily hit a total zenith.

But there is the subject. And that is that to which it is addressed: simply *you*. And if you realize that the only way it can be addressed is to make somebody better handle what he has, you realize that it can't be anything but a big win. And that's why I say we're neither the cowboy in the black hat, the cowboy in the white hat or the cowboy in the gold hat, if there is one. We're just us and we're on our way.

Thank you.

THE FIVE CATEGORIES

A lecture given on 19
July 1957

Thank you. Thank you.

This is the fifth lecture of the 18th ACC, July 19, 1957. Right?

Audience: Right. Yeah.

This moment I would like to take the opportunity to correct a couple of corrections which I've recorrected. I said that this was the first time since Buddhism that anybody had done anything about it. Buddhism was the last time anybody had done anything about it and then I told you last night that this was in the tradition of all the philosophy between then and now. That's right, isn't it?

Female voice: Yeah.

That's fascinating, isn't it?

Both remarks are true. Philosophy didn't do anything about it. They just talked about it. Just like most of the intellectuals you get into your group will do. They just sit around and talk about it. What you want to do is go down to the docks and pull up some longshoremen. They'll *do* something about it. Sounds horrible, doesn't it? But actually the smart ones at that level, the clever ones at that level have actually been denied their proper level in society. And out of a large number of people like longshoremen and so forth, why, you will get several of them that could give cards and spades to Einstein. It's fantastic but they will *do* something.

All right, now the last time anybody did anything about it was Buddhism. That was 2,500 years ago.

It must have been pretty good because it has established the tradition of everything that has happened since. And that is why we are in the tradition of the best philosophy possible.

Now you're going to challenge me and say, "Well, Greek philosophy did not spring from Buddhism." I don't know that it didn't. I don't know for a moment that it didn't. One would make that statement on the fact that nobody traveled way back when. Of course, there were few people who traveled that also wrote, since writing was not in vogue.

But there's a fellow by the name of Marco Polo, he got around quite a bit. And you hear him remarking every now and then in his works about other travelers who went back and forth on the same routes.

In the days of Tamerlane when Samarkand was the capital of the world, we hear of an Arab writer by the name of Ibn Batuta who wrote about the peoples of Earth, and he'd just been all over the place.

19 JULY 1957

And man today has an unhealthy attitude toward man of yesterday. He thinks that man of yesterday didn't get around. And man of yesterday got around most alarmingly. In fact, the silk trade and so on between Italy and China was simply interrupted by the creation of the Ottoman Empire and cut much of the travel that was done. What—we even read in the days of the Greeks of nearly everything that Marco Polo wrote about later. Quite fascinating.

In other words, Buddhism wasn't something that was totally located and entirely localized in the middle of China; it was not at all. The lower Tibetan plateau spilled its knowledge out into China proper, a tremendous distance away. It's an enormous distance from lower Tibet over to Peking. I'd hate to walk it. I'd hate to walk it. I haven't; I almost did once—check didn't arrive—but that's another story.

The Buddhist monk took civilization out across an Asia which up to that moment was *very* barbaric. The Buddhist monk went out with reading and writing and painting and pottery making and wearing shoes and he even got some of the Chinese to stop eating other Chinese by this route. It was a wild, mad, barbaric scene into which Buddhism moved. They took the Chinese writing, for instance, to Japan, which up to that moment had no writing at all. And to this day, the writing imported by the Buddhists into Japan is the writing of Japan. It's quite remarkable; it's a total Chinese character system, the basic writing used in Japan, with little tiny wiggle-waggles—katakana—up at the upper right-hand corner of the characters to tell you how to pronounce the character because they are not pronounced the same in Chinese as Japanese, you see? So they have to tell you how to pronounce the character. Japanese newspapers are quite fantastic.

But anyway, Buddhism took practically every civilized art Japan has to Japan except two: boating and fishing and killing other people. And these three arts—two arts and one pastime—were just about all that was native to Japan. Well, its civilization rose from that point and it ceased to be a total barbarism, became a civilized nation to a marked degree.

Well, along about the time this was happening, nothing was walking around in Europe but something in furs—you know, thrown over the shoulder in an abandoned fashion—and one had a rather difficult time going to nightclubs in Paris because of the wolves that roamed in the streets. Of course Paris wasn't founded for ages and ages afterwards; myself and a couple other guys got up there . . . Well, that's a different story. It was . . .

But here was Europe—here was Europe, actually a sponge for culture. The culture came to Europe on a comm lag of some duration. There had already been some people sweeping down from the north that had taken over Greece and they brought a lot of new ideas with them. They upset a matriarchy and these people with their new ideas were quite remarkable people. They—blond, blue-eyed people. And they took over that section of the world and had a communication line back to where they came from and actually their—one tries to find what could have cut man's urge to travel between Asia and Europe rather than, "Did it exist?" It was almost impossible for it not to exist. It's pretty easy—there are sea routes and all sorts of things.

But we don't find any of the sentiments of Buddhism sweeping into Europe. You think I'm—this is all I'm going to talk to you about tonight but it's not, I'm just building up to something. Actually I'm talking to you while I'm trying to think of something, that's all.

The people were very much in motion, a lot of information was being

THE FIVE CATEGORIES

carried back and forth of one kind or another and we find the religion of Buddhism sweeping into the Roman Empire and Europe somewhere around the time of Julius Caesar. And the sentiments of love thy neighbor, turn the other cheek and so on were buildups from this same basic philosophy and they swept into Europe on that route. There isn't much doubt about this. The—even the early Christian chronicles tell how long Christ studied in India. It's not a remarkable fact at all.

But—point something out to you: that this particular activity did not build up Europe but tore it to pieces. Here was a strong, powerful empire with good justice, good roads, good people, into which was introduced a revolutionary philosophy known as Christianity. And in just four centuries there was nothing left. My evidence of this is on very good authority: Edward Gibbon, who wrote the most monumental monument on this subject that has ever been written. And the only reason it perseveres until today the way he wrote it back around the last part of the eighteenth century—the only reason it perseveres is because it's got big words in it. And ignorant people, the kind who censor books, couldn't ever get past the first chapter. And it is simply there by ponderousness.

But it tells this story of the destruction of an empire. From a time of fine—fine troops, good police, freedom of a sort, citizenship, on down to a point where the Roman legions not only would not wear practice armor but would go forth into battle with a cross tattooed on the chest and run like hell. And they were practically lower than the barbarians. They had been swept away by recurring waves of barbarism. They could be swept away because they themselves had been rendered pitifully weak.

What had rendered them weak? As far as I could establish in very cursory investigation, it would be a philosophy which taught that all force was bad. A philosophy which taught that all force must be ignored. And as far as I can trace that philosophy, it seems to be the worst of Buddhism drifted through.

Now, Buddhism was not necessarily good. But its intentions were good. And all it told man was that he was a spirit and that the universe was constructed more or less around this fact. Now, regardless of what Buddhism taught or didn't taught or what its sects or cults taught, this was a new message in the world. But Buddhism did not teach that when one dies he goes up and finds some pearly gates with somebody playing hotcha on a horn. Nor did Buddhism teach that if one was bad he promptly sunk through the forty-mile crust of earth and boiled in the lava inside from there on out.

No, these factors are the earmarks of an operation. And the only reason I am talking about this, the only reason I am risking giving offense to those people who are still saying their Ave Marias—and they have a right to—some people are brave, some have Ave Marias—is simply this: you can take any philosophy and make a control slavery operation out of it. Do you understand this?

Therefore, I am saying to you here that the next resurgence or compilation of knowledge concerning the spiritual nature, actions and behavior patterns of man and this universe coming up at this time could again be roped, hogtied, smothered and used for a control operation.

The first sign of this would be secrecy concerning one or more of its essential parts. It would have to be made into a mystery before it could be made to accomplish slavery.

Slavery and mystery are almost the same thing. Look at the CDEI Scale. Curiosity becomes desire becomes enforce becomes inhibit. Mystery. Dispel the mystery and you've dispelled all.

19 JULY 1957

Now, for understanding, a thing called trust may be substituted. This is true. They're two slightly different things: understanding and trust. Now, trust can very, very easily be made over to enforced faith. And any time anybody tells you to take something totally on faith, they are trying to pervert your sense of trust. There is no reason you, at any time, any place, or any period of the universe should have to take anything on faith.

Now, therefore, any resurgence of philosophic knowledge has to be valued as itself. It is all very well for one to negate his own role or part in this. As a matter of fact, since last night I have had several complaints concerning the fact that I told you that I wasn't responsible for Scientology and several people have come around and kicked me in the shins but good on this subject.

They claim I'm trying to get out from under responsibility concerning the thing. All I was saying was I couldn't have done it without a tradition. So I'll have to take over the responsibility a little bit more just to get back a few friends.

But the point is this: authorship of something is unimportant; very, very unimportant. The point is, a great deal of revealed truth can bring about a tremendous change in the culture of the world. It can bring about a much more highly civilized state amongst barbarisms or amongst what people fondly believe are civilizations.

Now, the ability to make goods does not create a civilization. The ability to wear silk does not make a lady, nor the way to pat a top hat make a gentleman. These are different things.

62

We have today an interesting state of affairs. When we sum up the actual personality of national governments—and you should understand that nationalism is a brand-new thing on earth. People used to owe their allegiance to their land and to a king or some leader of this type. And now we have this whole thing moved out into some nebulous thing called "nationalism" which was invented back around the time of Cesare Borgia.

This whole subject of nationalism is becoming more and more and more ingrained in man. But unfortunately, he fought himself out of belief in it in World War I. World War I saw, really, the end of fervid nationalism and the beginning of tolerance broadly across national boundaries, just as it saw the actual end of Christianity. Too many nations fighting each other were all fighting, each fighting in the name of God. And the soldiers of those various nations went back home and said, "This is not logical" and that actually was the cave-in. It—later centuries I'm sure will remark that period as the cave-in of Christianity. Everybody was fighting everybody in the name of God. "*Gott mit uns.*"

Now, nationalism does not make for a wide civilization—it only makes for this: legality of crime on the part of a nonexistent being. The nonexistent being can commit crimes which are not permitted to the individual citizen. Kidnapping is legal on a nationalistic basis. In other words, although you cannot put the government in jail, the government can put you in jail and hold you for ransom: bail. That's kidnapping. That's perfectly legal. And so many other things are legal on a nationalistic basis.

Now, this makes and sets a stage. It's not something I am railing against. I'm just trying to show you with some truth the stage that is set here in the middle of this twentieth century. It is a stage and it is set. And it is quite fabulous to discover that it is waiting for an Armageddon or a civilization.

People are no longer fervently upholding national governments. They

THE FIVE CATEGORIES

would rather tend toward a philosophic approach to politics. Now, whether we like it or dislike it, communism is a philosophic approach to politics of one kind or another. Crude as it is, it's still a figure-figure thinkingness of one kind or another about how we should all go about running the nation; do you understand that?

Now, democracy never has been that, and somebody who says democracy versus communism is saying something like apples versus buffalo. Because democracy is a *system* of government and communism is a *philosophy* of government. And these two things, then, are not at war. But communism could very well invade the world at large and some form of socialism or another could be established and has been struggling into a level of establishment since about 1900. That's fifty-seven years ago. They got—the income tax amendment was one of the first actions of socialism in the United States, and that was 1911. In other words, this has been going on for a long time, these social philosophies of one kind or another.

Now, you have to meet, to some degree, spears with spears. Wooden hand swords do not accord well in a battle with spears, don't you see? You have to have impacts of comparable magnitude before there's a conflict. So don't be puzzled that socialism and socialistic trends are winning today in the Western world. They are unopposed. A system of government cannot oppose them because these things can exist, woven into this system of government. In other words, the system of government can sit right there, democracy, and everybody is a socialist. And there's no dispute between these two facts.

Nobody is very aware of this: that the doors are wide open, that almost any political philosophy of any kind could sweep in today upon these great nations of the Western world. And anybody who lifts his head with an opposing philosophy of existence has raised a spear in the face of spears. Do you see that?

Now, the Russian says that he is out to conquer the mind of man. Yes, that is very true, he is out to *conquer* the mind of man—something on the order that you would shoot bear.

This philosophy is alive today in the world. It is not necessarily good or bad, it is all whether or not the men who use it make it so. So far it has proven very evil. For instance, Russia herself under this philosophy is not able to progress. She has fallen a quarter of a century behind all of the European nations with which she was once abreast. She's having governmental shake-ups of all kinds. But this means nothing. The philosophy is still being exported of one kind or another just tells you that this philosophy, being a sort of a slave philosophy and having a pitch, is bringing with it destruction. Therefore, destruction would be the end product of any slavery, supercontrol operation, whether it be communism or Christianity or anything else.

Now, these things basically found themselves on truth. And then somebody comes along and for somebody else's good, feels that it would be best to pervert this truth, give it a little curve, omit a couple of things, add a couple of saltshakerfuls of mystery and this is for the good of man. At no time will this ever be for the good of man. There would be no way to temper or reshape the philosophies contained in Scientology so as to fully breast the philosophies of communism.

If Scientology were to win, it would win on all fronts, not merely against some oh, pig-eared ideology that somebody in a cabbage patch thought up when he was drunk. Shows the world's pretty bad off that that is what they call philosophy today. "Woikers of the woild arise."

19 JULY 1957

Something wins, however, to the degree that it assists others to exert control over their own environments. Those things which solely seek to control and nothing else, don't win. They just—this little group here is going to control all those groups across the world. And that—that just doesn't win. The only way a win is achieved is to use what you know to better somebody else's control of his environment.

War comes about because nations—meaning nationalistic nations— weaken the control of other nationalistic nations by propaganda and trade and other things. They don't bolster the control, they weaken it. And sooner or later they drive another nation mad and war occurs. That is the phenomena of war. It's just you weaken the control of somebody somewhere and he gets angry and upset.

Now let's look at this much more personally. If we wanted to handle a police officer, our course of action on a very short-term basis could be to take away from him his ability to control the situation. See now, that's a short-term basis. Criminals do that when they shoot one. You see, they sweep away his ability to control the situation. A citizen does that when he says, "Well, you haven't any right on my front porch, get off of here." It's quite remarkable. He always drives the police officer down into the misemotional bands and the police officer hits reaction. Well, it's quite amazing how easy it is to make Americans hit reaction these days. It is. It's quite amazingly easy; it's too easy. Frighteningly so.

64

The thing to do in order to handle him would be to get him in better control of the environment he's supposed to handle. In order to solve the difficulties with police, we do not need more barriers on police, what we need is more assistance for the police to handle their jobs. They only mishandle them when they can't.

If we wanted to make a good police officer we'd have to take him out of being worried about the criminal mind and a lot of other bugbears that have been mocked up for him these days. Quite amusing that people dream up things for police officers to worry about. Criminal mind is supposed to be an actuality—it's really supposed to exist. Well, the thing to do for a police officer would be to teach him how to handle the criminal mind and then the funny thing about it is, he would be able to be nice and pleasant and lawful with the other citizens. The wrong way to do it would be to reduce his understanding and control of the criminal mind and this would cave him in. Is that right? All right.

On an international scene, it would be necessary to bolster the Russian government's ability to control the Russian nation, to prevent war with Russia. Sounds incredible but you follow the same chain of logic out and you'll see that that is correct. Of course, we're sort of mad in that direction or something of the sort and we say, "Well, we just ought to knock the rascals out and cut them all to pieces and get it all revolting in all directions and so forth." No, that would not be the right direction.

Now, there would be a danger in partially assisting their control, right? Just partially assisting their control. Because they might come up to 1.5. So you'd have to keep punching this assistance through until he got through the blow band. You see that? You'd have to bring him up there. In other words, you'd have to assist him enough so that he would have enough reality on it so that he would come up above the level wherein he would be dangerous. Is this correct? Do you see this well?

Male voice: Yeah.

THE FIVE CATEGORIES

Well, because people were never willing to assist enough, they would run people up toward the blow band and then they decided that assistance and helping others control things was wrong. Do you see that? In other words, they didn't do it quite long enough. They didn't do it quite well enough and so they never learned it.

They would always fall short of it. The fellow would start up Tone Scale, he'd get to 1.2, 1.3 and they'd say, "This is dangerous, throw a net over his head."

We had a preclear up in New York one time; it was very interesting, every time an auditor would audit her up to 1.5 where she'd start cursing her brother and sister they would promptly get hold of her and take her into a hotel room and tie her down on the bed until she went into apathy again and this hurdy-gurdy-sandy-andy went on about five or six times. The auditor would build the girl up and so on. We finally had to have a consultation on it where we would—we shot this girl up through the anger band, didn't let her sit in it anyplace and after that, why, they thought this was fine. They were not very good at observation, they thought she was still in apathy.

Now, here we have numerous examples and I have to set them forward in this wise: the first thing I'm trying to tell you is the use of any technology to place another being into duress brings about a disaster. It doesn't matter whether it's on a large, civilized plane or individual to individual or group to group or nation to nation. And you haven't realized it but all this time I've been talking to you about a thetan.

Now let's get down to facts. We said what was Scientology addressed to. Oh, we could say generally it's addressed to other life forms and bodies and banks and the physical universe and it's all these things—it's just all of those things.

No, I am afraid we have to be factual; very factual. That thing which is the observer of the universe and other forms is a being which we call by the mathematical symbol *theta* or *a thetan*. And other people have called this thing a soul or a spirit but they got into a condition of where "my soul is over there" or "I have to take care of my soul or it will not go to heaven." In other words, they reversed on the situation. I don't know where "their soul" was. And the whole subject has been so grandly misunderstood that we have to take a fresh approach and it would be very difficult for us to take an approach without better semantics.

Even amongst ourselves here and there, somebody every now and then says, "Spirits? Oh, just the thought of having to study anything about spirits just is terrible. I mean, why do you have to bring that up?" Well, I'm sorry I have to bring it up; it would be deadly if you just sat there and looked at the subject of spirits all the time—conceiving a static. But I don't think anybody in the last 2,500 years has taken the subject up. And therefore they've got all these wild ideas about spirits and souls and religion and all kinds of other nonsense. And all of these wild ideas have made them avoid entirely this signal, single datum: that the only thing you can do is assist a spirit to control his environment. That's all you can do. You can't do anything else but that. Because anything else but that is destructive. And because you are part of that environment, you'll get included in.

And if you want to keep any kind of a show on the road in life at all, don't go around planting guys in their heads, hoping that they will then be stiff as pokers and not bother you anymore, because you'll keep falling over the corpse.

19 JULY 1957

Now, to assist the ability to control his immediate environment: in this is a tremendous—a tremendous lot of technology stems from, is grouped with that single statement.

What's a thetan? Well, we have this example which I have used a couple of times before and which I'm going to use right now. Scientology is of course addressed to the material universe and I invite you to take a look at that, would you? Would you look around and find out if there is a universe here right now.

Male voice: Yeah.

There is one here right now. Is that right?

Audience: Mm-hm.

All right. That's fine.

Now, I wish you would observe at this moment that you have a body there.

Do you have a body sitting there?

Audience: Yeah.

You got one there really?

Audience: Yeah.

All right. That is a body. Now, Scientology is addressed to the physical universe and is addressed to the body. You're sure about this body now?

Audience: Yeah. Yes.

All right, that's fine.

Now shut your eyes and get a picture of a cat. Any old cat, doesn't matter—or any picture. Got that?

Audience: Yeah.

All right, now, that picture is a mental image picture which in aggregate consists of pictures of the physical universe or pictures of the thetan's own universe and so forth. But it, in its aggregate, is *the mind*. You got the picture of the cat; all right, that's the mind.

All right, now we have the physical universe, got a body. And I call something to your attention: you've seen both of these so far haven't you? You've got a reality on both of these—and the mind, you've got a reality on that. Mind—so that's three. The mind isn't anything else, you know, but just what you just looked at—a mental image picture of one kind or another. And now let's get the picture of the cat again and answer the question, "What is looking at it?" Now, you can say "me," but just what is looking at it?

Audience: Thetan. I am.

You are. You are. And that's a thetan.

Now, this is the totality—multiplied, it is true—this room and many other parts of the universe. You know, other rooms in the universe or other minds or other bodies or other beings. Now, you have a subjective reality now on the physical universe, a body, right? A mind, and you certainly should have a reality on the fact that something was looking at it, right?

Audience: Yeah.

Well, that's *all* we mean by a *thetan*. Please. Because that, in essence, is all we can demonstrate 100 percent.

Now, these subjects as given to you, physical universe, body, mind, thetan, are each one, then, capable of a reality. Now, you heard everybody say, "Yes, I am looking at the cat," didn't you?

Audience: Yes.

So now you have a secondary or agreed-upon reality of the fact that there were other thetans in the room, right?

THE FIVE CATEGORIES

Audience: Yeah.

All right, now that is your closest approach to a reality on another thetan at this time. Let's just sort this out and see what we know about this subject, all right?

Well now, something mocked up or created or did something with something to have a universe, right?

Audience: Yeah.

And something or somethings made a body or bodies, right?

Audience: Yeah.

And something is perpetually making a mind, right?

Audience: Yeah.

All right. That's total objectivity right up to that point. Demonstrable as can be. But we said something *made* this. Now, it would be very, very limiting on our parts not to assume that you didn't have some share in this. Do you understand? That would be very limiting. See, if we said, "Well, everybody in the room but you had a—had a share in making this universe," you know? That—make a fellow feel kind of funny doesn't it? Makes him feel pretty good to get the idea, well yes, it's rather factual he did have a—he moves a body around in it, he at least shifts the scenery in it. Yes, he has some sort of a hand in the going thing called a universe. And for us to check out one person out of the whole of people and say, "He didn't" would be nonsense, wouldn't it? That would be nonsense. So we must assume that we all had a hand in it, one way or the other.

67

Now, this doesn't justify us in saying that nothing else anywhere had no hand in it. This doesn't justify us in using ourselves as a totality, does it? There might have been other beings or another being or any other way you wish to look at it, who also had a hand in it who are not at this time classifiable as thetans.

But let me point something out to you. If you never shake them by the hand, you will not have communicated with them. If you haven't communicated with them directly in all this time, the chances are pretty thin that you'll ever meet one. Pretty thin.

Now, you have met human beings and you do have, as Scientologists, a reality on the fact that they are thetan plus mind plus body plus their environment, right? Well, do you know there is no reason, to handle a problem, to assume anything else but these four factors? We don't have to go into a bunch of speculative stuff about whether or not there is an eighth dynamic or whether or not you haunt hotels after you're dead. We don't have to go into this at all. We can progress from this reality almost in the first moment of conversation with anybody we care to talk to on the face of Earth. In just exactly the order I have just talked to you.

He said, "What is this Scientology?"

You say, "Well, it's the stuff that handles all this."

And he says, "All what?"

And you say, "Well, look around."

And he says, "Well, yeah."

And you say, "You got a body there?"

"Yeah."

"Well, get a picture of a cat."

"Cat."

"All right, what's looking at it?"

"Well, I am."

19 JULY 1957

"Well, all right, that's the four factors of Scientology and those are what we handle. Thank you very much."

There isn't any place—any reason to go anyplace else. There's no reason to go into broadcloth altars or silk vestal virgins. There's no reason to go into necromancy or magic. Nor is there any reason to be appalled by any of these things, since we have found no answers that lay outside the communication level of the four things we have just talked about.

Every once in a while we run into a spook thing. Something that is a little bit—well, we're not—we don't like that too well. But do you know what it always boils down to? Thetan, mind, body, universe. Well, we say maybe we ran into something peculiar, well, it was a thetan who had never picked up a body yet or something peculiar like this. Or it was a whole track between-lives operation where thetans were given a bunch of pictures and a bunch of pictures taken away from them or something of the sort. We run into this phenomena.

Well, let me call to your attention that this does not fall outside what you have just been looking at. It is comprehensible. The only thing that stands between you and totally comprehending it is an interjection of the mystery factor, usually for purposes quite remunerative, apparently, to somebody else—which will pay him off not at all. Somebody's dropped the blinds on it and when we peek around back of the blinds, we find ourselves once more looking at thetan, mind, body, universe.

68

Now, just because this one seems so solid is no reason there isn't another one. This would be an "only one" proposition. I used to be appalled at the fact that when I was going to school (when they could rope me—they used to every once in a while; I took pity on them) they used to say that Earth was the only inhabited planet. I've read that! At the time I read that I was just appalled. I looked at this and I said *dzzz!* How come anybody would think that? The fact that there are other stars kicking around would rather indicate that it would be a freak indeed that would make only one planet habitable around one star! And I tried to argue this out—great lack of success.

Now, what—what would we have to do in order to get a reality on another sun and another planet and other races? And now we run into really the fifth factor and that fifth factor is *elsewhere*. We have to be able to assume an elsewhere. And now we have left the realm of solid reality and are in the realm of the abstract. The abstract is composed, evidently, only of elsewheres plus somebody's ideas concerning the four things we've mentioned and the elsewheres.

But when we've gone that far, the data can be so many and the proofs so few that we soar up into the most grand confusion anybody ever wished to look at. We find men who all they had to do was sit down and feel the floor, look at the wall, find out if they had a body, find out what did—the mind consisted of and wonder what it was looking at—to find, practically, the substance or the generality on anything there was to confront. And these men, with all of that to study, to look at, to realize, could actually sit around and discuss how many angels could dance upon the head of a pin.

So the study of the mind has been the study of elsewhere. And I'll tell you something. When you exclusively study elsewhere, you never get there. If you only study those things beyond the range of your experience, it is doubtful if you will ever experience them.

Now, a thetan is *a* thetan and we know what a thetan can do. We know that these mental image pictures have, actually, mass. There's an interesting

THE FIVE CATEGORIES

experiment on that. You have a fellow mock up things and shove them into his body and before you have him do that you weigh him on the scales and after he does that you weigh him on the scales and you'll find out he's increased in weight. And if that doesn't prove the mass of mental image pictures, which is the only thing that's happened in between, why, I'll go back and take psychology. Anyway. . . I'm taking it now, but quite another way. Anyway. . .

Now, there is the woof and warp of experience: the interweave of these factors; the complexity which can be discovered in the physical universe; the differences of forms; the aesthetic evaluation of what you are looking at. Rhythm, cadence, senses of time, all of these various things can enter in and make the picture adequately complex. But do you know there are people around who won't confront things just because there's nothing to confront. They think to confront something they would have to go to a war. There are fellows around—I knew a stage manager one time, he actually directed the Rockettes—interesting job, you would admit—who was begging me to go with me on an expedition to look at savage peoples so that he would have something to look at. Now, he had a bad case of elsewhere-ness, didn't he? I would say that was almost fatal. I tried to give him the expedition and swap jobs with him, but he wouldn't—he wouldn't do me that dirty a trick. He was too good a friend of mine.

So that we find people incapable of conceiving anything worth looking at where they are. They always have to be somewhere else. But in view of the fact that they can't actually be somewhere else while being where they are, they never look at anything. And I'm afraid that's all there is to it. That's basically all there is to philosophy. It's how to be elsewhere when you aren't.

Mathematics is always telling us that the end product will be elsewhere. That's the one constant answer. The barrel will fill up in twenty minutes. That's an elsewhere in time, isn't it? The barrel was full last year. Elsewhere, elsewhere.

Most mental systems, then, are elsewhere systems. What is happening over there or what will happen or what has happened. Now, in view of the fact that the past, for most people, is imperishably recorded on thinnies, they have to be able to be elsewhere at will, or the auditors will, in order to confront the past. But then how could they possibly confront the future, which isn't yet, is it? Or is it? That's a fine question, isn't it?

Now, that's about all the abstract I can use at the moment, is: is the future or isn't it? I get upset when I start running the preclears into the future and telling them, "Make it a little more solid" and they tell me what the stock market is going to read day after tomorrow—I mean, this is upsetting.

Another thing, sending preclears into the past and having them pick up and turn over and read the other side of newspapers which they didn't, then, is also upsetting.

So I would say this is just about all the mystery a fellow could use at the moment—without going elsewhere. Because this mystery is right where you are. Now, if you're stuck in the past, why, the mystery is there in the past.

Now this, fortunately, is a solvable situation. It is an observable situation, it can be confronted and processes exist which permit it to be confronted and auditing drills exist which permit preclears to be audited and so confront them. Right?

Well, there's a lot more about things I'd like to tell you, but if you look it over very carefully, you'll find the end product of them right about there.

19 JULY 1957

Now, we extend each one of these things. The physical universe you see; we could then conceive, because *it* is, the fact that there could be other universes.

Now, each of us has a body—except those two thetans up in the corner of the room—each of us has a body and ability to perceive that there are other bodies around, right? Well now, this becomes very observable that there are other bodies around. It's more observable than the fact that there may be other universes around. Got that?

Now, you can see your own mind rather easily and you can work with and get a communicated reality on somebody else's mind, can't you? But there's just one mind that you really look at, right?

Now, you know that *you* look at the mind, experience the body and experience the universe, right? And by communication, you find that others do the same thing, right? But that was by communication.

Now, three of these factors are then, by themselves, only-ones, and only expanded by means of communication. Is that right? In other words, thetan, mind, universe—they're singles, aren't they? So that bodies are plural in the reality, right? You've got a very plural reality. Now, how in the name of common sense, then, do you think there could be anything wrong with a body? I think this shows the highest form of inventiveness of a thetan. This is the one thing on which he has an observable reality, blunt and factual: that there are other bodies. That's correct, isn't it?

70

But there's only one universe that he experiences uniformly and routinely, one mind and one self. So there are three only-ones, aren't there? So you'd look for your biggest difficulty in those lines. But in view of the fact that his singularity actually doesn't bother him, except as it impedes him to conceive the multipleness of other minds—you see, if there were lots more of him, he would then be able to see lots more minds and maybe lots more universes, maybe. It's a limiting factor, the singleness of himself. Nevertheless, I don't see how he could have any trouble with himself.

He is observing, in some fashion, what he is observing. And he must be in an elsewhere state about what he's observing, not to be able to observe what there is to observe, don't you see? So if he could observe what there is to observe, then he wouldn't be in a bad state at all. It's only when he observes what there isn't to observe that we say he's in a bad state.

So we limit the things that could be wrong, then, to the mind and the universe. I seriously doubt if there's anything wrong with a thetan or a thought. I don't think, at a cursory glance, there's any such thing as aberrated thought. I think there would be an aberrated confrontingness, an elsewhere-ness. He is looking at something else while he thinks he is somewhere else.

So this boils it down to the fact that the mind, then, must be somehow or another at fault here. He must be able to have the mind in several places. But if that's the case, then the other factor at fault would be the physical universe around him—this would be at fault then too because of its singleness. But the mind has been carefully taking pictures of this in order to make it multiple. Which comes down to the singleness of the physical universe as the single aberrative factor. Therefore objective auditing is always more successful than subjective auditing or auditing directly addressed to the thetan.

And if you don't follow that very clearly and if you haven't got that entirely straight, how by the singleness of the universe . . . See, the mind has multiplied that universe and so itself has a multiple factor. The only singleness we find is the singleness of the thetan, the singleness of the universe. So

THE FIVE CATEGORIES

it must be a fight between the thetan and the universe and there's lots more of the other things. Got it? So the only scarcities there could be would be the scarcity of the universe and the scarcity of self. And I don't think there could be very much wrong with thinkingness. Thinkingness doesn't audit very well. It either audits totally, which is to say, you just get the fellow to confront what there is to confront and that's that, or it really doesn't audit at all. You just change the things it can confront and it has a better opinion of itself.

So it boils down to the fact that Objective Process is the best processes. And if you haven't gotten this straightened out, why, play the lecture back. I'm not sure that I understand it myself.

Thank you very much.

Thank you.

CONTROL

A lecture given on 22
July 1957

All right, this is the sixth lecture of the 18th ACC, the date?

Male voice: Twenty-second.

Twenty-second of July, 1957. The subject of this lecture is control.

As I have said already, control is a dirty word. Freud stuff has no word in it as nasty as control. But let me invite you, if you're going into the subject of control with somebody, to follow this sort of a routine. Now you see, we use a control-type auditing in processing in Scientology and before they wince or leap sideways of—you can say, "Have you ever been controlled by anybody?" They say "*sssaarruugglll*," froth at the mouth, lie down. Scrape them off the sidewalk, stand them up again and say, "Well, now how would you like that area of your life decontrolled so that *you can recontrol it?*" (And we have two new words "decontrol" and "recontrol" and both of them are done by control.) And that's the truth.

An individual who has been made to resist control winds up allergic to control. And if he is allergic to it he's dead, because there isn't anything you can do with anything except in some fashion or another view it or control it. If there's anything else that you can do besides—well, I should say sense it—view it, sense it or control it, it would be, be controlled *by* it. And any old Scientologist knows this thing about the one-way flow: if a flow flows too long in one direction it has a tendency to dam up and fix. And it is only necessary to reverse that to unfix the situation, don't you see?

So we go back into *Scientology*, I think 8-80, on two-way flows—and we understand this control situation at once. It is a very simple thing to knock somebody out by the use of one of these two-way flow things. You get a person getting the idea of flowing something out away from him for a while and he flows this out away from him for a while and all of a sudden he goes "wog." Now it is only necessary for him to make that something flow the other way toward him for a little while, just a mental idea of flowing, you know, and flow toward him for a little while for him immediately to wake up. If you have somebody who is putting up mock-ups out in front of him and he starts to go unconscious you only need have him put them in back of him and his unconsciousness disappears, which is quite remarkable.

Well, a thetan who is totally devoted to controlling things and who is not himself in any way to be controlled runs into this same phenomena. The phenomena gets in his road very, very much. Well, if this is the case then you can see at once why control of a preclear is necessary. If he has fought the

22 JULY 1957

control going out it is only because it has gone out too long. Don't tell me that a thetan can actually be upset by a miscontrol or a bad 8-C. I think that is just an objection. I think that is just an objection. I think he could take it rather easily providing he himself didn't have a stuck flow on it. If he himself had not done so much controlling of mental image pictures, which is to say the mind, the body, objects in the environment, if he had not done so much of this then there would be no stuck outward flow.

So somebody comes along and controls him *well* and he objects—much less bad 8-C. But of course bad control, that is, bad placement and bad handling and so on, naturally gets ferociously on his nerves *if* he already has a stuck outflow. Do you see that? He would not pay any attention at all to it if there wasn't a well-worn route. And it starts to come back and it starts to knock him out and he doesn't like it so he fights.

And a flow which flows—there's a little interesting thing here—a flow which flows a certain time in one direction tends to continue to flow until it is totally jammed or stopped. Now it's just the phenomenon of flow all by itself. A flow flowing long enough in one direction in the mind eventually flows harder and harder, not easier and easier. Why? Why? This is only true when energy is being employed.

And the more an individual outflows energy the more vacuum he creates on his side of the flow. And he's creating a nice little vacuum there, and the more he flows out, the more hole he leaves in the Swiss cheese called the bank. And eventually something is trying to pull that back in. He's got a missingness, don't you see, now, in the energy masses immediately surrounding him, and it itself tries to fill itself up by pulling back on the same line. And it's like taking a rubber band and just stretching it further and further and further—*nnnnrrrrrrnnuh*—well, now the analogy is not too good because what happens eventually is it just sticks. His effort to hold it out there is so great that he can only hold it motionlessly out there. And he's got it stuck. All of a sudden somebody comes along and they threaten to joggle it a little bit and that hole where he is tends to fill up too rapidly; he says, "No!" and he sticks it out there harder, and somebody joggles it and it again tends to snap in. He says, "No," and he puts it out there. I'm afraid the solution lies in these two data: one, you can't hurt a thetan and two, the worst that would happen on the snap back is that the bank would disarrange in some fashion and leave him with not so many pretty pictures.

But that flow is ordinarily undertaken by noncreated energy; that is to say, he himself didn't create the energy, he collected it one way or the other, you see. He got the energy from other sources on a misownership and other things that he packed it around. Then he used that energy, you see; one eats and then he makes his vocal cords run—you get the idea? Well, he has just so much energy deposit around the voice, he gets his vocal cords running, and he runs himself down. He eventually will have an actual vacuum right in the vicinity of his voice box. And if he talks too long he talks exhaustedly. Got that? And then he's got a hole there and it's a hungeriness for energy and all of this talk is out there on a strung-out ridge of one kind or another. Somebody goes "*snap*" at it, it snaps back on him, and every now and then we get the actual phenomena—what I'm talking about would be entirely baffling to anybody who studied only in the field of mysticism, such as psychiatry and so forth. Other mystic studies. I didn't mean to malign any mystics, my apologies.

But there is an actual electrical phenomena, a whole series of phenomena, which occur in the field of thinkingness and these things have been

observed to have sufficient violence that a person holding the electrodes on an E-Meter has had an explosion occur somewhere in the vicinity of his hands, enough to knock a hole in his hands and the can. That's how bad that one has gotten. We all know of some of these.

Now here's another one. An individual every once in a while gets a tremendous explosion in front of his face or up on top of his head or something like this. And he says, "*Ppplluh*, what was that, *uulllhhhl* Spooks, wizards, I'm being attacked, something's happening." No, nothing happened, he just got too much potential and he got a stuck flow out there, that's all. And one day, somebody wiggled this potential and it went "*snap*" and you got a complete electronic display. Anybody playing around with such things as electric shocks or anything like this is just being incredibly stupid, because it's the wrong wavelength in the first place. That's a very gross wave action.

But we look at this thing, of this tremendous electrical phenomena which surrounds the being, and we find that mental image pictures are themselves built of energy, they are not some imaginary thing. I love the introduction and use of this word *imaginary*, as it means "nonenergy, nonreal, nonexistent, couldn't possibly be handled." It's an operation, the use of that word *imaginary*. Well, this fireplace, of course, is imaginary up here and this microphone is imaginary and the current coming out of that and running that tape recorder, they're all imaginary too if that's the case. See, you'd just have to consider them all imaginary. Actually same order of thing.

Every once in a while we run into somebody who has had some one of these experiences of one kind or another. It was a hot day and he sat down and he was going to rest and he did and all of a sudden—*boom!* Something blew up. He said, "Good heavens, I'm being attacked. Some mysterious thing is shooting at me." Well, the mysterious thing shooting at him was this: he was on a high level of activity and he kept pushing out energy and he created a vacuum, an energy vacuum. And he sat down, all of a sudden, and rested. See, and he made a no-potential where he is. And he gets according electrical phenomena.

You can produce practically the same phenomena with any electrical current or various electrical gimmicks of one kind or another: resistors and condensers and so forth. And the electronic engineer can produce this reaction very easily with a condenser. But his ideas of condensers are rather strange too. He thinks you keep pumping electricity into a condenser until it fills up and eventually it discharges in some fashion or another.

Well, we don't know whether it has capacity or not; that's just a handy word to use. But we do know that the electric eel (known as a thetan) does have some funny electrical phenomena which are not any different than the electrical phenomena in life. And this is not unusual because a thetan after all is part and parcel to this universe, and the stuff he sees around him and the currents and so forth were probably at one time or another generated by life.

I want to cause you to think this over just a little more closely and you realize that the current running in that tape recorder at this moment is converted or generated by some life form at one time or another in the past. It's probably, by the way, running on coal, and coal is a bunch of life forms of one kind or another, and they got all condensed and so on. Oh, the cars in the streets are out there, they're running on what somebody would foolishly call "life energy." It's not life energy, it'd be energy stored by, converted by or generated by life forms. But it is processed in some fashion, that's the most

22 JULY 1957

that we could adventure with a total certainty, and because it's been processed then it's burnable and heat can be released and you have heat converting into a mechanical action, you've got electrical current flowing up the line, tape recorder runs. Got that?

Well, a person's need to be warm and all of that is quite amazing. I mean, that's one of the sillier things. A thetan does much better in absolute zero than he does in a hot room. But he gets accustomed to this and he says, "I need this," and he starts converting energy, one way or the other. He does some interesting things with it.

Well, the second he starts to handle energy he gets all of the phenomenon of electricity, of course: all the phenomena of electricity are there or he wouldn't have any need of eating or anything of this sort, I mean. I could strain at the point very hard to prove this, and I don't know why I should except for this one thing: it's almost totally overlooked. Well now, that this applies to the mind then should come as a shock to nobody. That it wouldn't apply to the mind at all should be a tremendous piece of balderdash. I mean, that would be a real swindle to say, "Well, no real living being has anything to do with energy, you know. And thinking has nothing to do with energy, you know." That'd be nonsense.

Well, if it has anything to do with energy then there are certain energy laws it obeys and the things I'm talking about are some of them. Now every once in a while when somebody is running Tone 40 on an Object with shouting, he keeps carving a hole in the bank. He carves a hole in the bank and all of a sudden he gets an explosion of some sort or another. He really feels caved in on, he gets all disarranged. He won't shout and can't shout elegantly because he's afraid that's going to happen. So in training we don't do processing, we just let him shout it out and if it's going to happen, it's going to happen, and if it doesn't happen it doesn't happen, and so what. We at least get him over the agony of suspense.

Now the voice of course is a natural for a stuck flow. It talks in one direction, one direction, one direction, one direction, and after a while a fellow can't talk very much it's so hard. Now you think it's because your voice gets rough or your throat constricts or some other odd explanation—the cells are mad at you in the larynx or something of the sort. But actually all it is is this electronic disturbance.

Now if you were real smart in handling electricity and—get this—you thought you had to handle it in order to speak, that's necessary too, all you could—have to do is mock up a block of spare electricity out here in a motionless form, stick it in your voice box and your hoarseness would cease. Now you can do that on a cruder way by just mocking up hoarse voices. All you're doing—the significance is meaningless. Just stick hoarse voices, larynxes or something in there, and all of a sudden your sore-throatedness would be at end.

Well, with the shouting you carved a hole and the stuck flow got out there and it's probably already very beautifully stuck; you give it just one more clip and it goes smash! See? All right.

Now other electrical phenomena contain engrams. There are many experiences and each experience in life is represented by a mental image picture of one kind or another which contains real energy, which has real potential, which is measurable in terms of current; and meters which measure current, measures the potential in these facsimiles. And furthermore, they have mass; you can remedy somebody's havingness, have him mock up these things, or shove these things in, you can increase a person's weight. And there are

many experiences which in themselves—and this is what's confusing—contain electrical catastrophes. In other words, you not only can have mental image catastrophes just on handling the phenomena, getting explosions and things like that, but you can also do this one: you can have pictures of catastrophes which when run out give you a repeat of the catastrophe.

Now there's an old experience on the track known as blanketing; most any GE bank has got a blanketing in it one way or the other. And sometimes a person has unwittingly been using the energy contained in this blanketing. And they exhaust the energy out of the blanketing, little by little, little by little by little, and then they find they have to work harder and they have to keep keyed-up more and more and they have to keep working harder and harder. And then all of a sudden they say, "I can't do it anymore," make some such postulate, sit down and suddenly rest, *boom!* See what happens? You just get a recurrence of the same phenomena of blanketing. It's something on the order of an electric shock.

Psychiatry—I don't intend to say anything nasty about psychiatry for the rest of the course, but all they're doing is dramatizing this type of phenomena. They're not curing anything, they're just dramatizing. And they're dramatizing mainly a blanketing of one kind or another. Blanketing was just—all a being did was throw an electrical sheet of energy over another being evidently and there was a nice resounding boom.

Now there's many ways to do this, you can produce all sorts of electrical phenomena which affect beings, all sorts. They haven't begun to dream of the number of ways by which a being could be influenced by electrical phenomena. One could say that's about the closest thing there is to infinity, the number of ways a being could be influenced by electrical phenomena. They are just numberless and they all obey the same laws. Fascinating, isn't it?

Now of course you can go back and wipe out all those considerations and make a bunch of new considerations and get another series of electrical phenomena on another track, but people haven't done that. They are still operating on this electrical phenomena.

All right, if they are so operating, and if these laws hold good, then you in processing can command the obedience of this phenomena. And one of the phenomena is the stuck flow of control. People usually control other things by energy. They control by energy, control by energy, control by energy; they don't control by postulate, they usually control by energy. And they control, control, control, and then one day they control just a little bit more by energy and they decide they can't control things anymore. Now there is no other reason to it than electrical phenomena. There isn't, "Well, I failed too many times to control it so I guess I cannot control it anymore." No. They just had to try too hard and had to outflow too much and had to work at it too hard and they pushed in one direction too long and they got a stuck flow. And there it is, stuck. And if you could see a picture of this fellow's bank it would have, actually, electrical phenomena showing these various stuck flow. All right.

Practically all flows are aimed in the direction of a control and control is start, change and stop. Starting things, changing things and stopping things, then, become stuck flows. Now you come along as an auditor, you start giving somebody some heavy control. Now listen, somebody may have controlled his bank; somebody may have—unwittingly you know, tell him a bunch of horror stories or other things, the way they amuse little kiddies; that's the best method of control is get them to read something like "Little Orphan Annie" and other Eugene Fields masterpieces. Anyway, they have controlled his bank

22 JULY 1957

in some fashion, they've controlled his body. But wait a minute, nobody's ever controlled him, not worth a nickel.

That's why we're successful in Scientology, it's nobody has ever controlled the *being*. They have controlled the *products* of the being, but never the being. Got that? Thank you, I see you heap savvy that. Well, if this is the case we are going to produce results, that's for sure. Because one of the things we do is back up this stuck flow of control. A thetan has been going all this time in the universe, a being, controlling things, and very few things have ever controlled him. He has a tendency to snap in on himself those times when he has been controlled, bad or good. And hence you get these various phenomena. The service facsimile and so forth find their basic residence in just that fact alone. The individual is on a total outflow of control, control, control so the closest things he gets to him are things that seek to remedy this back flow.

Oh, people will sit around by the hour and tell you about tough first sergeants they heard of once and, you know, they just hope that these people never controlled the being himself, they merely controlled the bank in some fashion. This idea of "train them until they develop an automatic response" has practically saturated the universe. They don't ever train the guy. In the first place they didn't even know who the fellow was. No, get some kind of an automaticity in the bank. The whole ideas of training are completely erroneous, because they think if they get some kind of an automaticity going in the bank then this fellow, like a wound-up doll, can thereafter drive cars and tanks and general armies and do other nonsensical things. You see that?

78

The whole idea is just build it up so it's all automatic; in other words, make a bunch of response pictures, and after that have him go off like a little wound-up doll. And it doesn't work. But everybody thinks it works. So that is the target usually of education, and that's why you're at odds with education at large; education, just ponderous—memorize it, memorize it, don't ever bother to apply anything, just memorize it, memorize it and memorize it, memorize. Don't do anything with it, memorize it, memorize it—"Oh, it doesn't—has no useful application, Mr. Jones, this is calculus." "Well, why are you studying differential equations? Because you'll need them to graduate."

You see, if they could just install enough patterns in the fellow, why, he'd function after that, he'd be civilized. And you get all these misnomers. Well, they all come about from this thing of nobody has ever addressed the being, they didn't even know who he was.

All right, now you come along and you start to control *him* with Tone 40 auditing, see. They're going straight through. And after a while he says, "I wonder if any of that is addressed to me? Could it be that some of that is addressed to me? In the first place, they're not asking me to store up any of this in the bank, but quite the contrary I'm supposed to do it every time, me. 'Give me your hand.' Does the fellow mean me because I don't see anything around here that will give me—give him my hand. I don't see anything around here. Well, maybe if he does this often enough he's going to install a machine and after that my hand will do this."

And then it doesn't, because by sheer duplication you can utterly ruin any machinery. The one thing that mental machinery cannot do is exactly duplicate. Now people don't believe that, they say, the one thing that machinery does is duplicate. Oh, no it doesn't duplicate. Each time it's got to have a little curve on it, it's got to be just a little tiny bit different. Only a thetan can duplicate, he's the only one that can stand the stress and strain of it. So duplication enters into this thing with this heavy control and he finds out at

last there's nothing can stand up to it but himself. So he must be the one who is being controlled. Thus he works it out and you get a back flow of control. That's all there is to it. And then he finally decides, "Well, a back flow came in and even though there was a small explosion, or nothing happened, I found out that I could stand it. I could take it and nothing particular happened. And I wonder if there's any real consequence to this at all."

And he finds out there's no great consequence to it so he becomes willing to control something. That's more or less a crude explanation of how control works when used in auditing. All right, we examine this very carefully, then, and we find out that control is senior to energy. Energy is the servant of control, not the end goal of control. It could be made so. But energy is energy and if it was just floating around doing nothing it would be chaos, if there was no direction to it, providing one can conceive of energy without an observer of the energy, which is doubtful.

All right, now if we take this idea of energy flows as the only method by which anything can be controlled, we've had it. There is the make-break point of a life or a lifetime. That's why electronics boys have a rough time. They're using too much and too long energy to control things and they are seeking to control energy only, which they themselves cannot even see.

All right, here we have a strata above energy. There is such a thing as controlling by postulate and there is such a thing as a mass without energy. There is such a thing as a mass without fields, there can be a mass with no energy and it is not true that that wall is composed of little things that wiggle. It is not composed of space with an idea or anything of the sort—an idea of little particles. It is simply itself, it is a mass. For heaven's sakes, let's get down to cases. Let's not try to say, "That mass has no mass," which is what physics finally got itself into and it got itself into this so deep it'll never dig itself out; dead science right this minute. Because when it advanced into "higher physics" it said, "That mass has no mass." Make mystics out of the lot of them.

I imagine every school of mysticism of the past was founded on a bunch of disgruntled physicists who had made this postulate. Now, that's a reverse postulate. It's all right to say there's nothing there—there is something there, and behold it. See. But now there is something there and we say nothing is there without banishing that and we are in trouble, because we're telling a lie.

Now let's get isness straight. This universe is real, it *is*. The universe is totally real; the floor is the floor, the ceiling is the ceiling. It *is*. And if you went around saying it was is, it would become less and less offensive to you. But if you go around on a second postulate and, while holding firmly in mind that it is, you say, "It isn't," you not-is it, you say, "It isn't, it isn't"—"Well, take that wall, 'tisn't. No floors; floors are very simple, they aren't." Now the least silly of this is they are really composed of little wiggle-wiggles. I don't know how this is, see, but there are little wiggle-wiggles that go around the wiggle-woggles.

And they sound fancy titles, there's nuclei and spooklei and electrons and molecules and, oh, they get all sorts of things. Undoubtedly you can work out matter in these ways. You can say that it does fall apart and various electronic things occur but this doesn't say it was made of it. Because it produces the phenomena does not mean that it is the phenomena.

Now get this as a truism, as a good thing to keep in mind. Because a thing makes something it is not the thing. Because you can make energy is

22 JULY 1957

no reason you're energy. And because that wall over there can make electrical fields when treated properly is no reason that it's an electrical field. And so you can of course disintegrate a wall and get all sorts of phenomenon, benomanas and other things out of it, don't you see? You could get a wall to shed almost anything including dog hair if you were good enough at mock-ups. But that's what advanced physics is doing today, they're trying to get walls to shed dog hairs. Well, it's just about as nonsensical as that.

Now in other words, this wall over here is, and don't ever think it isn't, it is. If your body runs into that wall it'll go thump! I guarantee that. Well now, if your body goes into the wall and goes thump then we have to admit two isnesses: the isness of your body and the isness of the wall. And some fellows with more feelings than others would admit a third: the thump.

Now here is this state of being, then: a tremendous continuing postulate of isness, existence, stuck by the effort to take it away. It sticks on the effort to take it away because one has called himself a liar; and about all you can ever do is deny yourself. In other words, we said it is, we all agreed that it is, everybody agrees that he had some part in it. The walls, he sees the walls, he made the walls, they are, various things can be done with these things, we're all set, it's all agreed upon; now let's go around and say, "It isn't." Now that we've all agreed upon this 100 percent, it isn't. Boy, that's a wonderful way to make something just stick. And so you see the wall sticking.

80

Now a wonderful way to get into a trap is to say, "Well, that is a trap," dive in head first and then say, "It's not a trap. It's not a trap, not a jail." And walk out the door and say, "Any time I want. . ." *Clank!* Well, you say, "Well, look, I kind of mocked this up in the beginning, I don't know why I can't get out of the doors easily," clank! No, you would have to say, "The jail is" without protest, because the original postulate of the jail was made without protest. The protest came later. You see that?

Now you can vary and alter and do all sorts of things, change MEST, electricity, anything you want without too much liability. It does get harder and harder to conceive of exactly where and when it was made up and so make a perfect duplicate. But that's the only thing that happens to it. It's when you say that it isn't that you start to go blind, see, as a thetan. And then you say, "That wall isn't." This is actually the total reason 8-C and other processes are so good. You just make the fellow go around and say, "It is. It is. It is. It is. It is. It is. It is." Everything brightens up and everything's liable to become solider and stronger and more massive and more massive and more massive and more massive and more massive and less massive and less massive—where's the wall? And then he says, "Well, I can adjust that myself." So he has a feeling that he could adjust solids rather than solids adjust him.

Well now, that's the basic control of the universe: it is. One controls something by holding it in existence, doesn't he? That's a part of control, isn't it? Just by holding something in existence he is controlling it. Well, supposing one is busily holding something in existence and then says, "I'm not holding it in existence anymore." While he is holding it he tells everybody he isn't holding it. Oh wow! All sorts of interesting things could occur from that point on, couldn't they? Well, we're not interested in how many things could occur because they are numberless. But we are interested in this factor of control.

The universe fixed in place is actually not in a state of stop, it's in a state of change, isn't it? But one must be continuously starting it and then it

CONTROL

changes. So "Start the wall" if run should produce some rather interesting phenomena, as I think some of you have learned. It's obviously stopped, isn't it? Well, this is just another little hooker on the material universe. We are starting it all the time and then changing it. All right, if we're starting it all the time and then changing it, and if we sit around and conceive that it is stopped, boy, is it solid. So you see all sorts of control mechanisms can be built into things, even this universe.

But look, if you're holding it in position all that time it must be, if you use energy to do it, a sort of stuck flow. So somebody comes along and controls *you* to some degree, reaches *you* who are very busy at this and what happens? Well, you've either got to blow up complete or find out that you can rise above energy. You have two choices there, and as a thetan can't blow up complete, the only thing left to him to do is rise above energy. Do you see how that would be?

Well control then even enters into this thing called creation: create and control are right next door to each other. If an individual cannot suffer control himself, his ability to create is rather doomed. He may be frantically creating, he may be trying like mad to create something, but it doesn't mean he's going to keep on very long. He's going to hit that stuck flow. Now, if he's creating with postulates and not with energy flows he could go on forever. And so we will go into the number one trick of control used in this universe on a thetan.

Do you want to know what this number one trick is? It is to make the thetan make a postulate that he himself can be damaged; that is, he has to make a postulate that he can be damaged. He has to think that himself. He can be damaged, he has to think. But a postulate all by itself wouldn't accomplish the job at all, and the modern method of wrapping this up as a complete trap is to make him conceive that he is energy, then damage the energy so as to make the thetan conceive that he has been damaged. Now I'll go over that again. You have to make him conceive that he is energy and that the energy can be damaged, by which he then has it proven to him that he has been damaged. Do you see that?

You can only damage a person thoroughly and enormously by making this identification between a spirit and energy and mass. Now if you make a total identification there you've got it—you've got it made. That's the number one trick. I'm not now talking about communism, psychology or phrenology or nonsense. I'm just talking to you *fact*. This then is a number one operation: it's to make a thetan conceive that he is energy and nothing else. And has no other capabilities than energy and then damage the energy with punishment of one kind or another, and this convinces him that he is damaged and so therefore convinces him that he can't postulate and he can't function and he can't do this and he can't do that, see? And we—"can't do's" get formed out of this mechanical action. You have a thetan conceive he's that chair, have him believe he's the chair utterly, that he's the same fabric as the chair or is the chair itself. And then you go over and bust the chair in half, and say, "See, you're broken." And he says, "Yeah, I guess I am." See how that would be?

So he could get all sorts of wild ideas from this association with energy. Therefore, any psychotherapy, practice of philosophy or activity concerning the mind is *doomed to failure and will not and cannot work if it is based on the premise that man is mass*. You understand that? All you'd have to do is look this over and say, "Well, do they conceive man to be mass? Yes, they do.

22 JULY 1957

Well, it doesn't work." That's all there is to it, just doesn't work. It's an operation then, isn't it?

The only reason Scientology works is because it disabuses him of this fact and that is the only reason it works. It's addressed to the being and if we were going around fixing up bodies thinking that man was a body and neurons, automaticities, curved in with neurons and that made a cross-circuit of synapses and all of it was a bunch of calves' brains which were jellied or something of this sort and that ran an automaticity in the left leg and that was why he stamped and what his reactions were, we would say at once, "Can't work. Can't work." Because it is using and confirming this identification. Now if you go on confirming this identification you wind up with a total unworkability. Because that is the basic misidentification necessary to damage a thetan or put him downscale.

So if one just continues to confirm that, going around telling everybody, "You know, you're an animal, and animals don't have souls and you're just a bunch of neurons and conditioned reflexes and you're just mass and you came from mud. And one day there was a big sea of mud and somehow or other you spontaneously combusted and now you're frogs' legs." You know, you just go around, "Yam-yam-yam-yam-yam, please, please believe me, please believe me, please be slaves, please be slaves, please die, die, die because I can't confront any of you." Got the idea? Those are all synonyms.

There speaks a man in *terror* who tells all other men that they are MEST.

82

Now the thetan who is convinced he's that chair can provenly be damaged; but a thetan cannot be damaged. So all you'd have to do, really, is disassociate the idea that a thetan was energy, and you've got about 99 percent of his case right there. You could even go through a chant like this, you could make the—run Rising Scale Processing, get the guy Svengalied somehow into actually thinking the thoughts you wanted him to think without any other preliminary and just say, "I am energy, I'm not energy," you see. "I am energy, I'm not energy. I changed my mind, I'm not energy, I am energy, I am energy, that's for sure," you know. "No, I am not energy," you know. Getting him to get these two postulates, get him working until you've got him shaken up real good and he would go away *a* changed man. You didn't change any bank at all, don't you see? In other words, you just shake up, don't even cure the idea but just shake up this idea that he—and put some divine question into his mind and you've changed his case. That's very far from a lot of processing.

Well, he's controlled so much energy that he himself thinks that he better obey the laws of energy and get stuck in energy. And that's why he gets stuck on energy, he thinks he is energy, he's gone through this proposition "If I produce something I am the thing," see, and "if I have a lot to do with energy then by association"—which everybody knows is the clue to everything, you just associate until you disassociate and then you go to university and study psychology, anyhow. This situation gets into a stuck flow and the second you start to process *him*, not an energy mass, you start to process *him*, he starts to disconnect from all this energy without really wrecking his havingness. Because I don't think you can hurt a thetan's hav-ingness, it's just another idea he's got, don't you see? Havingness works because it exercises his connection with energy. It makes him re-postulate it, you know, until he just wears out a whole flock of postulates and then he feels much better. He says, "Well, I can have anything." Well, that's interesting that he can *have* anything.

You take some fellow who's being a bedpost and if you could say, "Get some things you could have," and he finally finds some things he could have and first thing you know he says, "You know, I could have all this."

You say, "Are you a bedpost?"

He'd say, "No, what a silly idea."

You see this, this is a direct ratio then. Well, you'd have to convince a fellow he was energy before you could damage him. But of course with that goes the postulate that he could be damaged. Got that? Well, he very often sets up the postulate that he could be damaged so as to damage the other guy by example. Somebody said, "Hell was paved with good intentions." It's not paved with good intentions, it's paved with setting an example. I know, I had one of the paving bricks one time and went over it microscopically. It was an example. You say, "Look what you have done to me you brute," see? "You have slaughtered me."

Fellow says, "What? A living being can be slaughtered? My, that's a new thought." And he goes off worrying about this, "Let's see, he can be slaughtered," and you pick yourself up, dust yourself off and you say, "Ha-ha, I guess I got that guy."

Then one day you do it so often that you forget to get the guy or you run into too many others that convinced you. And it's just a method of going into agreement. You set an example of being damaged, then other people set you an example of being damaged, then you agree with the first time you were damaged because you hung somebody with that and suppressed it, and the next thing you know we got a nice agreement that we can all be damaged. Hence, downscale on cases, difficulty of processing, all these things, actually stem from these rather stratospheric postulates and activities which may or may not be reachable directly by an auditor. They can certainly be attacked on a gradient scale and that's where they're going. But if they could be reached just like that, why, you'd just have your one-shot, one-instant Clear, you know, boom!

Well, now, this whole matter of "I am energy, energy can be damaged, I can be damaged" is actually a necessary channel to create a good, solid slave society. Now a fellow who is energy cannot get out of a skull, because energy can't get out of a skull. Try to pass a lead pencil sometimes through a piece of cardboard and you'll see what I'm talking about. A person who can't get out of a skull must be to some degree conceiving himself to be the content of the skull, so he's trying to push his brains outside the skull or something of the sort when you tell him to exteriorize. And it's rather painful, it gives him headaches. Sits in there, you know, kicking brain out through the skull side, his idea of exteriorization.

But this individual who is doing this is actually in no great danger. He couldn't be in any danger, he couldn't be damaged, his abilities couldn't be lessened; we've already demonstrated that it's *impossible* to reduce an ability. About the only thing you can do is reduce its exercise or the willingness to exercise it. For instance, I know some processes, all you have to do is tell the preclear to look at the wall and mock up a mock-up, and over his dead body and muchly to his surprise he mocks up a three-dimensional, total brilliance, total mass mock-up the size of the wall and he sits there looking at it saying, "Yes, I did that. Yes, I did that." And sometimes takes him a day or two to get the facility turned off—worries him. He could do that? Well, he wasn't willing to do it.

Now some preclear that you run across who's not willing to be any better

22 JULY 1957

than he is, he merely says so, but that's a circuit composed of his wife or somebody, and you make him better and he gets worse, and you make him better and he gets worse, and you make him better and he gets worse—he's going through some kind of a cyclic action. But in no case were you processing the preclear where you had any real difficulty with the preclear. You were processing an energy mass one way or the other. And processing the energy mass, you're giving him the commands through, the commands are echoed by an energy mass which moves around. And so then you process the energy mass some more and so on. You can just go back and forth with this game just almost endlessly. Until you process the person directly you can process nothing.

Well, a tremendous process of course was "Be three feet back of your head." But the fellow was so surprised—get that, because that is, although this thetan can be damaged sort of thing and so on is all interesting *ways* he can be damaged, you know, *ways* that the damage can then occur after he's associated himself with energy and so forth—he also has all plotted out in orders of seniority, and top amongst these is surprise. I can make anybody go out of control and actually make his body just start flip-flopping madly, just by making him run on a process that isn't a process which addresses surprise. I'll tell you the process. Process, very simple process: Mock up somebody and have him be surprised, and just have him do that. And he says, "I'm feeling nervous now," and you just say, "Well, mock up somebody and have him be surprised." The next thing you know, why, he's got all of his clamps about surprise off and all of the surprise that was on more or less automatic in full restim. And he'll just flip-flop all over the place. All right, surprise is one of the methods by which energy could be damaged because he gets that associated with the blow and he has all sorts of interesting mechanisms figured out. But we have to have these basic mechanisms first: one, that he can be damaged and, two, that he is energy. And if we've got those we've got it all made. He can be damaged, that is to say, "I can suffer," and so forth.

84

Christianity, for instance, went ashore on the rocks of this same thing; although they were addressing the spirit rather broadly they actually brought in this mechanism called "hell." And there were seven hells originally, and these various hells were all places where thetans could be damaged. But they did this very interestingly: they said, "lour soul," which of course made the other operation, you were energy. You were energy and you've got a soul and you mustn't let *it* go to hell. Now, that's the score. Punishment was entered in—a damage.

Now that wasn't anywhere near as bad an operation, however, as this dialectic materialism-psychology mess that we've inherited in our modern times. Science is going straight ahead on the rocks of "Man is energy, man is mass." They're being very, very "thud" about it. At least Christian practices and so forth were—had a via on it; they said he could be damaged, and you will go to hellfire and you will burn forever and so forth. And they said, "Your soul will go." They still had some spirit in it so there must have been some recoveries of one kind or another and I am more or less prone to believe some of the miracles which occurred in the early days of Christianity—in spite of the several Christian churches which now offer large prizes to anyone who can prove that any miracle ever occurred. They say these miracles were never possible. Well, it was founded on miracles.

If you were just to convince somebody that he was a spirit, that he did

CONTROL

not have a soul, but he *was* a spirit, just like that and nothing else, you're liable to get a miracle. You're just liable to get one. Every few hundred people all of a sudden, somebody'd walk suddenly or do something, you see. Why, he would slip all the way out of being energy, being damaged, to being himself. You just slip him out through that lineup and you get a miracle; rather easy thing to do. Sudden recoveries of sight would be the easiest miracles to actually perform in that wise because the only thing that would blind a thetan would be energy masses while he considered himself an energy mass.

All right, therefore we have—as we look over this scene, we have control of the spirit as being the highest button of control or processing. Control of the spirit which would be rather direct. And I think that we, without mumbo jumbos and lots of vias, witch-doctoring and all that sort of thing, I think that we have come to a point where we can come very close to doing this quite directly. We can control a spirit. Then the moment that he himself sees that he is controlled and that he is not energy and so on, and sees that he can receive control, communicate and respond to it, he certainly will pull out of the morass just *swssst!* And it should, as we get more and more practiced at it, happen fast. Tone 40 works well for some people and works rather poorly for some people. Well, it's all the direction that it is directed. It has a lot to do with the goal of the auditor and his understanding of what he is trying to do with that process.

But we are probably the first—and this doesn't even include Buddhism—we're probably the first to overtly address this problem very directly and without superstition or mumbo jumbo or the feeling that the gods or whales were going to come down and eat us up because we did something directly to a being, an individual, conceiving him at the same time to be what he is, which we call a thetan and conceiving at the same time that he is not space or energy or mass and that he continues to exist along a time track. And the direct control of this is our direct goal. And when a person can be controlled then he *can* control. And when he sees there is no two-way flow involved in it he's got it made. Therefore I think we're pretty much there, if I can articulate it to you as I have done this evening.

Thank you.

THE STABILITY OF SCIENTOLOGY

A lecture given on 23 July
1957

I don't know why it is but you all look brighter tonight.

Female voice: Good.

Oh, you took that as a compliment—that was because I had some auditing, not because you did.

And this is the seventh lecture of the 18th ACC, July 23, 1957. And we have to cover some very, very important material tonight having to do with auditing.

Auditing is a practice, not an art. Any objections? Psychotherapy in the past has always been an art. Definition of art: something about which nobody knows anything. Anything is an art which can't be defined.

Someday we'll tackle the field of aesthetics and after that, why, we will be able to practice aesthetics. Up to this time we're entrapped by them—we merely experience them.

The entirety of Scientology today so far as its practice is concerned could be considered to be a *fait accompli*, certainly a productive practice when done exactly as it is supposed to be done.

Now this doesn't say that there isn't a field of Scientology today that doesn't go up into the field and the high stratosphere, the ionosphere, the sunosphere of unknown. Because it definitely does. The unknown is still there. But where? Above Homo novis. And that's a pretty good place for it to be. From the grave—cheerful place, worms live there—to birth—there may be a few spots that aren't quite spotted, there might be a few places where you've been where I haven't. But wherever these are, I can assure you of this: we know how to handle them on a MEST, human, *Homo sapiens* and even Homo novis level. We know how to handle these things.

Now wherever any subject achieves a high and invariable workability it achieves at the same time a stability. And the stability becomes an area of practice rather than speculation. We know certain things can occur if certain things are done.

Knew a cook once—she was a bride for many, many years. Every dish she did was experimental. And she hung on in agony expecting somebody sooner or later to praise a dinner. And one day it was discovered that she never followed the recipe she had executed before; she never cooked the same dish twice. Every dish she cooked was an experiment. And this is adventurous but it didn't get many plaudits. Because one could say, "This dish has too much salt in it," but in view of the fact that the dish would never be cooked again nobody learned from that data at all. Well, I don't say this particular

23 JULY 1957

cook reformed. But I will say that had she discovered that certain people who ate regularly her dinners liked certain things or responded to certain things and if she'd cooked those same things with the same recipe every time, she would have had this tremendous reputation for being a cuisinary expert. But this reputation she did not obtain and was still making bride's biscuits years after she was a bride. Never cooked the same biscuits by the same recipe.

Now, this is all very well and is undoubtedly adventurous. But it certainly leaves a lot wanting in a performance of an action. Now, nobody's trying to force people into being absolute, unquestioning—be questioning, the day you cease to be questioning you won't be here. Probably if you just stopped questioning you'd exteriorize too. But if you were extremely happy with a result, don't go around wondering how we got that result. Know how we got it; know it was so much baking powder and so much flour mixed up in such and such a way cooked in an oven of such and such a temperature. (Not a General Electric or Westinghouse electric oven; I'm talking about an oven. Even an old tortilla baker from down in the Mex border is better than one of these modern monsters. You turn on the heat and the thermostat is shifted; you know, it's terrific, but it doesn't cook biscuits. It does everything—it'll burn your hand, but it won't cook biscuits.) So, follow a recipe and you get a result. Well, you have the satisfaction of having gotten a result. I don't know what else one's working for unless the satisfaction of doing one's job well.

88

Of course there's the satisfaction of looking at brand-new horizons. But here is the catch in Scientology today: until you can look at any brand-new horizons you had better doggone well know how to make biscuits.

I love these speculative auditors who without knowing that space is the viewpoint of dimension, discover an eighth dimension and leave their pre-clear stuck in it.

In the first place, I don't think there's anything experimental that could be done today that has not been done in Dianetics or Scientology with the body, the mind of *Homo sapiens* and a fellow who could exteriorize and stay exteriorized. No greater ability than that, see. But if he could stay stably exteriorized up to that point, it's pretty well been done.

We have pulled the dead back from the between-lives area, much to their consternation. We have processed the Assumption out of babies before it was well implanted or even cool. We have processed all manner of *Homo sapiens* and even some beasts—other beasts, excuse me.

Homo sapiens, definition of, you know, is a beast who used to have a soul he took care of and sent to hell when he was sinful, but who has now forgotten that he had one. So he patronizes phrenology.

The thing here is that an individual to perceive has to be brought up to a certain level of perception, and I would say the base level from which perception could be engaged upon, above the level of *Homo novis*, would certainly be thetan exterior. Now from that point on I cannot tell you what there is to observe. And from that point on there is a great adventure, certainly. Probably many data that we have only guessed at are rather easily proven above this level or disproven. Probably many abilities of a thetan which at this moment are only barely skimmed, you know, are not even—not even known, not even guessed at, would emerge. Tremendous numbers of things could happen above that level.

But it is well to understand that up to the level of pretty good shape and able to handle a body rather easily and handle other bodies rather easily, up

THE STABILITY OF SCIENTOLOGY

to that point which is *the* outpost point, there are evidently no further outposts. That's a sad thing. It's a sad thing.

I remember back when Mary Sue and I were cooling our heated brains over E-Meters, pcs, we covered the whole track from one end to the other and left 99 and 9,999/10,000ths in restim. We found out that the same pattern of the mind was just more pattern and that any further advances on it consisted of just more of what we were already looking at. But we covered a lot of subjects which until very recently weren't at all known and which you haven't even had the benefit of information on.

But some of these subjects that we see as new today, why, she and I, working with an E-Meter back in 1951, 52, so forth, with pcs and so on, were actually cataloging phenomena.

How much phenomena was there?

Well I would say there isn't very much in the world of electrical phenomena that we haven't a good clue on. We might not know its exact map, but we have the clue. But this does not blind us to the fact that much phenomena lies way and far beyond, far, far, far, far, far beyond the world of space and electricity and matter and this continuum of incident known as time.

I would say offhand that anyone pretending that anyone matter, energy, space and time as he knows it here in this universe and in his own mind at this time is all there is to know about this subject, I would say that that man was either a charlatan or a stupid jackass. In the first place, three-dimensional space is simply a simple space concept, and to say that there are no other space concepts would be about the same—saying as people who are crosseyed don't see double images. It's simply a phenomenon of perception; that is all this space is.

Energy could be conceived to be a phenomenon of belief. Mass could be said to be a phenomenon of experience.

I said advisedly that energy was a phenomenon of belief because I myself have never seen any independent of mass. And I don't think anybody else ever has either. They are still measuring electricity by magnetic effects, and nobody's ever seen any yet.

You could probably tell some scientists working on companies contracted to the AEC this and they would start to argue and they would probably flip—they'd probably spin in before dawn. Because they know basically this is true. And their stable data tells them that they are in a nonadventurous world up to the point where they begin to reach just about to the boundary and then they find that energy isn't energy anymore and mass isn't quite mass and nothing behaves unless you throw in a bunch of factors to make the equations balance. Their world of stability ends. So even in the science of physics there is a finite end to this matter, energy, space and time which we know is experience.

But here is the great oddity: to know matter, energy, space and time of this universe, one's fellows, the animal kingdom, in other words, the dynamics from top to bottom, is *not* to know *every* universe, *every* life form and *every* phenomenon which could exist. You understand that? Well, on that basis—that other universes of other patterns made out of other things in other ways and behaving on other stable data could exist. You understand that? And we don't know a blessed thing about them.

So before we get too proud with the stability of our subject we should glance upon the humbleness of the fact that all we know is this universe and all we know about any other universe is that it or they might exist. And it

23 JULY 1957

boils down to the fact that all we know in actuality is the way a thetan has behaved and reacted so as to culminate in this particular universe, the development of bodies, development of forms, practices, development of animal kingdom, all these various things. But in view of the fact that the remainder of the scientific world has not at any moment a millionth of the information we have, we can still boast a little. But only by comparison with a bunch of dumbbells.

So, when I tell you it's stable, I say its practice is stable. Stable where? Stable for *this* universe. Stable for what? *Homo sapiens*. Toward what goal? *Homo novis*, which is simply stable exterior without too much difficulty.

Don't for a moment exaggerate what you know, and don't for a moment minimize it. Don't do either one, but maintain a clear perspective. You can do what you can do if you do what can be done to accomplish it at this level, this universe, this time. And we have certain practices which I don't think will go out or blow up or disappear so long as there's a universe here. I don't see any way out except the simplicity of what we learn in such things as the TRs. I know that many, many years of a great deal of heated mental activity have given us no more than two or three dozen workable processes which could be counted upon to work under all circumstances. And I know enough about what has gone on before in this universe and enough about what man has responded to to be able to say rather didactically that there's not much chance of this changing.

90

But that doesn't say, one, that there's no chance of it improving. It can always improve, providing it improves simply. The way not to improve something is to get complicated. If any improvement is more complicated, gaze at it with at least a sneer held in reserve. Somebody says, "Well, we used to do it this way. We used to walk up a rug this way, you see; and now we have a better way of walking up a rug, you see, and it's this way." You say, "Oh. Oh, yeah?"

Somebody tells you there's a better way of running Confronting 0 — Training 0, Confronting. (Confronting 0 was the trick name of it originally.) There's a better way of running it. Instead of the auditor sitting in the chair and looking at the coach, what he actually does is lock his hands back of the chair and at each five-second interval, while confronting, he twitches his fingers and thus releases the nervous tension built up by the confrontingness. You say, "Oh, yeah! Yeah. Yeah. Yeah. Yeah." It isn't true. There's more to do and whenever there's more to do you should ask yourself whether or not that is the direction progress is made.

Once upon a time people thought they knew something about the universe. They thought they knew a lot about the universe. And then it became more and more complicated, and more and more complicated, and more and more complicated and all of a sudden it has become something that nobody could know anything about.

Well, isn't that remarkable. All he has to do is look at the walls, look up at the sky and count a few stars, he knows about all there is to know about the universe. I mean, that's it. It's basically a very simple subject. You walk across fields and you'll see different colored rocks. You take some ocean water and—or look in the mountains and you'll find different minerals of one kind or another. And you can tie up the color of the minerals with the color of the rocks if you want to. And you could have a good time. But at no time was it complicated until gold became some exact number of electrons spinning insanely around an exact number of protons, which is measured out in so many molecules of *whumph* and flunked in a chemistry test.

THE STABILITY OF SCIENTOLOGY

Right about then you should say, "Yeah, yeah, yeah, hm, hm, hm, hm, how very interesting!"

Now all that sort of thing does is to lead to greater change at a faster rate. You want to run fresh out of universe, just make enough of those changes. Get just enough chromium-plated Cadillacs that get up just close enough to the speed of the rotation of Earth so you always have high noon while driving—you've just about had it. The apparent distances of Earth will become zero.

Fly up to the sun for another tankful of plutonium and come back before breakfast, and the distance between here and the sun has become so small that you've just about run out of universe.

Get it fixed up so that you never have to look for a pretty girl. You drop two bits in a slot machine and a reasonable facsimile drops out. And you've damn well run out of universe.

There is a point where something passes a peak of advance, and that advance beyond that point is something like taking a three-layer chocolate cake and adding layers of chocolate to it. And you just put on more chocolate and more chocolate and more chocolate. And you'll find out proportionately you'll have less and less cake.

Well now, I do not pretend that all of the TRs or the CCH processes are there. I don't pretend they're all there. I don't pretend that you're holding in your hot little hand the final, complete rendition. That comes up in the Student Manual.

Now, the direction of change to be beneficial should be in the direction of simplicity. That is the direction of change. When a direction is in the direction of complexity it soon becomes individuated to such a degree that you lose it. It goes into the hands of a specialist. And you at length have a specialist on TR 4. He never heard of TR 0, 1, 2, 3 or 5, but does he know 4! And you lose the workable whole of the subject. Now here's why I tell you that we are at something like an optimum stability because we have a subject which is yet in a sufficient simplicity that any person with some study could grasp every facet of it. Now, do you understand that? Much more added to it will bring it into a category where the Director of Processing understands only processing; he can never train anybody. The Director of Training understands only training and can never process anyone at all. You understand that? The entrance of the super-expert.

And right now, up till this time, Dianetics and Scientology, in spite of numerous changes, in spite of many, many investigations, has remained a subject which was capable of being embraced by one mind studying himself. That's quite remarkable. That's quite remarkable. Perhaps the whole field of science was that way once. Perhaps. It's very possible that it was if Scientology ever existed before. Because right now you have enough tools, enough axioms, enough material, in actuality, to be processed yourself up to a point where you could then follow again any track of investigation undertaken to this moment and advance your investigations beyond the point where they are now in certain definite directions.

Now you can take an old E-Meter, you can build one. They're simply a Wheatstone bridge in spite of the original manufacturer's nonsense. That's all they are, they're just a Wheatstone bridge. There's a few tricks in using them, but there's even been a book written on that, *Electropsychometry*. And with the aid of that and a preclear with fairly good visio who wasn't scared of getting into trouble with facsimiles, you could undoubtedly map the

23 JULY 1957

entirety of the genetic line. The entire map of the body from the moment when it arrived on Earth to now.

But I can tell you for sure that you would not find otherwise than that it arrived. It arrived on Earth. It didn't rise in seas of household ammonia. The genetic blueprint all the way along the line is fascinating to follow. Absolutely fascinating. This is a great study that will someday be undertaken, I am sure, but is within the capability of almost anyone in this room right at this moment.

Why?

Because the rules don't vary from anything we know. We have various ways of undertaking it which would be rather fabulous, such as Then and Now Solids. If you just ran Then and Now Solids on a person who kept it firmly in mind that he was his body, which I was running into this afternoon . . . My auditor was having a bad time with me this afternoon. I was a very bad preclear. I insisted on following some of the auditing commands and found out they couldn't be followed. It's embarrassing. I always follow the auditing command, however, no matter what it does to the auditor.

Now as we look across this vista called the genetic entity line we find all The Factors once more—The Factors, you know, technical piece of writing that belongs to us, man, and we'd find the Axioms and we would find all these various things. In other words, we could take one process on a person who is not too badly off or we could take a person who is very badly off and get him up to a point where he could run this one process and he could go back and then, fixated on the genetic entity line by agreement and constant command and so forth, he would then wind up with a complete map of it and he would be on top and in possession of all this information; even though it were not written down.

Sounds to me like an awful stable subject which will reextrapolate or regenerate itself. You could find this material all over again.

It's quite interesting sometimes to audit somebody who is green as can be, never heard of it before, a person who wasn't in too bad a condition, and Johnny-come-lately hasn't been crashed here on Earth any length of time at all—crawled out of his rocket, picked up an injured kid or a baby or something of the sort and says, "Where am I? I'll play at this game"—blow him out of his head and all of a sudden have him sit there telling you all about the Axioms. You know, telling you the Axioms, one after another. He'll say, "These are the agreements that the universe is made out of." See? And he'll start chattering these things off. Quite remarkable.

But that actually is a tribute to accurate work, rather than something one would regard jealously saying, "Well he's evolving it all again, kill him!" You know. That's the general scientific way of going about it. Somebody evolved the same formula, you generally have to have him shot or expelled or something. Liquidated I think they call it today in the American universities. Anyway . . . There are two universities today who aren't socialistic. There are two, so I couldn't say all universities, could I?

Anyway, they have a capability—these Axioms—also of evolving the remainder of the Axioms. So that you take a person and run him on some research process and all of a sudden he'll start to evolve the remainder of the Axioms from the one he was run on, which is quite amusing. I mean, they evolve themselves irrespective of the track.

I want to tell you tonight about two or three of these research practices. There are procedures which you should know about which may or may not

have any therapeutic value. But they're certainly interesting. Now if you want to establish certain data, there are certain research procedures which can be run as long as the preclear can stand it, and you'll pick up the required data.

Now, one of those is very interesting, is you mock up something and give it the idea that. . . Now, the—the actual therapeutic value of this thing is negligible, I assure you. Because it's a games condition to end all games conditions. And the amount of havingness that you put up or mock up or do something with and so forth is not necessarily compensatory for the amount of bank disturbance which occurs. But it's interesting.

Now, if you mock up somebody and give him the idea that—anything—the agreement will either restimulate or the auditing command will run out. If there is an agreement of that nature on that case, then the agreement will come into restimulation of one kind or another and the preclear can tell you quite a bit about it. But if there is no agreement of that nature around, the auditing command runs out instead.

Now, it's already allowed that the fellow can do mock-ups, you see. And it's already allowed that if he does them he won't get into terrible restimulation. But "Mock up something and put into it the idea that _____" will establish almost any control operation for what it is and get you the rest of the information connected with it, right out of the bank. Bang. Bang. Bang. Give you some sort of an idea.

Here's one. Let's take dialectic buffoonery, I think they call it. Mock up somebody and give him the idea that—you see, this is the games condition you're running—give him the idea that all thought comes from energy. And he'll very shortly tell you, well, that this is an operation to end all operations. And if you wanted to get somebody into *real* trouble all you'd have to do is simply tell him and convince him that all thought came from energy and matter. "Oh," you'd say, "is that so?"

"Yeah," he says, "this is an old one. I know I—I got the idea this is very old. I mean, it's been done, it's been done—a lot of things."

"All right," you say, "that's fine. Now mock up somebody and give him the idea that it's all been done before." These are simply dialectic materialism statements. There is no originality, all ideas come from force. I see by your faces that you're not too well aware of what this dialectic materialism is. It is a subject, it isn't just nonsense. Those are two of its premises. All right.

A fellow would start telling you about control operations and how these things could be used, and he'd give you an awful lot of stuff on this. It's all right, so the next one you'd say, "Well, mock up somebody and give him the idea that individuality is a sin." You know, the cult of the personality and other things that dialectic materialism comes down on with a thud.

Here we fed him three principal ideas out of a broadly understood subject. Now we take his answers and what he has to say about it and what he dreams up while this is being run on him and we put the rest of it down and we will have the practices of it and perhaps some of the things which eradicate it. Now if we keep this up on several people we will undoubtedly wind up with the answer to the eradication of the subject.

Now you got that as a research procedure?

One I have used. Quite interesting. It's a very reliable research procedure. You'll find out that their answers from person to person don't vary enough to bother with. You take the three pins, you see, out of dialectic materialism. Have them mock somebody up and give them the idea that, it puts certain things into restimulation in the bank, the rest of the material which

23 JULY 1957

has been known in past ages about this comes into your possession. So that's a fascinating thing to know, isn't it?

Now, Then and Now Solids has the power also of revealing considerable information concerning the subject of life—what has been done, what has been lived—but is not very good as a research procedure because it is too confoundedly therapeutic. Fellow doesn't introvert and figure-figure the way he does on this other one, see? It's too good for him. He gets terribly interested in having been a Roman senator. But that's a personal interest, isn't it? Terribly interested in cataloging just where he was during the great plague, but that is a personal subject. And the research subjects are generalized subjects, not particularized. So Then and Now Solids is not as good as this other one.

All right. All right. The E-Meter is a very, very good research instrument if you know how to use one and if you do not mistake your answers—quivers of the needle for answers when they are merely the fact that the fellow has started to get his—thigh has started itching.

The chap who used to make those things used to give us some interesting things. He had a one-handed electrode—this was never as good as an ordinary tin can, never as good as an ordinary tin can.

I have a vested interest in the E-Meter. Actually, every time the thing—every time I'd want something more workable, why, I'd get it simpler and more capable of registering, and then it'd drift for six months and get more complicated and unusable. And then I'd have to get a model which was more simple which could be used. And I think the final model that came out—400—I worked on one just the other day and was able finally by cutting off all—practically all of its dials and all of its lines and cutting a bunch of wires with pliers and so forth, I finally got it down to a point of where it would register a case, not passing cars. And it was quite workable after that.

Actually a Wheatstone bridge with a battery in it has only the liability of a comm lag. It takes it maybe a half *a* second to respond to the question you answered when they're battery, DC operated. So you ask the question and then the needle sits there for a half a second, maybe even a second, and *then* registers. Well, you in your swing on through questions and so forth may be thinking that's null and gone off to another question. The pc also, you think, might have thought of something else, and a doubt has been entered into it. So an AC meter is a better meter.

But the use of this thing is something I should give you for what it is worth in case you ever want to follow along some of these lines.

The way you set one of them. Regardless of what kind of a needle or dial the thing has, the preclear with his hands held evenly on the can gives the can a sudden, hard squeeze. See? Just a sudden, hard squeeze. The surge that should produce is one-third of the meter dial. Got that? Anything else is insufficiently correct—insufficiently accurate. If it is less than that, less than that one-third surge, you'll miss some. And if it's more than, you'll think everything is hot.

You've got to cut these things back in their reads so that they read intelligently, so that you can differentiate. And you want lots of things that might possibly flick or read just a little bit, you know, you want those to be just dead as doornails if you're doing research. You don't want that needle jumping at every flick that goes through the fellow's mind. You got the idea? You only want the big ones. You want the two-dial drops, the fifteen-dial drops. But neither do you want it so insensitive that it will fail to pick up what we call a theta bop.

THE STABILITY OF SCIENTOLOGY

Now a theta bop has become very interesting to us of recent times. It is a certain behavior of the E-Meter needle. It's a hunt. And it goes like this. And it's just that much dial, little tiny bit of dial, and the needle is unmistakably coming over this way and then it goes over and it hunts over on the other side and then—so on, and it's just bopping, bopping. And it just keeps bopping. And that means not a death as we thought it did originally but an exteriorization incident. An incident in which the preclear exteriorized is registered by a theta bop. And that's what that theta bop is.

There are some other characteristics. One is the totally stuck needle. (There aren't many of these characteristics, by the way: they're just the surge, the theta bop and the totally stuck needle. The only remarkable things so far as research is concerned.) The totally stuck needle gives you a case that's just off the bottom of the dial. You could actually hit him on the head, as I have done, with the side of your fist, you know, bang, with no registry on the dial, even though the dial is set on surge, one-third of a dial when you squeeze the cans. Really. You know? I told him I was going to do it and I said, "All right, here we go now." *Pow*. No read. No read of any kind. Just *z-z-zit*. The man could have murdered somebody yesterday and he still wouldn't have gotten any read. That man is fixed against surprise and could be called a surprise-absorber. Nothing will bother him at all. He doesn't necessarily have criminal patterns or tendencies. But criminals also can have this reaction.

Criminals can also go all over the dial. Psychos can be totally stuck or so wild even while sitting still, you know, holding the cans, perfectly relaxed and so forth, and here goes the needle. And you just tune it down, tune it down, tune it down, tune it down until you finally get a reaction on some questions. You'll find that that again is answered by this one-third of the dial surge. But just sitting there quietly they're in total dispersal. And this other person sitting there quietly is in total freeze. Those manifestations are important to anyone doing research.

Well, you can swing on down the line, you can find out more doggone things in less time and put it down.

But here is the great oddity with the E-Meter today: we can run an engram up to a point where it is in full reality. And it's a technique which is quite valuable—it's terribly valuable. And in your forward career you will hear so much about this and you will do so much with this that you will be quite bemused by the fact that it went overlooked this long. Because it is the basic technique of control.

Now it would be one thing to sit there with the needle telling you everything, and if the preclear wasn't getting smarter and smarter and didn't know it himself and couldn't look at it and assist you very much—you would be groping. To a marked degree you'd be groping. There'd be much data that would remain unrevealed.

But you can take an E-Meter today and run the technique which I'm about to give you and actually have the preclear give you the rest of the story, even if he starts in with a circuitry don't-know at the beginning. In other words, you just spot something in terms of time; you spot the fact that it was 1162. Theta bop. He's evidently exteriorized. Magnitude of time—the manual on electropsychometry goes into all of this, by the way—you establish these moments by time. And we don't know what a galactic year is or something of the sort, but the—a thetan evidently does, only he doesn't let himself in on it. And let's say we found an incident with a theta bop in it where the person's evidently stuck in an exteriorized type of incident in 1162. Now

23 JULY 1957

before, the only thing we could have done was to have restimulated it and restimulated it one way or the other by questions until the person finally told us what he saw in the picture. That was Dianetics.

Now, let me show you the slight difference between Dianetics and Scientology and explain to you further why Scientology is a stability where Dianetics didn't have a prayer of being a stability. With this process you raise his recall to a point where he tells you—the fellow, you know, I mean the pc himself—where he tells you out of his recall and without the aid of pictures the rest of the incident. Got that? In other words, he gets it on a total reality, full recall basis.

Now, the E-Meter was always invalidative in the past. That is to say, your constant questions about which the preclear knew nothing and about which you seemed to know more and more, finally just drove him into the ground.

Well, what you do with one on research these days—you've all been—probably sat there being invalidated by the needle; it was talking about things you didn't have a clue of—well now, this process reverses that procedure. We find a theta bop at 1162. We've checked it by—we've asked the preclear, "Something bothering you?" And he said, "I don't know." You say, "Well is there anything I should know about?" And he has a slight drop. And we say, "Well, how long ago was it? A few years?" and we get no reaction. We say, "Tens of years?" We get no reaction. "Hundreds of years?" We get a tremble.

So we say, "Well, was it five hundred years?" And we get a little drop. And we say, "Was it more than five hundred?" And we get quite a drop. And we say, "Less than five hundred?" We get no drop. And we say, "Well is it around 750, is that about it?" And we get a drop. And we say, "Well is it less than 750 or greater than 750?" You know. And then get a drop. We're inspecting. Less than 750 is what gave us the drop. We say, "Well then, it's evidently 600 or thereabouts, is that right? More than 600? Less than 600?" You get the idea? And we find out that it was 602 years ago, 1355. We say, "Is that the date, 1355?" And it goes wham! wham!

"Well, where were you at that time?"

"Ahwo." Here we go. See?

All right. Now if we'd located it with that procedure, we would say, "Have you got a picture?" And the preclear would say, "Well, yeah. I—picture. Doesn't mean anything to me. I mean, it's just—just a little old body lying there on the pavement. I mean, there's nothing to that. See it any day, you know, in the *Washington Post*, they publish dead bodies all the time." And this is the point where you would use this technique.

You would say, "What in that scene could you handle?" And that picture will sort out and sort out and sort out and all of a sudden he will say, "Well yeah, my name was Kleine Schweinhund and we were raiding on the outside of a village just to the north of Rome and I never liked the centurion and he had me thrown in the clink. And I'd just gotten out and he was in a wine store and I remember there was—Tiberius was on one side of him and Maxim was on the other side of him and I didn't pay any attention to it; all I did was shoved a shiv in his back. And he was a member of the same legion and you know, I don't feel so good about that."

"Well, what's this body?"

"Oh, well, that's just me." Well...

Anyway, right about that time if we kept this sort of thing up and didn't let him let the pictures get too automatic, you know, just shift over to other

THE STABILITY OF SCIENTOLOGY

scenes and other things—we just held him there, because the shift is an avoidance of something in the scene, you see. We don't let them go up and down the track: we hold him on *that* picture, until it finally is in total recall. Every time he goes up the track he's running away from that picture. Every time he goes down the track he's running away from that picture. Don't you see? Until he can just put it there, throw it away or put it there and throw it away, why, it's still got dynamite in it. Don't you see? And you can tell by his emotional reaction whether or not the thing is flat.

Well, in other words, from that point you could actually establish the customs, general orders, name, rank and serial number and anything else of that time and place with the greatest of ease. And furthermore, this has been done and it is of tremendous interest.

Now, what if the fellow running on the meter went up and into the future and started getting facsimiles of the future? Use the same process, "What is there in that scene that you could handle?"

Now, there's a variation, sometimes, evidently required in the question, and that is, "What in that scene could you have handled or could you handle?" It's a double. See? "Could you handle? Could you have handled?" There's a difference there you'll notice in running it.

And in the future it would be, "What could you—handled, or what will you be able to handle?" Different.

And all of a sudden he'd say, "Well, poor old Earth, poor old Earth, the atomic termites finally got loose from the US Army Bacteriological and Insect Warfare Headquarters and they started eating all the paper and no government was possible."

In other words, you have a great deal of knowledge at your tap and the E-Meter now ceases to be invalidative, because you easily recover any lost ground by the processing that you do.

Now, you could stick with the meter if you wanted to and still keep check on your preclear. You could keep checking it up. Might be an interesting thing to do. And when the theta bop is gone, why, the incident is pretty flat; he's onto other things and moving free on the track and you'll get other needle reactions.

It's a neat operation handling an E-Meter. It's a tremendous research instrument. Now what's interesting is that an E-Meter would also detect criminal practices or detect anything else. The E-Meter used by a Scientologist understanding it is undoubtedly—well, it's not even to be compared with a police lie detector. I mean that's in the kindergarten, buy-it-at-the-dime-store variety.

Every once in *a* while they run into a murder in a past life, you know. And they've got a criminal there and the criminal's sitting there with the— with the blood pressure and the breathing mechanism and all of the other . . . I don't know, they hang him up with tubes and space hats and things. And he's sitting there all wrapped up and getting blood poisoning from this and that, and they say to him, "Well, did you or did you not commit the murder?" And then the—everything goes boom! You know. And the blood pressure goes up and the breathing goes uh-hu-uh-hu-uh-hu. And they say, "Well I guess we—guess he's guilty. Ha-ha-ha-ha-ha. Well, we got you now!"

I don't know, they never ask him when he killed somebody. Never ask him the fellow's name. Never ask him if it was a dog. They never get the gen, in other words. They aren't intelligent enough to know anything about this.

23 JULY 1957

But you cannot operate a lie detector or a police lie detector accurately. They're about 15 percent completely inaccurate by police findings. So I don't know, they're 90 percent wrong probably.

When addressed to this, "Did you commit this crime?" or "Did you speak to that person?" the reaction is not reliable for the excellent reason that they never clear the auditing session because they don't know how to audit. It's an auditing instrument, the lie detector is. It is not a police instrument that's worth a nickel. And you have to hunt up and down and clear this thing any way from Sundays.

I know of an instance, once, where a person was asked if they had been misbehaving. You know? During a certain period of time. And the needle went, *plongo!* You know, and the person running it says, "Aha, I caught somebody; I caught somebody scarlet-handed right here. *Uh-huh-huh-huh-huh-huh-huh-huh.*" Only it wasn't misbehaving that the needle was reacting to: it was fear of punishment in case somebody thought—and this is the only thing that cleared the needle; needle kept reacting until this question was hit—fear of punishment in case it couldn't be proved to the person that behavior had been good. See? It was this complicated a reaction that was making the needle ping.

Before you monkey around with the mind, you should know something about the mind. And outside of Scientology they don't.

Well, anyhow, there's a research instrument. Well, there are research processes and research instruments and with these and with various techniques of this character the entirety of our present stability could be recovered. The one thing that probably couldn't be recovered easily would be the amount of technology which has been assembled, investigated and abandoned. And that piece of the work would probably have to be done all over again. Whether it is possible to do that or not I do not know. But it was trial and error, tremendous numbers of people and so on.

For instance, to find out how to train people—take seven years to find out how to train somebody in a subject is rather a critical thing to have happen to us. We should have been able to do it much faster than that. But if we think this is the case, look over the fact that the last 2,500 years of training have revealed no method which trained anybody. No methods.

In the absence of willingness, there are still no methods. And that's very accurate.

So it has to do with goals and willingness and still falls back to some degree on auditing. You'd have to make somebody willing to be trained before training would benefit him at all.

But we are nevertheless justified in this. If the subject were to be reconstructed again from scratch, it could be reconstructed fairly certainly with instruments such as the E-Meter and with auditing. In various ways you could get this whole assembly of knowledge together again. How long it would take I don't know. I couldn't guess at that. I think we've been going at breakneck speed to do it in seven years.

But it is itself, is all I'm trying to say. It is itself. It is a stability in that it could be reextrapolated. It could be re-created. It could be gone over and put together again. And that is important because it doesn't leave a lot of tag ends hanging out that there's no explanation for.

Now, there's one word I would give you of caution in practice. Don't do a thing unless you have some understanding of it. If you don't have an understanding of some of the things you are doing, then you certainly had better

THE STABILITY OF SCIENTOLOGY

look it over from all sides. Because to learn something by rote, to learn something just because it is and to deny it your appreciation, by which I mean your ability to understand it, is not to have it at all.

Now the subject is there. It is a thing. On low—on its lower levels it is a stability. And being a stability at this time it is capable of being understood. There are lots of people who understand every quarter of it.

If you don't understand some quarter of what you are doing in the TRs, in the CCHs, in some of these others you could only be criticized if you didn't try to look at it again and so understand it better; and if you didn't ask anybody about it out of some misguided pride, you would be denying yourself a full knowledge of the subject.

Now that's what you're here to attain. That's what you're here to learn. You could extrapolate the entirety of this subject from one end to the other, put it back together again. Certainly it's an easy job to look over that part of the subject which is here and find out if you do understand why these TRs exist, why these processes exist, why we're doing what we're doing and how these various Axioms work, what the Code of a Scientologist is, why it is that way and what the Code of the auditor is and why it is that way.

If there are any blank spots here, now is the time to haul them out, take a look at them, and don't put it off till tomorrow if your Instructor's giving you something today that you don't understand: you look at it harder and understand it better and you will go out of here much, much wiser than you came in. And that's what we intend to have happen.

Thank you.

AUDITING STYLES

A lecture given on 24
July 1957

How are you this fine, beautiful, cool evening?

Audience voices: Dandy. Good.

Good.

And this is the eighth lecture of the 18th ACC. And this is July 24, 1957. Tonight I'm going to talk to you about styles of auditing. About time I did!

There are three auditing styles. The first, which we will not letter or number, is called Informal Auditing.

Informal Auditing—with no slur intended—that would be the kind of auditing done by a Book Auditor who had simply read something of the subject and plunged in. You know, it is still auditing; but you'd have to say that it was informal. He has not been trained to audit, he doesn't have any vast view of precision in the auditing, he sees no particular reason to maintain the auditing commands stable—no stability necessary. Duplication: he has—not impressed with that and so forth. Nevertheless, funny part of it is, this kind of auditing does get results and, therefore, we would have to dignify it with some kind of an appellation and that we would call Informal Auditing.

Then there is Formal Auditing. And this is that type of auditing which is done by a trained auditor, which pays attention to duplication, which handles the origins of the preclear, which gives the auditing command best calculated to handle the case at this particular time in the auditor's opinion and which carries on in such a wise as to permit two-way communication to as-is many of the preclear's problems and difficulties as they come up. Formal Auditing has a dependency upon two-way communication for its workability: it depends upon acknowledgment in order to sweep away many of the difficulties which the preclear has and depends as well upon a very high maintenance of ARC with the preclear, that he knows is being maintained; and quite in addition to this consults the power of choice of the preclear and increases it. That's Formal Auditing.

The next type is Tone 40 Auditing. And Tone 40 Auditing is of considerable interest to us because, although it is the highest toned auditing, it is preferably addressed to the lowest toned cases. The highest toned auditing—the lowest toned case. Now, Tone 40 Auditing will work on anyone. And one who becomes expert in Tone 40 Auditing will find that he will use his facility with attention—*intention* in his Formal Auditing, and that is as it should be. But Formal Auditing is not Tone 40 Auditing; and Tone 40 Auditing is not

24 JULY 1957

Formal Auditing. It is itself. And the highest toned is used on the lowest toned case, preferably.

Now, does this mean that Tone 40 Auditing would only be used on a low-toned case? No. But it is the only thing which could get to a low-toned case. And we'll go into the anatomies of this later. Therefore, when faced with a comatose, psychotic, highly neurotic, or immature case, or an animal, you would have nothing—no choice in the matter: you would simply do very good Tone 40 Auditing.

Now, people as they come up the line, all the way on up respond very well to Tone 40 Auditing. There's no particular reason to say that it is *only* used on people who are completely missing from amongst us. But its greatest effectiveness is upon these cases; and it is the only known form of auditing which reaches them and, therefore, it has its proper bracket amongst such cases. And it has this to recommend it: run on a high case or a low case, it blows circuits out of the preclear that he himself has found difficult to handle.

But when you have no case but only circuits confronting you, you have no choice at all—you have to run Tone 40 Auditing. Tone 40 Auditing is why we can say we have gone all the way south.

But Formal Auditing is much faster than Tone 40 Auditing on cases above a certain point. It is faster because it uses the preclear's ability to as-is, under the artificial conditions of auditing, things which have been troubling him and which would continue to trouble him outside an auditing session. And so we get this two-way comm, understanding, acknowledgment, all combining to sweep away much of the difficulty and debris which have been bothering him.

Now, Formal Auditing combined with an excellent process would be the fastest means of handling any case above 2.0. That would be the fastest means of handling the case. It would not be faster to handle a case above 2.0 with Tone 40 Auditing. It would produce a different result, it would do different things, but it would not necessarily be faster. Don't you see?

Now, to understand this clearly is vitally necessary since people believe that Formal Auditing with acknowledgment, handling the origin of the preclear and so forth, is a sloppy Tone 40. It is not sloppy Tone 40 Auditing! It is itself and demands, if anything, greater ability on the part of the auditor and the handling of his tools than Tone 40 Auditing does. Particularly it demands of the auditor that he know his theory and be able to put it into practice. And when the preclear comes up with something, to put the exact adroit question to make him come up with a little more of it, to put in the exact adroit question that makes him come up with the rest of it, and then with a cheery "okay," to continue on with the session. The preclear saying, "What do you know! You know, that's right, I always have hated ducks. Yup, that's right. Yeah, we got someplace in this session. I found out I hated ducks. I didn't know it before." But whatever cognition he achieves, his knowingness is increased and because he's being rather permissively handled—only apparently, let me assure you—his power of choice is quite important.

Now, you should realize that below 2.0 there is no power of choice. You say, "Well, we should all be self-determined." Well, that's fine, that's fine. This is not the same statement as: "You should always consult with the preclear's self-determinism." It's not the same statement at all. Because below 2.0, you ask this succinct question: *What* self-determinism?

Well, I can tell you what his determinism is below 2.0 and that is why you can draw such a chart as the Chart of Human Evaluation. Zoom—draw

it right across the boards. The reason for this is very easy to establish. It's a patterned determinism below 2.0, which has as its end product: "Give 'em things they can't handle and they'll become so engrossed with those that they'll never get to me!" They are automatic mechanisms which have been developed on an identical pattern by everybody, because they were the exact things that could be handled least by other Homo sap. And those things which were *least* able to handle became, at each point of the Tone Scale as it descends, the pattern of that person's behavior. And when somebody finally does handle or invalidate a slightly higher level, they drop to an exact pattern lower level. And so you can draw people below 2.0—whose only goal, by the way, is to be terrifically unpredictable; that's their fondest hope—people below 2.0—that they will be totally unpredictable. They think that's the way to be and they develop this pattern which is totally predictable!

And the totality of the pattern is: here's something you or they can't handle! And this is so horrible, so terrible—or at covert hostility—so indirect, that nobody could handle it and, therefore, these people consider themselves safe. Safe as can be. There they sit in the middle of a bunch of precomputed experience which nobody could handle. And below 2.0 you never talk to the person, you just argue with one or another circuit. That's all. And these circuits can be the most confounded things. You get somebody in propitiation: "Oh, yes, I'm trying to get well. I'm trying to succeed all I can. And the auditing has done me a lot of good, lot of good, and of course my headaches are on stronger than they were at night and I'm not seeing very well now like I was before the session, but ah—but I know you're trying and it'll all get better, I... I know that." What can you do in the face of such a circuit? One: recognize it's a circuit. And two: use Tone 40 Auditing.

This is not a matter of judgment when you're using CCH. You can always start with CCH 0 or 1, as the case may be. If he's out of communication, you could always start with 1—CCH 1 and proceed on up the line. And CCH 1 either won't succeed at all or it will blow his head off. And when you've gotten up to the ones which require a little bit of criteria or judgment on his part, such as Book Mimicry, you can always go back down to the bottom and go over it again to see if it's just a little more there. You can always do this circle on the lower CCH processes; and you would pick up any case there was and you wouldn't get any sleepers.

You know, you do get sleepers: person appears to be in good shape, they get perfect mock-ups; they're what we used to call the wide-open case; they—mock-ups are all perfect, they described everything perfectly—just nothing to it. And you just audit engrams and they didn't change and you audit more engrams and they didn't change and you audit more and more and more and *mmrrrrnnmmrrr*. They were usually giving you this: "Yes, they're trying hard to get well" and "they'd succeed if it wasn't for the number of blunders which you made in session," and so forth. Nothing was real to these people at all. Nothing could have handled them that we know about now except Tone 40 Auditing. You were just talking to a circuit; there was no preclear present. You'd have to wake up the preclear. Well, how would you do that?

Use the lower CCH processes with Tone 40 Auditing. Preclear says something, it has only one end in view: to give you something else you can't handle. That's the only goal, something else you can't handle. You got that? Something else. And you kind of handle that a little bit, scares them to death, and they come up with something else you can't handle. And they'll finally get frantic in the number of "can't handles" that they hand you one right

24 JULY 1957

after the other. You're validating circuits and we've known for years that you mustn't do that. Well, Tone 40 doesn't do that. It just takes it for granted that anything the preclear says is a circuit and skips it: says, "Well, here I am processing the preclear and I'm just going to process the preclear."

Well, oddly enough, a thetan will respond to Tone 40 that won't respond to Tone 4.0. All right. So, we just process straight away up the line and you'll find out this person has all sorts of actions and reactions which are quite in the line of good progress. After a while they say, "Well, you don't want me to say anything. That's what it is. You just don't care what happens to me!" Well, that's just another circuit.

Anybody who is in good shape should be able to stick his hand out. Anybody who's in good shape should be able to walk around the room by the hour touching walls. Anybody who's in good shape should be able to do Hand Mimicry extremely well. And anybody who's in good shape—and this in the first four steps of CCH is the killer—should be able to do Book Mimicry very well, without much stumble. And they can run up the line on these lower CCHs until they hit Book Mimicry—and here you're doing a more or less formal audit—and they'll fall all over themselves trying to make a duplication of the motion with that book! That is quite amazing. But that has happened to many of us and is simply a matter of sight-muscle coordination, which a person should be able to do. But this one in essence is a test of: how well coordinated *is* this fellow?

104

Well now, if somebody blows on Book Mimicry, you've almost had it because you would have to get ahold of the book and make—with his hand on it—make it do the duplication of the command which you just did, back and forth, back and forth. And that's the way you'd handle it until you considered it a little bit level, and then get him back there on Give Me Your Hand. (Which is not the auditing command, but is the name the process was known by originally.)

All right. An individual with excellent coordination—exterior—may also be unable to coordinate the body that well; he might not be that interested. It's quite interesting to notice that a thetan in terrific condition, just getting the idea that he might do something with the body, would present almost the same picture on Book Mimicry as a body-plus-thetan in mediumly awful condition. That's because you've called the body in as part of the process—the handling of the body is part of the process. All right. But anybody would fall through at that point and his willingness would become very apparent at that point. You see that? You find out that people are in pretty good shape if you went up the scale from CCH 1, 2, 3, get them into Book Mimicry, which sits at 4 now. And you'll find out this fellow will keep trying, try to get the coordination a little better, try to square it around a little better. Won't do him any harm. He'll get very interested in the process.

And you'll find somebody that just—you just were very careless in passing him up the line—will hit Book Mimicry and they will just say, "No!!!" It is just too horrible to contemplate. Too horrible to contemplate. And you just know you went too fast and you pick it up at the bottom again and graduate it up to Book Mimicry.

But the first two: CCH 1, CCH 2, are definitely Tone 40 processes and must be run as Tone 40 processes and must not be run with Formal Auditing. See, they definitely are Tone 40 processes and they must be run that way. Now, some of the remaining steps also run as Tone 40 processes, but don't have to be; they also can be run as formal audited processes.

All right. Now. An auditor's power of choice, then, is present to a marked degree from CCH 3, Hand Space Mimicry, upwards—Tone 40 or not, as the case may be. But it's either Tone 40 *or* Formal. It is never a sloppy Tone 40. Never! And you don't Tone 40, Formal Auditing. They just don't cross. If your intention is good while you're doing Formal Auditing, you can say, "I am using Tone 40 intention." Well, that's very interesting too. Why aren't you using Tone 40 intention all the time? Your preclear will respond better if you use Tone 40 intention—respond much better. But it's Formal Auditing you're doing and the difference between the two is simply this—I'll describe these two auditing styles; we won't bother describing Informal Auditing—but the two auditing styles of Formal and Tone 40 can be described in this fashion: Tone 40, you might say, is between the thetan (who is being audited or who will discover after a while that he is being audited), and the auditor; and all else is considered circuitry. That's it. It just is, as far as the auditor's concerned.

Now, we get a process going and all of a sudden (Tone 40, you know, you're asking him for one of the body's hands and taking it and putting it back in his lap), you freeze the process. Give the command. You thank him for it and you retain hold of his hand and you say, "How are you doing?" This, that, the other thing, so on, still holding on to his hand.

You say, "Aha! But you've lapsed into Formal Auditing."

Oh no, you haven't. That's all for the auditor: he's simply trying to establish state of case. Now, naturally people can blow circuits and do all sorts of things while one of these freezes is going on. It'd be strange if they didn't. But it's not for the preclear—one of those freezes—it's all for the auditor. You understand that? All for the auditor. He wants to know where he is on the Know to Mystery Scale. He wants to know where the preclear's getting to. He wants to know what all that twitching in the preclear's left leg is all about. Just to find out if the preclear is changing or is moving in the session; that is what is desired. So give the command for the extension of the body's hand, take the preclear's body's hand, thank him. Without putting his hand back in his lap this time, ask him how he's doing and so forth. All we're trying to do is just that: just establish the state of case at that moment.

When we've established it, we couldn't care less about what else is happening. We might even spring a cognition, we might do anything in it; but it's all for the auditor—all for the auditor. We put his hand back in his lap and repeat the command and go on with the Tone 40. And the preclear says, "Well, I feel a little bit tired now," and we go on with the process. And the preclear says, "I have a pain back of my left ear that's killing me." And we go on with the process. You understand that?

Because we more or less determined that he would advance these things anyway to protect himself. He's just doing a protection mechanism where these things are walking forward on an automaticity of protection. And until we were very well assured that this preclear was actually capable of some self-determinism and personally capable of some criteria of one kind or another about his life and what was going on would we, then, engage in Formal Auditing.

But we wouldn't then run CCH 1 or CCH 2. We would run some upper process and we would do it on a Formal Auditing basis. And when the preclear said, "Oh, wait—wait just a minute, I—huh-huh . . ."

You say, "What's going on?"

And he says, "Well, I just remembered. My father used to beat me three times a day and twice on Sundays. I never remembered that before."

24 JULY 1957

You say, "Well, you got a somatic that goes with it?"

And he says, "No. No. Yes! Yes, that's what that is. That's what that is. Yes."

"Well," you say, "all right. Now, how are you doing now?"

And he says, "Oh, I feel a lot better."

You say, "Fine. Thank you." And get on with the process. You see?

What'd you do? He said something, you answered him, you asked a question, you amplified what he said, you make him say a little bit more on it, you made him realize something about what he had said. In other words, you've fished a cognition. And you, having understood it thoroughly to your satisfaction and therefore his—which is very interesting because if you don't understand it to your satisfaction, why, you've never understood it to his; it's downright magical this particular fact—and then you sail on with your process, give him the great "Okay," and away we go!

Now, what if the preclear says, "I'm terribly tired now," and so on? Well, naturally, under Formal Auditing, we'd just knock off, wouldn't we? Because we're not enforcing auditing commands, are we? We'd continue. But, he'd never find out that it was over his dead body! Do you understand?

He said, "I'm awfully tired now."

And you say, "Well, we have been sitting here for quite a while." It's a fact. "We have been sitting here for quite a while and we've got quite a little while to go." And he'd say, "Well, I guess we have."

And you say, "Well, let's get on with it." It wouldn't [be] the way you'd handle it in Tone 40.

He'd say, "Well, I'm a little tired now."

And you'd say, "Extend the body's hands into my hot paw." (Whatever auditing command you're using.)

Now, here's a vast difference. Here's a vast difference. It's a difference of understanding of people. And unless you understand that people lie below self-determinism and rise up into it, you would not understand that these two auditing styles are addressed to, really, two different states of case.

Now, the same case can be a different state of case. And what is absolutely wonderful to me is that many auditors never realize that a preclear changes. And I often wonder why in the name of common sense they're auditing him. He's changing all over the place. He's just change, change, change, change, and the auditor keeps on treating him at 1.1. Well, the auditor actually can slam him back down to 1.1 with very, very bad ARC. Fortunately, he can't slam him down there permanently again. It isn't in his power to do so. He'll knock him down there maybe just toward *him*, but the person will respond out in the environment at large. This is quite an interesting thing. We have to understand, one: that people can change, before we can audit.

Now we have a devil's own time—there's some old cult or another, they existed in the middle twentieth century, that insisted that nobody ever changed at all. And the funny part of it is, it's almost impossible to teach people of that belief how to audit. One, they couldn't possibly take it seriously because their stable datum is that no change is possible. So why should they audit anybody? Well, that is an extremity. That is an extremity: the person who just believes—by personal conviction, by training—that everybody remains the same no matter what happens. And now, that would be an extremity.

But there is this middle ground where, "Well, I know her, she's awful 1.1, she always has been 1.1 and she always will be 1.1," and yet the person has received auditing; they're probably now 1.5 and they'd bite your head off.

It's almost incredible that auditors will still run a comm lag on this, but they rather tend to. Even I find myself doing this occasionally. It's very difficult; if you're of the kind of temperament that must have everybody exactly characterized and pegged at all times, then you're sometimes uncomfortable in Scientology because you meet Joe and Joe is, oh wow! You know, he was one of these apathy cases and it was all sob when he got happy, you know; he'd cry, he'd come clear up to tears, you know. And you'd meet Joe, and you'd say, "Well, I know Joe."

And one day somebody comes along and says, "Well, I was audited by Joe the other day, and I feel fine!"

You say, "What!"

And, "Yes. What's the matter with Joe?"

"Oh, I don't know. There's nothing the matter with Joe really. (Code of a Scientologist! Code of a Scientologist!) Are you sure you feel all right?"

Well, Joe got audited by somebody and Joe is now about 3.2. And you meet Joe and you say, "How's the weather out in your part of the world?"

And he says, "Well, it's probably going to have the usual spring weather."

You've moved him up into conservatism, you know, and you say, "Can this be Joe!" And you say, "Well, I should have Joe around here; he'll impress the public that I see and people come to the group and everything; he'll impress the public because we need a good, conservative member of staff." You know? And two months go by and you get ahold of Joe and he's running the group for you and everything else; and you stick your ear in one night to find out how he's running the group and he's saying, "Boy! This is the dog-gonedest subject you ever had anything to do with! It's terrific!" You know: adjectives, adjectives! Somebody got hold of him and processed him and he's up in enthusiasm. Just Scientologists aren't reliable, that's all; they keep getting better.

It's quite an interesting thing, though, that people continue to overlook this. Actually, they have tremendous background, backlog of experience that tells them that people remain the same, you see. Their mother never changed—not in all the years they knew her! But it's quite interesting that somebody can get a stamp on him that says 1.5, you know, or somebody gets a stamp on him that says 0.5, and people just stamp this on him, you know, and everybody agrees on it and you got a total group reality on the fact that this fellow is some below-2.0 tone. Everybody but the guy. He gets some auditing and even though he's doing well someplace or another, why, people tend to hang up on this one just a little bit. And it comes as quite a surprise and sometimes rather upsetting to find out the fellow's changed on the scale.

That's one of the—one of the things, by the way, that I have a little trouble with. I have a little trouble with that because broad judgment on a certain person is liable to hang up just because amongst many people you don't have as rapid communication *as* you do with one. You see? And a lot of people have the idea somebody's still hung up somewhere on the Tone Scale and it'll take them several weeks to find out this is no longer the case. And then they find out this is no longer the case and we have a different attitude toward the person. But during that period there, it's quite marvelous that the person has gotten into good enough shape to take the beating he gets. Because sometimes he does take a beating.

So anyhow, it's necessary to appreciate this fact that change occurs. And even more so today because change in CCH is more rapid than it used to be and a person can move out of these rather tenuously held—do you know it's

24 JULY 1957

awfully difficult these days—pardon me, it probably always was difficult to hold a low-toned position. They actually blow up quick. You hit them in the middle and they tend to explode and I don't know how one manages. It must be awfully uncomfortable. But before Scientology he was able to hold on to it quite easily and quite well; in spite of himself or anybody else he would just go on through life at this level and eventually sag down maybe half a point to grief or something like that, and finish his days as a weepy old man or something. But these rapid changes are discombobulating.

Now, I can tell you a process that will break somebody from a psychosis to a neurosis rather rapidly—if you can run it—providing he is actually holding on to some very strong psychosis. And that's one that you know well and which we know now as—you knew it for a long, long while. It's just ARC Straightwire, which is now a training drill. It's a fascinating process. But you get somebody who's spin-spin-spin and if you put the question to him and he does get the question and he does answer the question, he's liable to go click-click and he's just neurotic.

And I never used to give up a psycho as a bad job, way back in the old days. I would just never give them up. I would always keep asking this embarrassing question of auditors on staff and around in the field and so on when they tell me about this case they're having an awful lot of trouble with. I'd say, "Have you run ARC Straightwire on the person?" (There are some people here who've even heard me say that.) "Have you run ARC Straightwire on him?" Way back when, you know.

And they'd say, "Well, no. It's almost impossible to get his attention that long."

"Well, try it."

We had one that was hanging around the Foundation. He'd been around the Foundation. He was from someplace way up north somewhere; and he'd been out on a lighthouse or on an iceberg on duty or something for years, and he was strictly spinny. Oh, he was awfully spinny. He just came in—he didn't walk, he pirouetted—and he came in and they audited this on him and they audited that on him and tried anything they could think of to audit on him and so on. And they—suddenly I noticed him one day in the shop and I said, "How long has he been around here?" And somebody said, "He's been around here for several weeks. He's had quite a bit of auditing. There's several of the student auditors who have audited him and so forth, and nothing much seems to happen to him." And I said, "Well, that's very interesting." And I walked into the room where the fellow was sitting there and I just told him, I said, "Now, recall a time that's really real to you." You know? (*snap*) (*snap*) (*snap*) About five questions and he said, "Whoooo, where am I?" That was the end of that case.

It wasn't because I was *that* good. I gave him his first smell of reality of the bank, don't you see? And that's how that old, creaky process used to work—and would work today.

Well, we've had for many years a process, which if you could get the question to him, would produce a rather phenomenal result when addressed to a psychosis. And this has always given me the idea that a psychosis is awfully frail. And of recent years, I've had the opinion that states below 2.0 were very frail: they broke up very fast. Well, what would cause this opinion?

These states are an assembly of circuits which have just one common denominator. And when you can get the common denominator of a lot of objects, you can handle all of them. And that common denominator is: you

can't handle this and neither can I. Unhandleable manifestations. Well, naturally, we get the idea that these cases crack up fast to the degree that we can handle these manifestations. And when we get better and better and more and more practice and less and less dismayed by these horrible things that, oh, I don't know—well, you couldn't imagine a Scientology practitioner winding up in a spinbin from some auditing or something. I mean, it's pretty hard to figure out. You'd say, "Well, why didn't he go see a friend if he was feeling bad about it, or . . . ?" It'd be kind of unbelievable. You just wouldn't believe this easily.

Well, this is the first thing that is believed in psychiatry. "Well, I don't know, he's in there consulting every day—he'll be down in Ward Nine here in a couple of weeks!" They believe this is going to happen. Why? Because these people are handling conditions which can't be handled by classifying the conditions which can't be handled. And this is their idea of handling the condition, is just to classify them. You'll see them all sit around and say, "Well, he's got Kraepelin's disease. Yes, that's right." "He's got Menninger meningitis." And they'll classify these various things of one kind or another, and this gives them some sort of an illusion of handling them. And then they notice one day that the fellow's still spinning. But they've classified him! They put him in the schizophrenic category. And the fellow insists on spinning, so they say he's willful.

But when bluntly called upon to handle one of these they considered an unhandleable thing—and it does tend to kick them into the spinbin. I'm not running down psychiatry for a change; I'm just telling you about an accurate observation of this. And you look down into any sanitarium and you see somebody down walking in circles, well, it'd be a head nurse and you'll see somebody else walking in some other cell and that fellow, one time he was the head surgeon of the place, and so forth. In other words, they wind up in their own spinbin.

Now, Scientologists wouldn't do that. Not today. It just wouldn't happen—it's not thinkable. We find it a little bit difficult to understand, I'm sure, how they would wind up there and how they would give up that easily. Well, it is hard to explain unless you're content with this explanation, is: they Q-and-A with the circuit. And the circuit says, "It can't be handled," and they say they can't handle it. And if they can't handle it, therefore, it is more powerful than they are and they wind up in the condition that it says. So the circuit is boss.

Now, somebody the other day wrote a book on laughter, and he says that laughter is a complete and entire manifestation of neurosis and is nothing but neurosis and laughter is neurosis and people who laugh are indisputably neurotic and there's nothing can be done about it and it's all that bad over there. And he's written a whole book on it and he's proved it conclusively from beginning to end, totally overlooking the fact that the only psychotherapy which is reported in the Middle Ages was: get them to laugh! And he's criticized all the comics of the day and everything else. He laid it all out: "Well, one is nuts if he laughs."

Well, let me assure you that laughter has been known to be therapeutic as long as man was. I get a bunch of guys together, go out sailing, something like that. The boat gets sopping wet and everything goes to the devil and you haven't anything to eat for a day or two and you finally drag up on the shore and get into the shelter from the storm and they sit there looking exhaust-edly, and the only real agreed-upon sign that is given that, "Well, it's all over and we're okay now," is they'll start laughing like hell. And I've seen people

24 JULY 1957

laugh like fools. How could we get into this much trouble—look at us! And the only thing with which they can reject all this is laughter. So their inability to laugh—if they are unable to laugh—is actually suppressing any release from the duress they have experienced. And this has been just known by man just for more years and decades than you could easily count.

And this fellow comes along and tells us, evidently with a straight face—and furthermore is given a full, great big page of review, very serious—and he says that it's neurotic! Well, that's wonderful because laughter is about the only thing that could handle most anything. Got it? It can handle most anything.

All right. So this guy has Qed-and-Aed with a circuit which says, "Laughter is bad" so that the circuit can't be handled. And if you were reading the book, you would be reading nothing but a circuit. Furthermore, I'm sure the book reads that way. I'll have to get a copy—I'm sure it does. Something like Gertrude Stein's poetry, or something: "Is a girl, is a girl, is a girl, when I was a rose, oh thunder!" Gertrude Steinian poetry.

But here is an example. An individual—I'm giving you this as a social example, I'm not trying to come down on psychiatry—here are these people who are totally confronted with nobody-can-handle-its, see, and they go into the terrific duress of electric shock and knives and things that bore holes in the skulls and all sorts of things in some fantastic effort, even though they know none of these things do any good whatsoever. And they'll tell you they don't do any good for the patient. (And I think these things are mainly designed to give the psychiatrist a little relief.) But, you see, they get frantic with this situation.

Now, there'd be two ways they could handle this sort of thing. One would be simply to realize that it was something there which was not supposed to be handled. It was something that was not supposed to be understood, either, since understanding and handling come awfully close together. Remember I told you that your understanding of a psycho would be advanced if you realized that a psycho was being un-understandable. See? Now, you can understand something that is not understandable: well, that's psycho. Well, we just put our oar in here just a little bit deeper into this puddle and we find out there is something there which is a concise delineation and motto and that is simply this common denominator of all of these circuits and machinery and behaviors and so forth, is "You can't handle it." See? Not supposed to be handled. Nobody's supposed to be able to control, handle it or anything else. It's a total barrier.

Well, think of a bunch of fellows going up against that sort of thing professionally, one way or the other, and just describing what can't be handled all the time—doing nothing but that; they'd get swamped sooner or later, wouldn't they?

Well, there is a way to handle it. Many ways to handle it. Many, many, many ways to handle it in auditing today. But chief amongst those is bypass it.

Now, the mayor sends the cops. Right? The cop's a robot. You shoot a cop, you'll just have more cops. You got it? There's a cop, cop, more cops, more cops, more cops. They're robots, because nobody sent them—I mean, pardon me—the person who sent them can't be contacted. See, there's nobody there in authority while you're talking to a cop. Right? He's got his *orders* which came from Lord knows where. Well, you have a totality of handling cops if you start to handle cops. Got the idea? You just handle one cop, you get another

cop. You handle that cop, you get another cop. Shoot another cop and you get some more cops. You get the idea? And then get the FBI in it and they want publicity. In other words, evidently the more cops that you would handle to get them out of the road, why, the more cops there would be. Don't you see? Well, the answer to it is to talk to the mayor. You could probably do something about the situation if you could talk to the mayor. You got that?

All right. Now, we get a situation here then where the person that needs auditing is the mayor. And if you audit the mayor, you don't get more mayors. In other words, there's a finite end to the situation. You audit the mayor, you got him. Then maybe he'll send his cops out and have them pick up cigarette butts or do something useful!

Now, the other part of the analogy is, is only those people who are weak or vicious—uniformly, routinely and always—use police. In other words, the more scared a person is, the more he would really try to get something to front for him. Wouldn't he? He himself couldn't front up to anything, so he'd get some employed force of some kind or another to front up for him; and he'd just get more and more people fronting up for him. But the weak, the very, very weak resort to police.

It would be a strange day when you would call for the cops to do anything. It's not any critical thing to call the cops, but at the same time it's not something you do every day. If somebody is parking in your driveway, why, you leave a note on the car or something. Or you let off his brake and let him slide into another car up front. In other words, you do something about it yourself.

But the very, very weak person wouldn't do that. He would go around and he would tell the cops. And the cops can then not tell you who sent them: they're not supposed to. And don't we get an interesting situation!

I'm putting it on a third dynamic level only for one reason: not because I hate cops—they're beneath my dignity—but simply to give you an analogy of what is happening with the thetan. He gets very, very weak and he sends out circuits. And the circuits are totally irresponsible. They are not what sent them out. And you can audit them and audit them and audit them and you'll get noplacement, noplacement, noplacement. And that was the basic secret behind validation of circuits. Do not validate circuits, remember? And you start talking to circuits and validating circuits, you just get more circuits. The thing to do is to go talk to the mayor. Got it?

So Tone 40 Auditing just bypasses all the cops and goes and talks to the mayor. You got the idea? No matter what the cops say, Tone 40 Auditing still talks to the mayor. Got it? Now, that is what happens.

Now, if you think a person is forevermore going to send out circuits to front for him, then you have actually invalidated the results of your own Tone 40 Auditing. Sooner or later the fellow woke up. As a matter of fact, as you run Tone 40 Auditing for the auditor's benefit—freezing the process every few commands—you'll find the fellow will go up from the *mystery*, right straight on up the line—up to *know*. He goes up rather rapidly. He comes *up* out of the subzero scale, he comes *up* to apathy. And sometimes if you don't check with him like this, you fail to note how he is arriving. And he comes up through apathy, he comes up through the minus Tone Scale in the misemotional band and he comes—starts coming on out the top.

Well, he still has things to handle. He has all the debris of all the things he mocked up that weren't to be handled. Don't you see? And there's tag ends of all of these things all over the place. And now he'll start cogniting on them,

24 JULY 1957

however, and he'll start mopping up. But he himself is now confronting life; and on that person you use Formal Auditing. That's the way it splits up.

Now, it's quite fascinating that this can be laid out this neatly. And it was just for this unit that I managed to get it laid out. Because it wasn't this neat just a few days ago. Because it hadn't been articulated: it was merely being done. There's a big jump between doing something and talking about what one is doing. Sometimes actors can act right up to the moment when you start to explain—or you ask them to explain acting; then they're liable to fall to pieces. I can get at any automobile driver that's got a lot on automatic out here and ask him how you drive and get him so he couldn't even start his motor. Just crack up the machinery a little bit by asking him to explain it.

So, between being able to do something observably, there's a little period of confusion ordinarily before you come out and are able to articulate it cleanly. And we've gone through that period: we've just passed through it with regard to these auditing styles.

Now, it actually doesn't require a great deal of judgment on the part of an auditor as to when to use what style. Because if he always started with CCH 1 and went up through 4 and then went back to CCH 1 again to find out how the fellow was doing on it, he would wind up with having mopped up the case—providing he didn't spend too confounded much time on every case doing this but only did it when he found it was necessary. And if the auditor kept checking up on the preclear—on how the preclear was doing—and by what the preclear was saying, evaluated his position on the Tone Scale and went on up the line. This is all almost routine. But an auditor could make a tremendous mistake by continuing Tone 40 Auditing to the end of time and never shifting off onto Formal Auditing at all. Because he'd deny the preclear the benefit of as-isness in two-way communication. An individual, then, would get ahead a lot faster if he was given Formal Auditing than Tone 40 Auditing, but would still progress. You get the idea?

112

Now, we face up to this: that there is probably a fourth auditing style. That style will be discovered when it is needful. That I am fairly sure. But I could adventure at this point to tell you kind of what it would be like. It would be nonverbal, totally exteriorized auditing. And they would have a very definite series of steps that should be accomplished while doing it. And I could just give you that nebulous a shape to it because, for sure, we have run into this horrible position: one, accurately and well applied, Tone 40 Auditing used with CCH lower steps, moves a person up to Formal Auditing, which when well applied, moves the person on up the line so rapidly that we have found that most of our auditing commands (as originally issued in the spring of 1957) are relatively unworkable after a period of time. They're insufficiently precise. So these have had to be reworked. Why?

Because an individual doesn't just blow out of his head, which anybody might do. He picks up an understanding of himself as himself rather rapidly and gets up to a point where people, who are rather routinely exterior, normally exist most of the time. In other words, we take this fellow who is dead in his head and slogged out and knows everybody is after him and carefully strains his coffee every morning and feeds some to the cat because the restaurant owner might be poisoning him, and we take this routine, ordinary, run-of-the-mill *Homo sapiens* and we move him up scale rather rapidly to a point where he will function well and do well and is a bit exterior. And we move him up to a point where it becomes inconceivable to him to be totally identified with a body and he doesn't see how this could work anyhow. And the

auditing command right about that point—if it's wrong—becomes incomprehensible to him. Such a command as "Touch that wall" is found to be unworkable. "Give me *your* hand" is unworkable.

I can sit around all day and "Give me your hand," and you'd never pay me the favor of thanking me for it. And then you would say, "Well, I mean your body's hand." But you didn't say so and therefore I'd have to hold on to the beginning of the session throughout the remainder of the session in order to execute the auditing command. I'd have to say every time, "Oh, you mean—you mean give me that hand down there. All right. I'll lift the hand and give it to you." And many other commands are in this same category.

People move up top precisely, too swiftly under CCH to show that we can no longer afford to be totally hopeful. The auditing command must be terribly precise. Thus CCH as developed in the spring underwent some changes, and this ACC has catalyzed these changes and these changes are now being made in HCO Bulletins coming out on them and the CCH you see in the Student Manual is accurate and does express those changes. They are correct in the Student Manual which is published in the middle of '57—being published right this minute. They're correct in it, but they're not correct on this unit's sheet.

But then it's about time you got over the fact that a command was a magic incantation, anyhow. You have to give the command which will run all the way. Well, in view of the fact that these auditing styles do pull a person up all the way, then, I can tell you that if this alters the precision of command and demands a much higher precision of command, it will someday demand, for an all-the-way-north case, a highly precise type of auditing for the all-the-way, almost all-the-way-north case. And what kind of auditing will that be?

Well, I'll just tell you it will be a nonverbal auditing of some kind or another, not necessarily a non-MEST auditing but certainly a nonverbal auditing. It'll probably have different types of communication; we'll probably have training drills that teach you to do more than squeak while out of your head; there'll be other ramifications to it. But the day has not arrived when we either have it or need it particularly. And we will just let it come about in the course of events.

To bring a case from all-the-way-south up to Homo novis, comfortably exteriorized, it is only necessary to know Tone 40 Auditing and Formal Auditing.

And the only thing I wish to tell you here in this lecture is don't confuse the two. They are definitely, immensely different, one from the other. If you use Tone 40 intention while doing Formal Auditing you are not doing Tone 40 Auditing. Please, please understand that.

The two auditing styles are actually quite simple. Tone 40 Auditing is taught in the Upper Indoc and CCH A unit. Formal Auditing is taught in the Comm Course and CCH B unit.

And you're learning in this ACC unit two auditing styles. Please take them apart, examine them, look at them very carefully, understand them and use them well. Because you will need both of them to get anyplace with a preclear today.

Thank you.

SCALES (EFFECT SCALE)

A lecture given on 25
July 1957

Thank you. Thank you. I would accept it except you didn't stand up.
I think they were running "lecturer indoctrination"—stop the lecturer.
Thank you very much. Thank you.

Well, it's a good thing you are all in a good mood tonight because I have some very, very serious news.

The truth of the matter is—the truth of the matter is, from here on no Instructor is supposed to pay any attention at all to a blow. They are only supposed to pay attention to those who are doing superbly well.

115

And another piece of information here that might interest you greatly is the fact that the "Field Validation Certificate," that is to say, the one which is validated for field validating (one who could validate other certificates) will be a gold certificate. And the thing that determines it is *coaching* ability. That is what determines the color of that wafer. And I thought you might be interested in that.

You understand that's very logical. It should be a person who is capable of doing a fine job of instruction who should get that gold wafer. I choose to believe this is acceptable to you? Is it?

Audience: Yes.

All right. You got that on tape; they agreed to it.

All right, and the next piece of news I have is, this is the ninth?

Male voice: Ninth.

. . . ACC lecture, 18th ACC, July 2-5, 1-9-5-7, AD 7—After Dianetics.

Okay. Tonight we have to cover some very arduous ground and the whole lecture could be summated under one title: scales. Scales.

We have so many scales and so many of you do not know some of these scales, that this lecture was just a little bit hard to plot. How far south do I start?

Well, I'll start this far south: the scale is based on tolerance of space or inversion thereof.

"Zero" means zero spatial tolerance. Below zero is inverted space. What do I mean by "inverted space"? It went by and he didn't notice it. He's operating five feet behind where space isn't, or he's operating five feet in front of where space ceased to be. In other words, one can have an inverted idea of space.

Now, this actually is the reactive mind. The reactive mind is a total structure—as a total structure, is based upon inverted space and inverted

25 JULY 1957

time. It says, *then is now*; where it doesn't have space there is space; where it has space there is no space. It's a total backwards contradiction.

We see some manifestation of this in mirror image. Some people, you say, "Show me your right hand," and these people instantly show you their left hand. They deal with a great certainty on this. A lot of us are confused because right and left are just words and we don't have bodies labeled as well as some societies, some "cults" do—such as the AMA; it's one of the larger cults. I heard somebody laugh about that. That's a serious thing—that's a serious thing.

Every time I make a crack about these societies, you realize it has to be edited off the tape. You know that. But actually there is nothing wrong with the AMA that a counter-propaganda campaign wouldn't cure, because it's just propaganda.

Now, the AMA has a lot of ills, tremendous numbers of ills; they have these things classified, reclassified, declassified and all of them usually top-secret. They get these ills in long catalogs and if the patient doesn't have enough, they can always invent some more. They follow the practice of naming something and then saying, "That is it." Labeling is a solution of sorts. Don't you see? But they still have drugs and needles and things like that. And they go into a doingness on the basis of putting more MEST into a situation which has too much MEST in it already. And various things.

And you'll notice that they are in the business of curing. And that is a dreadful business to be in, I assure you, because the cure for any problem is only the problem. And if you go all out as an auditor to cure everybody's lumbosis, you are going to be in very fine condition yourself, let me assure you.

The liability of curing lumbosis, because one cannot confront lumbosis, is to get lumbosis. Curing it proves one can't confront it. Curing old age proves one can't confront old age.

Numbers of other mechanisms of this character go on and on, but we could say, offhand, for our purposes, that all solutions are at the low end of all scales. So if you expect a scale to solve anything, you are going to be terribly much upset because it won't solve anything. These scales are not solutions. All they are is graphed understanding.

A total understanding of a medical problem would as-is the problem. Now, we are not in the business of curing and never will be—because we know better. But we *are* in the business of understanding. And if you understood a thing completely and acknowledged that you did understand it, it would probably vanish.

Therefore, scales, when they're extremely accurate, tend, themselves, to vanish. You no more than get a good, accurate graphing of conditions and everybody says, "Well, I understand that," and turn away and skip it. Well, that's as it should be. So graphs just—which are correct and are accurate tend to disappear.

Now, graphs of profit and loss assist understanding. But I have known people who ran businesses—I have known people who ran businesses that spent all of their time with graphs and none of it with business. With the result of course, that the graphs just had to get more and more complete, and they went down and down further and they were totally absorbed with the business of understanding a graphical representation.

You have the same sort of thing in semantics. People get so absorbed with the exact meaning of a word that they lose sight of the substance which the word names.

Well, similarly, none of these graphs will do anything for anybody except understand. And if they were perfect they would as-is. Thus, don't be surprised that we keep drawing up graphs and they keep disappearing into the backtrack. Whenever we've drawn up a rather accurate graph it has tended to drop from view.

For instance, very few people are thoroughly acquainted with the Chart of Human Evaluations; very few people are thoroughly acquainted with this chart. They look at it, it embraces their understanding, they say, "Yes, that's the way it is," and that's that—there it goes.

Well, we have the shortest scale and the newest scale is the Effect Scale. It is so easy to represent and it understands the situation so well that I doubt that we will see it around very often or in very many publications. It's that good.

All it says is the top is tone 40. That means unlimited space *at will*. It doesn't mean "the greatest space." The greatest space would be something that would happen about tone 20 or 22. At tone 40 you would have space at will. And with the Effect Scale we have any effect acceptable, whether received or delivered. In other words, effect on others, tiny or great, is okay; effect on self, tiny or great, is still all right. No real concern, worry or seriousness over effect. Axiom 10 has not yet totally congealed somebody's thinking.

So Axiom 10 as a postulate gets made, a person gets anxious over cause and effect—which side is he at? Well, he must only be at cause, he says, and he slides down lower. That postulate is made at about 22 on our graphical arbitrary representation of numbers. And he makes this postulate that after that he must only be *cause*; it is never safe to be effect. Well, at this time of course, he has something to protect. And so we get possible, occasional interi-orientation; looking after possessions, other things occurring here at about tone 22. And of course then, if we enter in possessions, we enter in games. There can be no game without possession; something to get, something to have.

All right. It goes on down scale then and dwindles out to zero. And at zero, why, all causes would be all effects and all effects would be all causes. But what is the actual frame of mind of a person who approaches zero?

Just before he has a total tangle on the situation, he's in this interesting frame of mind—and this is a little gem of discovery here that took seven years to whip up, and it finally explained so much about behavior that the Effect Scale all by itself renders understanding of all of the other scales rather pale. So as I say, I expect it to vanish and you'll never hear of it again.

Now, the Effect Scale tells us at that point just above zero, that an individual must have *no* effect on self and *total* effect on everything and everybody else. Now, that is the category of "only one." This person can never communicate on a team basis. Really, he can never communicate because he can never find out if he *has* communicated. And we have one-way communication at this extreme point as the only communication possible. But that isn't communication! So this condition sets in at about tone 22 and then gets worse and worse and worse and space decreases more and more. And this idea that he must have *total* effect on other things or, higher on the scale, he must have *great* effect on other things and very *little* effect on self—becoming at length *total* effect on other things and *no* effect on self—is actually what jams the space. You keep that up very long and everything you're trying to affect, you'll be *in*. And so we get the zero position of the scale.

A thetan trying to make an effect on a body, who must have no effect on himself—see, the thetan must have *no* effect on himself and he must have a

25 JULY 1957

total effect on this body—can never get an incoming communication that will tell him that he has had an effect on the body.

You might say, a hunter or a criminal or somebody picks up a double-barreled shotgun, walks up to another human being, puts both muzzles of it against his chest, pulls both triggers. The other guy just flies to flinders, you know? The head goes in one direction, the feet go in the other direction and the blood spatters all over the place, including on the person who shot him. And this very messy, gun-smoky scene—you would say, "Well, he knows he's done it now."

No, he probably says (after the other fellow is lying there dead or been buried for days), why, he says, "Why are you still standing there!" You got it? "Why are you still standing there!" He couldn't possibly find out that he shot the fellow. He couldn't discover that he has shot the fellow, because he can't have an incoming comm. So he cannot observe that the other fellow has been shot. So next time he has to get a five-inch gun or something and shove it into somebody's chest, you know, and pull the lanyard on it. And it goes *booooooom* and there's the—and he says, "Why are you still standing there!" You see, the guy's gone, buried, nobody ever heard of him anymore.

And the guy finally goes out and he invents an atom bomb and he throws the atom bomb on the city and—blows up, you know, and kills all the women and children. And you could just see this guy just absolutely gibbering in his laboratory: "Why didn't it kill anybody?" You know? Blood all over the place. Get the idea? No incoming effect.

Now, you'll notice this particularly at about 1.5 on the scale. It's a pretty tight interchange, 1.5. A fellow still can find out something at 1.5. But a fellow at 1.5 will take a human being and he will beat him and beat him and beat him and beat him, *way* beyond any possibility of the beating being received. He never finds out the other fellow is being beaten up. Do you understand that?

All right. These total-effect boys (down around zero) don't even get the satisfaction of having made a total effect. They never find out. Even if they read the newspapers they'd never find out.

What they do—from tone 22 down, a person starts going through this category of a space getting smaller and smaller. Why? Because he's got to get closer and closer to find out if he did make an effect. And he finally goes into the thing he's trying to make the effect on and then uses *it* to make an effect, and then goes into the thing *it* makes an effect on, and tries to use this new combination to make an effect, and you get this interiorization, interiorization, interiorization, interiorization. And you look over a human body and you find out that it looks like a telescope; it's just got life after life after life (facsimiles of) all jammed into it and valences and identities and everything else crowded into it one way or the other. Because successive generations of thetans, (thetans don't have generations, but every generation, why, there's another thetan) and these fellows then start jamming this up, one way or the other. And you get a no-space condition.

Now, if it just—if it stopped at no space it would be all right. Fellow would just wind up with no space. But he doesn't do that. He keeps up the *same* action. Only now it goes on a gradient scale of "total effect on self, no effect on anybody else"—it flips and we have the victim. "It only happened to me," the fellow says.

He goes out and does these interesting things and every time he spits he feels spittle in his face. Get the idea? He can't do anything without getting

his teeth kicked in. Overt act-motivator sequence sets in. He says, "Boo" and dies of terror. Now, that doesn't take place exactly at zero. It gradually sets in. After this *total* effect on everything else has taken place, you start to get this thing as a switch.

And the bottom of the last awareness level is that every time a pin drops in the universe, he has his head blown off with an atom bomb. Any cause, any place, would cause a total effect upon him. And that is an accurate statement of the bottom of the inverted Effect Scale.

You understand this—human behavior gets so much like an open book that you really don't bother to read much.

You see this fellow coming in, he's got a wild blazer on and one of these super peaked caps that's got neon lighting on either side and he's coming in and he's talking at a high scream and he's in total motion, agitation, really tearing up things in all directions, you know. He just walks into a restaurant like this, there's a—there's just this commotion where he is. It's just—there's nothing there at all. It's an interesting thing that he doesn't know anything he is saying is reaching anybody, anything he's wearing or doing, he doesn't know that these things are reaching anybody.

Well, his answer to this is not to try to reach people but to wear a louder shirt and a louder cap and to get brighter neon lights. See that? He's got to go in the direction of *more* effect.

Well, the Effect Scale—a complete comprehension of the Effect Scale—tells us rather accurately that if an individual wishes to remedy this condition at any point of the scale, all he has to do is find out if he is creating an effect *or* find out what he can really create an effect upon that he is willing to observe he has created an effect upon. Do you see that? Now, run at the very low levels of the scale, it's—is an unfortunate thing that he will never find out.

You can't take this *direct* approach. You have to be very covert about it; you have to let him find out that you can have an effect on *him*. And when he finds out you can have an effect on him, which doesn't kill him, he finds there is something less than a total effect. Now, that's the first thing a person has to discover in order to ascertain reality at the lower end of all of this Effect Scale: that an effect *can* exist. And that's all you have to establish. But of course he won't understand this at all unless the effect is observable by him.

So we say, "Well, we know how to process these preclears—there's just nothing to processing these preclears. Take a double-barreled shotgun and an electric shock machine and we kick them and we beat them and we hit them with chains and we blow their brains off and they'll find out they've been processed!"

Now, in corroboration of this, ask somebody who has treated human beings with extreme violence, if he's ever hurt anybody. Ask somebody in the death house that's about ready to get roasted, "Did you ever hurt anybody?" And we look up his record and we find out he brutally murdered eight women or something of this character and he says, "No. It's all a frame-up, society is against me. I didn't do a thing. It's all justified. I didn't even hit her. She just—somebody came along and said, 'She's dead' and then—she's dead and so on, and that's the way it is."

But of course, that phenomenon isn't as near as asinine as the attitude of the society which permits it. The society which permits it has an entirely different attitude. They say, "If we just kill enough of these fellows, then they'll find out they mustn't kill anybody."

25 JULY 1957

All right. Speaking of social reactions, let me assure you that no posted law, in the long run, ever restrains any crime in societies. And that is a sad thing to observe!

Now, there are such things as laws whereby we agree that on certain streets we shall stop and look for traffic and on other streets we shall run free without having to inspect the side streets. Well, that's all right. But when these things just cease to be agreements for convenience and become fixed martial laws of one kind or another, to be enforced with a sledgehammer, they defeat their own purpose at once. Because the only people who cause accidents are the people who must have total effect on others and no effect on self. So if there's no effect on self, they never find out about the law. Even when they're sent to jail, fined, driver's license taken away from them, they never find out. They could never discover what the law was. In the absence, in the past, of somebody going over this with them and trying to be understanding about it and trying to see what their problem was—perhaps somebody just talking to them in social work or something like that could have established some gain of this kind. But a Scientologist certainly could.

You'd have to teach this fellow the law on an interesting basis: you'd have to show him that there was an acceptable effect of one kind or another, there was a tiny enough law that he could obey. But first, there's a law that's tiny enough and ineffective enough that he could find out about it. He can't find out about these big laws which promise enormous effect on self. He just can't find out about them! And when he drops from that point, the fact that somebody is willing to knock his block off just suits his appetite to the core. "Ha—*slurp*. You mean they'll execute me? *Slurp*"

Men are walking into police stations all the time saying, "I did it." And they say, "Did what?" "Oh, murdered the woman." "What woman?" "The one you found in a culvert last week. I murdered her." "Well, yes, well how did you do it?" "Well, I did it with an ax!" And they say, "I'm very sorry, but she was shot."

It's the business of courts and so forth to put up with this nonsense. But court is the last resort of a society which has already discovered that beings cannot live with one another. Well, beings can't live with one another only to the degree that they can't communicate. They can't find out what the agreement is; they can't find out they're part of the society, they can't find out there's anything you could do about anything anyhow and they can't have an effect on anybody else anyway. And they don't need any law restraining them—they know if they shoot somebody in the forehead that it won't hurt him. And you get this very fascinating, lopsided thing called an only one, and he can't read.

All right. The rest of us have stop signs. When we see a stop sign we have a stop sign. We don't plunge out into an arterial. And we stupidly, confidently drive down the arterial thinking people stop at stop signs. Ah! But the state has already licensed, at this dark age, *anybody* to drive a car. And if anybody can drive a car, including all those people who must have total effect on others and no effect on self—they can't read those stop signs! It isn't a case of passing enough laws to make them stop at stop signs. It's simply a case of getting a stop sign they'll read. I mean, it's as idiotic as this. And these people plunge through the stop signs and out onto the arterial and we hit them and we say, "What on Earth was that doing here!" That was doing there because the Commissioner of Motor Vehicles doesn't know his job. His job is to license competent people to operate vehicles. And he doesn't do that

so he could probably be arrested for every accident there is. Anyway—it's an interesting thought though, isn't it? That's bypass the circuitry and find the guy there.

All right. We have a point here on the Effect Scale where this inverts and we have the people who must have a total effect on others getting along beautifully with the people who must have a total effect on self. And they team up and we have a government. Quite fascinating. I mean, these two go together hand in glove. Their mental attitudes are both below death, because death is no deterrent. Death does not tell them they can no longer have. Death is not real, nothing else is real. There are no restraints of any kind, but then there is no universe anyhow. But then, there's nobody there anyway. It's a rather interestingly ghastly state of mind to get into—but it's definitely attainable. And it's that state of mind at the extreme bottom, where the fellow must have total effect on self and could not possibly make any effect of any kind on anybody else, that we call "all the way south." It's below death.

Everything happens to him, *nothing* ever happens to anybody else, much less his doing something to somebody else. That's all the way south. Now, when that gets up on its—before it inverts, the person has to have *total* effect on others and couldn't possibly have any effect on self. And we get some rather interesting thing—we see people like that doing interesting things.

I've seen them in war and so on, they—somebody puts a slug through them, something like that, and they look rather curiously at the wound and go on walking and so forth. They're not very aware of the fact they've been shot, somebody calls it to their attention after a while that they have been shot. And when the ridge snaps with which they're holding that whole wound in suspense, of course it becomes about a thousand times more painful than it ordinarily would. They just flip on that one particular incident to, "I have not been shot," to "I have been shot all to pieces!" See? It's a fast flip, quite ordinarily, that you'll see this happen in.

Well now, if we understand the effects of the Effect Scale; if we understand the downward level on this, we'll just never have any trouble understanding communication. Because communication requires space and the Axiom 10 tells us that from about 22 down, we have the main game just making an effect, just causing an effect.

All right, if a person has a game of causing an effect, he had better find out that he had caused an effect, in order for him to know that an effect has been caused, which will end the cycle of that. It's when he doesn't find out that he has caused an effect that he goes on and tries for a bigger effect. And he never finds out that he created *that* effect, so he tries for a bigger effect. And then he didn't find that out, that he caused that effect, so he tries for a bigger effect and we finally get somebody willing to work on an atomic project.

My, you're certainly going to have to edit these tapes. Anyway . . .

Here we have, then, an individual who is in this frame of mind: he is totally willing to create bombs of sufficient magnitude to blow Earth in half. Yeah, you get ahold of him and you say, "Now, look son, look, you've got a family, wife, you're not doing too badly (the taxpayer's money). You're not doing too badly. Now, if you blow Earth in half with this new creation of yours, let me point something out to you. You'll blow *you* in half too." You'd expect, well, this will have an effect on him. You say, "It'll knock off your kids, it'll do this; it'll do that."

Nope. Nope! I had one say to me, that I followed this course of logic with,

25 JULY 1957

and he says, "Well, they'll"—this was the exact remark after I had pointed out the fact that it would kill him: he said, "Well, they'll just have to look after themselves. That's all I've got to say." I don't know how that fitted in, but it fitted into the conversation.

Well, a fellow of this character I was working on, I—telling him he'd— his continual subscription to the idea that we ought to use weapons of great magnitude and so forth would eventually wind him up in the soup, and I tried to convince him of this. Just, I was being vicious, to tell you the truth, because I was trying to flip the lower end of the scale on this guy. And I didn't.

Scientologists are condemned to a certain horror: the horror of doing good. You work on somebody, wishing to wrench his head away from his vertebrae and you find out after you get through he feels better. Anyway—it's a terrible thing to do. And I went through all of his possessions one after the other; how they would be affected if the world were destroyed or the place were atom-bombed. And it wasn't until I got to his social security card (we remember this), that it suddenly became real to him! And I told him he'd lose his social security card too, if he got blown up. And right after that he said, "Well," he said, "I—I'd better do something about it. I better lay in some of the food they've been telling me about in civil defense work. I better stock up on some of that food."

Well, how tiny an effect this was, you see? That something would affect his social security card was real. Well, we hope that in any case there is some level of reality which can be attained. If you attain that level of reality, you can continue to improve the acceptable effect. And improving the acceptable effect, we of course have a person less and less anxious to create a total effect. He has a much more sane reaction toward his people, fellows, and he certainly gets into communication again.

All right. Not all people who pass into these levels, by the way, are vicious or wish to destroy everything; this is just a peculiarity. It just hasn't occurred to them. They're not that imaginative. But they will subscribe to people who would destroy everything. See, they themselves would not but they will subscribe to such people. And we get a Germany, on which a can't-have was run all during the period between World War I and World War II. Can't have, everything was can't have. They set up a rather successful government there, and other nations were pledged to support it—the Weimar Republic—it folded up.

They finally elected into power a fellow by the name of Schicklgruber. Now, Mr. Schicklgruber, sometime corporal of the Austrian army, was one of these *total-effect-on-others* boys, *no* effect of any kind on self. He wrote a book called *Mein Kampf* and we had other people at that level who were not violently pitched or framed, who were simply willing to subscribe to this philosophy as a good philosophy. And they voted Mr. Schicklgruber into power and he went on acting like a corporal and that was the end of that particular nation to all intents and purposes.

Now, here's this level of effect on others, total effect on others, no effect on self—engrosses our attention for this reason only: it has been one of these can't-handle mechanisms. It's one of the mechanisms which we've always said can't be handled. See, it can't be handled—mechanism cannot possibly be handled. We just can't get to this fellow, see?

We'd say something to him, we'd—let's say he just drank; he drank all the time. He'd come into the house and he'd pick up a bottle and drink. And he'd go to bed and he'd drink. And he'd get up in the morning and he'd drink.

And we say to him, "You're ruining yourself, your digestion and so forth. And you're spoiling any life that you have. And you're making others around you miserable. Won't you please stop?" And he'll say, "*Rah-rah-rah-rah-rah.*" And after a while we say, "Well, there's nothing you can do about an alcoholic." Oh, yes there is! Oh, yes there is.

Something rather interesting. We feel that if we could set him a horrible—we used to feel that if we could set him a horrible enough example or a big enough example—see, we're going down the Effect Scale with this too, on this particular point.

You understand that a scale can apply to a particular incident or type of consideration, or it could apply to all considerations. Anybody has been on the down side of the Effect Scale, about something, at some time or another. Well, there is something you can do. It's just don't go down scale about it, go up! Well, how do you go up? You just be willing to settle for the effect that can arrive, and that's all you have to do to go up scale.

In the case of the alcoholic you'd have to give him something of an effect which was acceptable. Now, what is acceptable to an alcoholic as an effect? We want to say something to him which will deter his drinking. So we say, "Whiskey will rot your guts! You'll wind up insane, raving, behind bars." You say all sorts of things, you know, like they tell little boys.

Anyhow, we'd say to this fellow all these various things and we're just going down scale on the Effect Scale. We're trying to make more and more of an effect and the first thing you know, if he stopped drinking, we wouldn't find out about it.

Now, nearly all alcoholics discover this to their horror: they haven't taken a drop in months, they've been holding a job, they've been walking the straight and narrow and everybody goes right on treating them like an alcoholic. Why? Because they got everybody into a total games condition about them. And these people cannot now observe them. It wouldn't matter what they were doing, they're still an alcoholic! Because everybody has a *total* effect on the alcoholic, you see? "We've got to *do* something! Horrible! Terrible!" They go right on chattering about him, talking about him and how bad he is and how he'll never recover and never reform, and the fellow could go right on up and become president and the people in his hometown would never find out about it.

What would you do to reverse this thing, just examining this Effect Scale? Well, it just tells you that there is something that is acceptable on the subject of alcoholism, and you would simply work around it until you found it. You know, outside of session just talking to him, you work around it.

And I had one of these one time and he was in a logging camp. I was surveying the Canadian border—they didn't have enough to teach you down here in Washington, and so we went up and surveyed the border. And we found it, too; it's still there. It wasn't for quite a while. It had been lost for some time.

But this individual in a logging camp would get up in the morning and he'd down a pint of "Golden Wedding" and he'd go to bed at night and he would down a pint of "Golden Wedding," you know? And all day long, why, he would take a quart every now and then.

Well, in view of the fact he was supposed to be the cook, nobody could get any cooking done. And these boys were all government men and this was during prohibition times. And they kept telling everybody they were just surveyors, survey crew, my—just chainmen, you know, and rodmen. They're

25 JULY 1957

government men. And they'd stop these poor bootleggers coming down across the border, you see, with a hundred pounds of hooch on their backs and they'd say, "We're government, man." And the bootlegger would fish out a pint and hand it to them, or a quart or something and go on unmolested. And there was no lack of liquor!

So how did one deter this sort of thing? Well, it was fascinating. It was fascinating. I found this out very much by accident. I told this fellow that the liquor had been packed down on people's backs and had probably been very roughly handled. And I was being very offhand and go-to-hell and sort of showing off in front of the other kids in the camp. But I had him—had him backed up, more or less, against the stove wondering why we didn't have any dinner, you know? And I explained to him about liquor (and I knew he wasn't getting it anyhow) so I just got more and more sarcastic. And I said, "Do you know one of those bottles might be cracked?" He said, "No! No! No!" And practically passed out and he wouldn't touch it afterwards.

And not until recently did I know what had happened to the man. A little chip of glass might have gotten into the whiskey, which he might have swallowed in some fashion. And it would take something that tiny to kill him, of course. Which was just idiotic chatter at that time, from me, but wound up in the fact that he got breakfast and all kinds of things—somebody'd gotten through to him.

124

And I used to catch him when I'd come into camp, looking at me sort of fearfully and respectfully. I know all that happened to the man. But let me tell you—every one of these chainmen and rodmen, at one time or another, had beaten him up. And they were big guys. And they'd come in there with hamfists and the cook wouldn't have any dinner or something of the sort, and they were hungry and they'd knock him all over the cook shack and out the door and kick him in the ribs with their gumboots. It didn't have any effect upon him at all. But, "One of those bottles might be cracked . . ." It was not my perspicuity; I was just gagging.

And it mystified me for a long time, what had happened. But the principle is very sound. The principle is very sound.

I told a cop one time who was waving a gun around—he was going to shoot a guy who was slightly inebriated and there was no reason to shoot him; and I nudged the cop and I said, "You're going to get some grease on your hand." And the cop put his gun back in the holster and got out his handkerchief and wiped his hands off. And he didn't know what he was doing.

These are just shots in the dark, you understand. I mean, they're just a tiny enough something—the fellow's social security card.

So don't be amazed sometime when you're auditing somebody who's been saying, "Well, I don't believe this. Scientology isn't doing any good for me; it isn't doing anything," and so forth. And the last engram you ran out completely changed his color from bright purple to scarlet, and so on but, "No effect on me, no effect on me, no effect on me." And you happened to give him an acknowledgment, you know, your throat fails or something, and, trying to shout it down and you say to him, "Good." He falls out of his chair and goes into a cataleptic fit and gets up and says, "Boy, you needn't take it *that* heavy on me!"

Now actually, all this comes under is the proper estimation of effort. That's the heading it comes under at the lower end of the scale. But it's "What does it take to make an effect?"

Now, you could go on and blast atomic scientists and scream and fight

and say, "Well, they're going to kill all of us someday," and other nonsense, and yell at the Atomic Energy Commission. And then one day, misspell its name in the press or something of the sort, and have the whole organization disband, fall apart, nobody'd belong to it anymore. Get the idea? It'd just be something completely nonsensical. Not necessarily nonsensical, but it'd be a tiny little thing that just wouldn't have much to it.

You want to beware in trading chit-chat with somebody who is obsessively teasing you. This person is always teasing you and you say something one day, a rather faint joke as far as you're concerned; and you find out you wounded them to the quick and they've taken to their sickbed and they're almost ready to die.

The road up is the road marked by acceptable effects. And if acceptable effects are to be acceptable, then the person causing those effects certainly has to have a very fine estimate of this.

Well, other scales which were previous to the Effect Scale actually delineate the acceptable effect at the various levels.

Let's take, at first glance here, just the Havingness Scale. Havingness Scale, at the bottom—there are several variations and inversions down below—and all of them are packed into the first rung and then they kind of spread apart and go on up. But in general, the Havingness Scale runs "waste," and above that we have "have" and roughly, giving you the big jumps on the scale, you have "handle," "confront," "contribute to," and "create."

All right, we paired this up, we would see that this individual had to have a pretty considerable effect on others, you know? He just had to work like mad.

As a matter of fact, you know, it's the more relaxed people that have the wider effects on people. But this individual, as you think, he just has to hectically get up there, you know, and pound that through, and hammer it in somehow or another and so on. And you say, "What's acceptable to this fellow?" See? "What would be the acceptable effect?" Well, it would possibly have something to do with waste. It'd be something that was wasted.

Now, just above that level, this individual never knows when an argument's finished. This may be a woman, or a man, never knows when an argument's finished. They go on arguing after the point; they're not necessarily trying to make total effect, but they just go on talking about it and arguing about it and you know this is a characteristic of theirs.

The most disgusted feeling came over me one time when I found out that such a person could be handled with such ease—that all during the time of my acquaintance with this person, I had permitted myself to suffer in any way at all. And I just—it's—I felt like it was the biggest cheat that had ever happened to me.

This person, a girl, *yow-yowed* and *yow-yowed* and *yow-yowed* and *yow-yowed*, long after the fact. See? There—it wouldn't matter what happened. You're ten minutes late for a date or something like that, you see, you heard about it for the next two or three hours! Of course, now I would say well, the person never found out that you said you were sorry or anything. You see? The person never found out that anything had occurred. And they just couldn't get this settled—couldn't get any situation settled.

Well, after one of these rows which was just, oh, it was just a horrible row—the person just kept talking and talking and talking, and finally said she would never see me again, or have anything to do with me again. I didn't even know who she was talking to by this time. I don't think she did either.

25 JULY 1957

I went downtown the next morning and quite carelessly and stupidly I saw a blue negligee in a window and I told the clerk to pack it up and send it to this girl. And he did. Next time I saw this girl, I don't know, it just—there was this characteristic was missing. The person didn't do that anymore. All at the price of a blue negligee.

What was this all about? I didn't know for years what this was all about. I was through with it. It was over, done forever as far as I was concerned. Because it's no fun to stand there being talked to by somebody who hasn't the least clue whether or not you ever say anything to him or not—or her. This is nuts! But it just shut off the characteristic just like that! The person was at "have"; personal possession settled anything. Personal possession just settled *anything* with this person. And of more recent times I have had to go into this again and look this over more. And it happened when I was young and even more foolish than I am now (if that's possible). And I didn't appreciate it until fairly recently.

And it works at a much lower level; it works so startlingly, if you pick up the person at that level. They're not trying to render a total effect; they're just trying to keep the effect going. And you reach in your pocket and you take out a penny and you give them a penny and they shut up.

This sounds utterly incredible. I know some of you just don't believe me. You got it all set but your agreements on this are on social patterns. You know what you do with somebody who argues and argues and argues at them—you argue and argue and argue back. That's the thing to do. But it doesn't get anyplace because your argument is not acceptable to them.

All right, now if they're stuck at "have," you can give them *anything!* Just anything. It doesn't matter, as long as it's small and rather insignificant. And they shut up. You feel like a fool for ever having argued with the person.

I often thought about this blue negligee. It evidently changed a person's whole life. But it didn't really change their life, it just toward—changed their attitude toward one person. Me. After that there was never a cross word. It was quite fantastic.

People are misestimating on this Havingness Scale against effects all the time. At higher levels, why, you'd think that your handling the situation would take care of it.

Had a second lieutenant once, when I was down here in a fancy-dress Marine company we had in college. And he just used to keep giving orders. He was a geyser of orders. And he just gave orders-orders-orders-orders-orders and he gave them so fast that they couldn't be executed in any way whatsoever. And all the men around were stupid enough to believe that if they handled the things he was telling them to handle, they'd make it. But the truth of the matter was, this individual would have required something else like a—he wouldn't have shut up if you had broken his jaw, you understand. He probably would have shut up if you had tapped the button on his shirt. See? *Tok-tok*. He probably would go . . . But the misestimation on the Effect Scale versus the Have Scale was simply this: the boys would go on trying to handle what he was telling them to handle and it drove him nuts! Well, where was he? He was below such a level. He'd required something back one way or the other. But there are people on the Effect Scale—those that are well off—they tell you something and you handle *anything* in their vicinity, they shut up.

Now, I'll bet you there are very few people present who do not believe

that if you stand up to somebody with a strong face, and really stand your ground, that it'll settle the whole thing somehow. You got that? That if you front up to the situation, you front up to the person and stand your ground, why, it'll settle somehow; it won't be that bad. If you could just bring yourself to do that, why, it'd end the whole thing. Well, that's just a fixed estimation— that's confront.

And there are people, who when they're going *yow-yow-yow* or doing this or that or trying to render a total effect, if you simply stood up and looked at them, they would simply stop and that would be that, and they'd be very happy afterwards.

Now, we go up on the upper harmonic of "contribute to." I don't know exactly what we'd do, because getting up to "contribute to," we're getting up above the level of insane psychotic spins on this subject. But I would say that possibly something like this would work: the fellow is yelling like hell at you, and you get up and start yelling like hell at the place you've been sitting down.

The way to handle people, however, is never to create a worse situation than the one that has just messed things up. That never works.

But you get how these two scales can be paralleled one against the other? Just giving you an example. This is very, by the way, is very rough, that I'm giving you—no effort to make these things fit in smoothly. Just showing you that the Effect Scale, because of Axiom 10, then clarifies all other scales. And other scales are what effect they have on which, across how much space or inverted space.

And it's quite amazing that the Effect Scale is the leading scale, the top scale, that clarifies all other scales. Therefore you should know it rather well.

But as I've already said, there isn't anything about it much to know. You look at it and it's a rather total understanding and it doesn't have any way-stops. So that's why we've got to make it so complicated by making it compare to other scales, and then this is quite never—not quite ever exactly the case. And maybe the Effect Scale will stay around for the benefit of future generations of Scientologists.

But in any event it is never a good policy to simply Q-and-A with whoever is rendering the effect—that is what he expects to have happen. In other words, he's trying to render a total effect, you render a total effect. Russia tries to bomb the United States, the United States bombs Russia. It never winds up in anything because it creates a new situation.

In the field of effects and the creating of effects, it is the creation of an effect which solves it every time. But what kind of an effect? If you want to solve the creation of effects, you will create an effect. With this slight difference: you create an acceptable effect, which is to say, one which is *real*. The person is certain that an effect of some kind or other has occurred.

It's sometimes very funny in playing with little kids, they "boom-boom" at you with a cap pistol, boom-boom, you know, and you say "Ahhh!" and fall dead, you know?

Boy, if you want to upset a kid, do it sometime—they just didn't intend that much of an effect, that's all. Come over solicitously, and . . . But some little kid who is pretty badly off, you do that to—oh, boy, that is cream in the coffee. That—that's ice cream soda in the cup. He thinks that's wonderful. Well, what was his actual intent? To bump you off, of course.

Well, thus we have these scales and the clarification of an Effect Scale in your mind would actually render a great deal of advance on your part—make

25 JULY 1957

you capable of a great deal of advance, in understanding of people. And remember that if you could understand people, it also clarifies other scales.

And the next time you look at other scales, why, look back at this—what I have been saying about this Effect Scale and you will see at once that it becomes much more comprehensible.

Thank you.

Thank you.

THE MIND: ITS STRUCTURE IN RELATION TO THETAN AND MEST

A lecture given on 26 July
1957

It's a real good thing you're here tonight. We're going to talk about Technique Zed.

Audience: No!

Everybody that's been in an ACC knows about Technique Zed, but it's Technique Zed that we always talk about when they're absent; and we always tell them when they're absent that we have just discussed Technique Zed and so on. This leaves them well up in the air, you see? Well, Susie was absent the other night, so I told her, "Good heavens, you've missed Technique Zed." And in all seriousness she came into the Instructor's conference and she says, "Quick, tell me what Technique Zed is!" She fell for it, hook, line and sinker. But there really is a Technique Zed.

Tonight we have some interesting material for a change. I notice people trying to hold their hearts and so forth.

This is the tenth lecture of the 18th ACC, July 26, 1957. Come up to present time. Anybody hearing this on the tape will have to go back, won't they? Well now, that's the subject of the lecture tonight. The anatomy of the mind of Homo G. Sap.

Picanthropus erectus didn't have any trouble with the mind; he only had trouble with teeth. But when his teeth receded sufficiently to get these teeth confused with the mind, he thereafter started biting himself with something he called a mind.

There were some old witch doctors back along the line; I knew one of them, a lazy, no-good dog he was, but he actually did have something—to be technical—did have something on the ball. He used to lie up on a rock. And when the sun was shining he'd lie on this big flat rock and watch everything that was going on down in the caves, you see? And he had a couple of boys that had been orphaned by too fast a spring by cave wolves and saber-toothed tigers and so forth—and he had these two boys and they'd run around and he had trained them to listen very, very well. And everything they heard they brought back to him; and then he would have seering sessions in which he would sear the people good and plenty, castigate them for all the things they'd been doing wrong and they would not know at all how he came by this information. But he had to have a solution before he could do this. He had to have the solution to this problem: how can we make people retain guilt?

In other words, before it did him any good to pick up these bits and pieces, he had to get people to retain guilt so they would thereafter be

26 JULY 1957

reminded and would walk the straight and narrow and would not forget to leave the haunch of venison on his rock. Very interesting.

Talking to him one day—has an office on Park Avenue—and he told me that this whole subject of guilt was a very engrossing one. In fact, it was all there was to psychotherapy. Guilt. And in a session whereby you were "psychotherapeuting," all you had to do was pretend to plow up guilt and thus get people in the frame of mind that they could feel guilt, and they would separate with a lot of gelt. Actually, his tactics hadn't varied at all over a great period of time, even though he was now on Park Avenue.

So let's begin at the beginning, and let me show you that guilt has nothing to do with it. Guilt has nothing to do with it. Memory does. That memory which makes a person feel guilty is simply an inflowing memory which he cannot confront. That's all there is to guilt.

Well, we've polished off Freud's psychotherapy and the rest of the things. What else will we talk about tonight?

Oh, if you think it over very carefully that is it, see: an inflowing energy that one cannot confront, you see, and that would be guilt. Now, if you restimulate this, the individual keeps getting inflows that he can't confront and he goes on feeling guiltier and guiltier and guiltier the more we talk to him about guilt and the more we look for this thing called guilt, right? The more we look for this thing, the more we restimulate these inflows, because the guilt ain't. See, that's just another consideration. It isn't. Guilt isn't. And when you search for something which is not, what do you get? You get a lot of things which are not, and none of them are the correct not, and all these things together form a very large knot. And this is what is called the human mind, and which man wrestled with there back in the Dark Ages; way back, way back in the, I think, twentieth—twentieth century, if my memory fails me.

Anyway, the mind has been very, very engrossing mainly because it is the primary control mechanism by which men seek to control men. And when they go all out, when they go all out on control, then they start fouling up people's minds any way they can think of.

Now, if you wish to bring any release to this situation, or any freedom to it at all, you actually have to go into the business of freeing minds. Because all abilities, capabilities, physical energies and everything else depend upon this thing called a mind, which has a high monitoring value, or had, on *Homo sapiens*.

Individual feels down today, he feels upset, nothing is happening—today is like yesterday, as far as present time is concerned, but some other factor or influence enters in.

Now, we could go so far as to say we don't even know if there is such a thing as bacteria, but we'll give people the benefit of the doubt and say, "Well, there is such a thing as bacteria that is itself not generated by the body." The body, you see, can generate bacteria and can generate bacteria of very many types and classes, all of which are tremendously fascinating—which can even be viewed under microscopes. And I think this is very smart of bodies to be able to do this.

But bacteriology, a subject which was discovered to save the French wine industry, would have had people believe that these things somehow or another floated through the air in some fashion. And of course you can grab a bunch of spores out of the atmosphere and plant them and things grow, but there is no complete proof of this transfer as such. Now, as soon as I tell you about this, this whole subject of bacteria starts folding up on you and it's very

THE MIND: ITS STRUCTURE IN RELATION TO THETAN AND MEST

unsettling. And if a bacteriologist was listening, he would be more surprised than you, because he doesn't know this. Why do they believe that injecting somebody with some germs or blowing them into his nose or something like that causes these germs then to breed, as such? "Well," you say, "well, they make cultures of these germs and they pour them in." That only proves that germs grow; it doesn't prove that they breed.

I'm not dragging a long point here. You can produce various phenomena with cells and small animal organisms and so on. You can do some wonderful things, but I don't know that any of these diseases are done by any of these germ strains. I'm not sure of that at all. And I think the only reason anybody else pretends he is sure of it, is he's got to have *some* explanation. And you can mock up the whole concatenation of logic and rationale of bacteriology and you can wind up with some of the most beautiful results and gorgeous experiments that you ever cared to inspect, so long as you don't enter this particular datum: the body itself is capable of generating bacteria.

Oh, you don't believe this, huh? You don't believe this.

Well, it can generate any kind of bacteria you ever heard of, totally independent of any other kind of bacteria it ever heard of. What's the proof of this?

All right. Shoot a man in a nice aseptic sand, totally purified area in Arizona. Hot day, you see? You have him fall in the middle of this totally purified plot, but the sun is shining brightly. And I assure you that this fellow will putrefy.

Now, very few people have conducted this experiment. But it's a logical experiment to conduct. The body can, when it wishes to get rid of some excess part, generate putrefaction, which is to say, a conversion of parts into pus-like matter. Well, you can do other things to the body and cause it to generate other things, all of them more or less in the direction of putrefaction. The body can putrefy itself. Well, if it can putrefy itself it can obviously mock up bacteria, all on its little old lonesome. And if it can do that, then we have to ask the question: is it then possible for it to mock up everything else whenever set an example?

When set a proper example of tuberculoses, will it then generate tuberculoses? Is it the tuberculi which generate tuberculi, or can the body counterfeit tuberculi? Well, that line of questioning and that pursuit is—not been adequately followed at all. There—we would find then that very probably many diseases, if not all diseases, were autogeneric. Set a proper example, the body goes on and does them.

Well, the only thing that opens this up—is because Dianetics and Scientology have presented too many examples of diseases that just went *pfft!* And the auditor wasn't auditing the bacteria. Let me point that out to you. He was not auditing the bacteria and yet the disease vanished. Well, he was auditing the person. Well then is it possible that a person generates diseases, completely irrespective of the body? Is this amongst the capabilities of life forms? Well, it evidently is.

A live being is capable of generating destructive measures. We have to assume that. And a little inspection of life, if anybody ever got out and looked at it—and they didn't there in the twentieth century. Most of the people in, practically, early part of the twentieth century, never looked at life. But if you go out and look at life rather directly, you will find all around that life generates, amongst other things, destructive methods, destructive measures, destructive procedures of one kind or another. We go around and look in a

26 JULY 1957

city where they have a—had a slum of one kind or another and we find the contractors there busy tearing up slum dwellings—they're going to build an apartment house. Well, life has to destroy in order to build on that site, according to the postulate. They just were very backward in those days and they had to do everything according to the MEST universe laws. And what is this all about, then? I mean that if life—why do we balk at this idea that a live form can generate a destructive measure or method? Well, it obviously can. It obviously can. And this trick of putrefaction is just a trick of getting rid of a body which would otherwise lie around and clutter up the streets.

Somebody calculated one time that the forests of the world, were there no dry rot or other wood-destroying measures—we won't say bacteria because we don't know that's there, but we do know that the wood-destroying measures and methods are there—somebody has said that the world would be about a hundred feet deep in undecayed timber if no termites or anything ever came along and chewed it up. Clearing away the debris is evidently one of the methods of life, and clearing away debris is rather easily done with bacterial means, if you want to call it that.

In other words, life does not only mock up life, it mocks up death. And in view of the fact that life, a living being—by which we mean a thetan—cannot die, it's very obvious that death is some kind of a consideration or another that is simply mocked up and whammed into something. It's an agreement of some kind or another. It's an agreement based on: "I've gotten tired pushing this mock-up around—I think I'll get another one."

132

All right. The methods of getting rid of the old mock-up also include destructive measures. Well, destruction is normally chaotic. Chaos, destruction—these things go rather hand in glove. These are quite similar phenomena—chaos, destruction, confusion, that sort of thing. You surround a human being with enough confusion for a while and he has a tendency to sort of go to pieces. We've all observed this. You take soldiers in battle and that sort of thing, they have a tendency to age enormously. For instance at Dunkirk, the evacuation of troops from the Dunkirk beaches found amongst them many young men who had become gray haired overnight.

Well, Dianetics and Scientology had another look at this and found out that this destructive impulse, just as such, was reversible—you could take care of the thing and many people who have gotten gray haired, under auditing have had their hair turn back to its natural color. This has happened many times. Matter of fact Susie gets a kick out of me. She can normally tell when I've been working too hard or something of this sort because the gray in my sideburns goes up and down like tide, having nothing to do with the growing of hair. The hair doesn't wait to grow, you see? It's just a straight, outright mock-up. And my hair'll be gray way up into the hairline very far and then I'll get a couple of days rest and it won't be gray and it's very silly. Well, when I got away from corvettes in World War II, I had gray hair. Well, we've many times reversed this process in preclears. We sometimes don't do it with great certainty. Sometimes we set out to give somebody brown hair who now has gray hair and reverse the thing. And we very seldom wind up with a redhead but we may not be totally successful in this. Well, why wouldn't we be totally successful in this? Well, something has something to do with this and that's all I'm getting around to.

Medicine had the idea that structure monitored function at all times. That's their basic teaching. When you're talking to somebody in medicine you're sometimes talking at cross purposes because he doesn't understand

THE MIND: ITS STRUCTURE IN RELATION TO THETAN AND MEST

this primary thing. I remember in Kansas City I was giving some lectures, a medical doctor came up to me and he said, "Even though I have to unlearn my basic principles in medicine, I'm going to. You've sold me on the idea that something else is possible." And I said, "What do you mean by the basic principles?" And he said, "Well, I was educated in medical school and ever since that structure monitors function." In other words, the body would monitor the mind. Fellow is [un]happy when he doesn't feel well; therefore you cure the body and the mind is better. And he said, "Now according to you this is reversed and you say that function monitors structure." Well, that's a fair statement of it, but not a totally accurate one.

The actual statement is this: life monitors structure. And naturally there's an interchange between the two, so to some degree, structure monitors life. Got that? Well now, if you take life on an Axiom 1 basis, and 2, you will discover then that there's an interchange between matter, energy, space and time, and this timeless being—this timeless living being. There is an interchange between the two. So we're not going to be very definite anymore and say totally that function monitors structure. We're going to say that structure can be clarified through life. In other words, you can handle structure via life. And you can also handle life, until it gets wise, via structure. In other words, structure can monitor livingness, and life can monitor living-ness and you have an interchange of livingness when these two things are together. Right?

Well, what's in between them? There must be some gradient scale of a solid gold brick and a massless being. Yes, it's a gradient scale of matter, energy, space and even time. And that interconnecting link by which life handles small energies and thus handles larger and larger and larger energies and thereby gets a gradient scale of response, we call the mind. And this mind is capable as it is energized by a thetan or as it is monitored by structure (see, it can be handled either way—life on one side, structure on the other side, mind in the middle) why, it is capable of anything that life could do or anything that structure could do. See, it's a sort of a mystery sandwich. Well the meat, the mystery meat, actually was the mind; and an understanding therefore of this interlink, on a totally functional, structural, mechanical, draw-a-map-of-it basis, is absolutely necessary to a living being who is trying to live. If he's got a missing link in there that is a total mystery to him called the mind, he's going to be at best poorly oriented. He doesn't know how he's connected to that stuff, how he's connected to MEST. He doesn't know what keeps dragging *him* along the time track. He doesn't know why he's there; he gets very confused.

Now, there's another scale called the Curiosity, Desire, Enforce, Inhibit Scale—the CDEI Scale—and this scale is one of the more interesting scales because it tells us the cycle of response to havingness. One first is—it's also a cycle of response to a lot of other things, but particularly it matches up with the Havingness Scale.

A person is curious about something, then he desires it and then an enforcement to have it occurs, which winds up with his not wanting anything to do with it and being stuck with it.

A fellow will listen to a sales talk—he's got a 1938 Ford and nobody will buy it off of him and he—you keep asking him, "Why don't you just run it off the road someplace and forget about it?" And he says, no, he can't do that and there's no sale for them these days and he goes on and on like this and he just can't get rid of this car. Well, to some degree he's stuck to the car. What

26 JULY 1957

stuck him to the car? Actually all the experiences he's had with the car. Call it nostalgia or anything of the sort. Now, he's gotten down to a point of where he doesn't want the confounded car and he can't get rid of it. And this is the "I" point of the line-inhibit.

All right. This tells you that there must have been a CDEI on this thing called the mind, this interconnecting link between structure and life. There must have been a CDEI.

Now, we can theorize in many ways as to the creation of the mind, but that would be theory. We are much more interested in the workabilities of this. Of what is the mind composed? Well listen, after this midpart of the twentieth century, don't let anybody push you around into believing it's composed of impulses or repressions or guilt or something—you know, a bunch of considerations. Because the thing—anybody stating it like that is simply saying he doesn't know a blasted thing that he's talking about. Of course a mind contains thought. That's very obvious, isn't it? In other words, there'd be more stored thought as it comes up toward life than there would be mass in it, right? Well, it's got thought in it. Why then give these thoughts a bunch of control designations? Somebody could say it has reverence in it; it has—"A man is no good if he is not reverent." "A man is no good unless he can experience guilt." "You must be able to apply yourself so that you will think the right thoughts." Oh, balderdash.

134

Let's not characterize the mind in such particularized control terms. Let's just say from the point of livingness as we proceed towards structure, the first entrance in is thought—thinkingness. And as the thinkingness gets more and more fixed and solid, we eventually come to the first points of energy, nebulous little bits and parts of energy, and then this goes over into more and more solid masses and when we have a fairly solid mass with—like a mental image picture which contains a lot of significance, we have just about got the middle ground.

Now, that's a facsimile. We call it a facsimile—mental image picture. We have had to make up our own terms for these things merely because man had never noticed them. He had never thought it worthwhile to look at this; he was too interested in a bunch of control mechanisms.

Now, the mental image picture has been mentioned in literature many times, but the anatomy of it never included the fact that it *was*. People thought they saw these things. People imagined. One line I quote directly out of a very old textbook, about 1949 I think, something like that—December 49. This textbook, by the way, came off of the American Book Company lines, the last volume of that text came off the lines immediately before the first volume of *Dianetics: The Modern Science of Mental Health* rolled off the book rollers. It was very funny; here was a psychology textbook—I beg your pardon, I—it wasn't a psychology textbook, it was published by the University of Illinois; I don't know what they teach out there. Anyway, just as this last copy rolled off, I was standing right there and the people of the American Book Company were showing me what a beautiful, fast job they were doing on my book. They were being very nice about it. And I saw these blue books coming through the rollers and I picked one off the line rather loosely and looked at it. And so help me, it was the basic textbook of psychology, or whatever it was—of the mind, of the University of Illinois. And it was rolling right along and the last of these went off the line, *clunkety-clunk*, and the first of my book appeared, *clunkety-clunk*. And as the first copy of my book rolled off the rollers, it knocked the last copy of that book on the floor. So I

THE MIND: ITS STRUCTURE IN RELATION TO THETAN AND MEST

picked up the blue book and I said to the fellow, I said, "Can I have this copy?" and he said yes; as a matter of fact it used to be in the old Foundation libraries.

But anyway, this book—this book was very nebulous about all this, but I quote all it said about mental image pictures: "Very often, small children and morons think they see pictures." End of observation. They think they see pictures. Well, I don't know what people think's biting them when they've got a nice big juicy facsimile hanging around their ear giving them an awful earache, but it certainly isn't something they *think* is there! It's there. It is.

In other words, we first have to grant isness to the mind before we can recognize any part of it. It is. Just as much as mass in the solid form is. Isness. We have to say it is. Not somebody thinks it is, or dreams up these things or something of the sort. We have to recognize that it's there. Now, if you're going to repair a radio set, you're not going to get anywhere handling one that is not on the bench, that you just think is there. You'd be balmy. You'd be utterly nutty. If the little boys in white suits came by with their butterfly nets, you'd go; you'd be standing there at the radio bench repairing thin air. Screwdriver, you know, and pliers and soldering, you know, and so forth. And wouldn't be a thing in sight. And the little boys in the white suits would definitely break out their butterfly nets and you'd have had it. In other words, people that try to repair things that aren't there are crazy, aren't they?

You got it?

Audience: Yes.

So if the human mind didn't exist and had no anatomy and had no mass and wasn't in any way, shape or form, anybody that repaired it, before Dianetics, must have been nuts. Isn't that right? And they were. Naturally. You start to look at something to which you're granting no isness at all, you're trying to look at something and all the time saying it isn't, you wind up in an awful state, right?

Well, now we see this mistake being pulled on the walls. People go around all the time and they're saying, "Well-1-1-1, it's not very real-1-1, but... It really isn't there, but. . ." you know. You know, they walk down the street and the sidewalk isn't there and one day they get hit by a taxicab that isn't there and they lug them off to the hospital and sort them into the assorted parts bin.

Now, here we have, then, a very fine example of what not to do. If you're examining something, why, grant it some isness. Now, science learned this trick in the material world a long time ago. They learned this quite well. They said if there's a ghost knocking on the windowpane, there *is* something there. And that actually is the basis of all physical sciences which have been with us now for a couple, three hundred years. All right. If something is knocking on the windowpane, it is there.

Now, they went whole-hog and they said there is no such thing as a ghost. This is an unwarranted assumption. I could say easily that scientists very seldom see well enough to see ghosts. When I first heard that ghosts didn't exist in this century and place, I wondered if I'd gotten the wrong address. I felt awfully invalidated. And everybody was telling me when ghosts did exist, that they were very afraid of them. Invalidate, invalidate, invalidate. But science tells us that if something is knocking on the window, there is something knocking on the window, that it is done by physical means. Now, stage magicians, which in other times didn't have to resort to these physical

26 JULY 1957

means, were forced by this to actually practice entirely with physical means. But it still is a fact that even in stage magic, or ancient magic, that if something happened, there was something there, don't you see? And when there is something there and you say there is nothing there, you're either being crazy or just hopeful.

Now, the study of the mind then must have been very vastly impeded by an unwillingness to grant beingness to structure. And it worked this way: people who became incapable of seeing that wall, looking more shortly, thought they saw something and then tried to disprove it and that was the only basic information we had on the mind. It had to be a good, straight look. We had to look at the mind and we had to say, "What's there?"

Well, all kinds of things are there. These mental image pictures are there, and the—you might say, the machinery that handles them, the cross-interlocks of pictures of one kind or another, the various basic mechanisms of structure in vignette. We see the physical universe out here big and bold, and then shut our eyes and we see a picture of the physical universe. Well, that isn't any decay of vision or other things I've heard it called—I think "optical persistence" is its name. It's not optical persistent, it is a picture of the wall. And if you were to measure the exact mass of the picture, you would find out that it did have a tiny little bit of mass. It was a thing.

All right. We found out then, about the mind, that it did have structure. And for somebody to say, "Well, the mind is function and structure is structure," is a misnomer. Houses have carpentry work in them. Houses have beams and two-by-fours and eight-by-sixes and so forth, don't they? Well, so does the mind; so does the mind—except they're interlocks of pictures of one kind or another. Some are on the massive side, some are on the very, very light side. These pictures have thought in them. It is easier to associate a picture with thought than it is with mass, to tell you the truth, because they're closer to thought than mass, when they are closer. But on the lower end of the spectrum it is easier to associate some pictures people are dragging around with the structure end of the thing.

Well now, when one of these lower ones gets into restimulation, moves itself off of its assigned place on the time track and snaps against somebody's nose, his nose hurts—and that is the final test of it. You hit somebody with a two-by-four and he'll get a bump on the head. You hit somebody with a mental image picture and he will get the bumps indicated in it. It says you get eight bumps out of this picture, you slap it against him, he'll at least get seven.

I remember when Dianetics first came out, I received a tremendous number of letters. I haven't received too many letters quoting on this same phenomena since. But for some reason or other, people were obsessed for a couple of years with throwing their wives into measles engrams and then taking them to doctors who would then say, "Your wife, I would say, had the measles except there is no respiratory congestion." Had all the spots, had the fever, had everything else and it'd be a case of measles that lasted about three days. A fellow would hear about the time track, he'd decide well, the proper place for a wife of course is in a measles engram if they exist. And he'd shoot the girl down into a measles engram, the spots would turn on, fever would go up and it never occurred to the silly bloke to run the rest of the engram through like it said in the book. He'd lug her off to an MD who would diagnose it as measles without any germs or respiratory difficulties.

Well, what had he done, in essence? He'd taken the pictures made by the

THE MIND: ITS STRUCTURE IN RELATION TO THETAN AND MEST

girl when she was a little girl having measles and he'd taken these pictures and he'd simply splashed them up against the modern body. That's all that happened. And when this juxtaposition of space between present time and the old picture was made, the body—call it structure—reacted to the content of the picture, just as easy as that.

Now, in view of the fact that people live many wild, wide and variegated ways and they have tremendous numbers of very interesting experience—except mostly what gets wrong with people is they don't have enough happening to them and so they get bored to death. That's factually true, you know. If you want to give somebody trouble with the mind, don't give him any place to put his pictures, such as up against the noses of highway robbers, you know, and mutinous crews and—no drama, no drama. And he has a—too many drama pictures, he doesn't know what to do with them and life is too boring so he pulls in some of the drama pictures to have some drama close up. You can say that this sort of thing happened—it'd be much truer, by the way, than the fact that he got the pictures because of guilt. Now, let's—he's just bored.

I was talking one time—I investigated the police one time or another and it was a very interesting job. I wanted to find out what policemen thought of criminals and what policemen were; and I went down and got myself a badge and became a police officer for a while. And they never got wise to me. They thought I was a good cop, but I never used to get into fights and this mystified them a little bit and they thought I must be bored with life. And it didn't upset them a bit when I left the force. I used to see them afterwards from time to time and say hello. It didn't upset them a bit that I left the force because they knew I must have been leading a very, very bad time. I'd been on the force for months, never been into the hospital, never had to have my fist bandaged up, you know? It didn't occur to them that there was any other way than all this superdrama to handle people in a drunken area. And all—they thought well, you joined the police force, you get all these fights; cops and robbers, cops and robbers, cops and robbers, cops and robbers, television, television, we got it now. See? Television. And we thought that if we didn't get that drama, well, you had no reason to be police and Hubbard just wasn't getting any of this drama so naturally he left—he went out and did something more interesting. He's just unlucky—lucky. Criminal walked up to him, would never draw a gun or anything like that, the fellow would say hello and go on his way—or walk down to the jailhouse.

I had one of them discuss it with me when I was resigning. He said, "Well," he said, "you'll do something else, you'll get some more excitement." He said, "Don't feel bad about it." He said, "A fellow can't live in the middle of a vacuum forever." Never occurred to him there was any other way to handle life, than just handle it, see? You had to handle it with drama.

Well anyway, an individual, for whatever reason or rationale, does make pictures of what goes on or what he does. Now, we say he makes pictures — let's say he permits them to hang in suspense, or he permits something to associate itself like pictures, or he permits a picture phenomena to occur. And in the early days we just characterized these things as pictures and that was that. Well, actually it's a little more simple mechanism than we thought it was. Really, he's just sort of stuck around in that moment of time, and the scene has gotten very thin and this is a picture. And he, by changing space slightly—because thought can be everywhere—of course can see this picture right in front of him at any time.

26 JULY 1957

Now, the funny part of it is he also has the capability of mocking one up out of whole cloth. He just mocks one up. Well, telling the difference between one that was mocked up and one that actually happened, people think is the cause of it all. They say, "Well, he hallucinates. He thinks the pictures that are not real are real, you know, and it never really happened, but he thinks it happened and he's crazy and so forth." Well, putting this in a picture category, a picture is a picture regardless of what it's of—it is just a picture. Now, you say it is of something that happened, well, then we would have to say well, it must be a special kind of picture which is the residue of what happened. Say that's all that's left of what happened. Or we'd have to say he mocked it up. But it nevertheless is an energy mass and does have very many purposes. It has a tremendous number of purposes. And we look at CCH and we find most of these purposes in CCH—the purposes of the pictures. The pictures have thought in them.

Now, some of these pictures are clean out of sight—they are there totally, but they're missing. The individual went unconscious but the picture stayed there anyhow. Well, for sure an individual who goes unconscious will get the picture because the picture's totally collapsed upon him. Then with great surprise, as you start to audit him, he sees these things peeling off from him. Well, they moved all the way in and then there was a total space closure between himself and the picture. You got that?

138

And that's what unconsciousness is—being totally reached. Didn't want to be reached, but was reached. The individual's final retreat is not away in space, but *down* in awareness. Therefore, when he totally refused to confront something, he really got a picture. See, he just wouldn't answer up to it at all; then it's almost totally there all the time.

Well, that's actually all there is to the reactive mind, the unconscious, the subconscious or any other of these things.

Now, because these are all violent experiences, when they restimulate they generally cause a person to act in a violent way. And thus people like Freud make the statement that the unconscious or reconscious or something of the sort contains nothing but bestiality and man is basically an animal and he raves and screams and has these horrible impulses and so forth. You couldn't say any such thing. You could merely say that most of his violent happenings, those things which happen to him violently, are capable of being dramatized.

Now, the funny part of it is, it isn't what happened to him that counts in therapy. It's when he reached past the picture. Well, this is a violation of his inability to confront it, so he couldn't confront it but he reached past it and did it to somebody else and it caused the picture just to really snap in; in other words, he just started to confront the picture. So all the key-ins on these things are—you might call overt acts and give us these ideas of guilt complexes and other things. You can look at this anatomy rather interestingly, but it's the same darn thing we're talking about. We're talking about the bridge between life, a massless, thinking, living thing capable of creation and so forth, and the structure which it has created. And those impartial viewers looking at this would immediately have to conclude that it was just a gradient scale between thought and structure. And where it sort of disappears out of view and the general ken, we call it the mind. And it's that part of that gradient scale that's missing in normal observation. You look at Joe, you don't see this thin little structure sort of thing, the bridge between himself and how he manages to stand on pavement, which is quite a trick. And so we say, "Well, he's—it's his mind."

THE MIND: ITS STRUCTURE IN RELATION TO THETAN AND MEST

Well, there's only one thing wrong with the mind and that is the fact that a person has lived. There really isn't anything wrong with the mind. And if there's any basic postulate at the bottom of all of this series of pictures, it would be just this one: he wanted to keep a record. You can Straightwire somebody on that question—you'll get some very interesting results, you see? "Can you recall a time when you wanted to keep a record?" "Recall another time when you wanted to keep a record." And "Recall another time when you wanted to keep a record." And all of a sudden these pictures will start peeling off and going in all different directions, because he started parking remote vision points in front of all these old scenes. You see? He'd say, "Well, you know, I don't have that battle anymore and I don't have a battle now—I wish I had that battle back. The next time I get a battle I will keep some portion of the battle so that I can look at the battle and when I don't have a battle I'll have a battle." See? And therefore he'd haul one up and then there'd be this battle and that battle and then he'd say, "Well, I think I'll bridge the thing over into women," or something like this and he'd have a picture of one woman, another one. And then he'd say, "Well, I think I'll start keeping records of financial transactions," or something of the sort. And he starts getting all of his pictures—pictures.

In other words, he doesn't do it by recall, he does it by pictures. And when he does it very thoroughly by pictures, then he begins to depend upon similar pictures to handle similar situations. He does what happened then. He knows what happened then, then he puts this on automatic and he says, "Well, I don't have to handle any existing situation," (inability to confront) "so I will use a picture to handle the situation. Pictures will now confront for me."

139

There we get the mind in action. The individual doesn't have, he thinks, capability of handling structure directly. And as a matter of fact, structure is a little bit hard to handle directly with no intermediate step. And so the individual puts structure on automatic and he said all the structure will be handled on a gradient scale and here we go, and "I won't have to put out any effort and I can just sit here and not confront anything and be dead in my head and life will go on being lived." He does this for a few years and then he says, "You know, I'm not living." This occurs to him suddenly. He says, "You know, I'm not living, I don't have anything to confront, I'm not getting anywhere in life," lots of other things.

But the use of the mind or its disuse, the use of life or its disuse are, alike, enervating. That is to say, one totally uses and only uses mental mechanisms to remember things for him and one day he gets down to a point of where he can't remember anything unless he writes it down on a piece of a paper and then he gets to a point of where he can't remember anything unless somebody else writes it down on a piece of paper—he can't do that anymore either, he—somebody else has got to do it now—and he's just passing on out through remote stages. By stages of confrontingness, or failure to confront, he's getting more and more remote. Well, the mind naturally lends itself to this kind of thing.

Now, the mind has vacuums in it wherever it had a picture with a vacuum in it. Masses of pictures can—just as such—can evidently be influenced by other energy masses and you get all sorts of things. Energy influences energy, space influences space, energy influences space, time influences energy. You get an interconnection of matter, energy, space and time any way you want to look of it—at it, and any interconnection which is possible in the universe is also possible in the mind. It is just a study of the

26 JULY 1957

interrelationships of matter, energy, space and time and thought. And when these things are very thin you have the mind.

All right. Now, how does a person keep a mind in restimulation? Which is to say, how does he keep pieces and parts of it that close to him to be in present time? How does he keep whistling these things in? How does he make this thing stand in suspense on the time track?

Well, we have many processes, amongst them ARC Straightwire, which demonstrate to an individual that the time track can be unraveled. He's got it all jammed up and he starts—you start asking him to confront this and confront that about the mind and all of a sudden he begins to have space where he didn't have space anymore. So he feels better, he says it's gone into the past. Well, I don't know that it's gone into the past, but it certainly is further from him. You've asked him to confront parts of his mind and so he has been able to confront parts of his mind and all the mind would be, in essence, would be failures to confront or things we want to keep on confronting, either one. There are people who keep pictures around just because they're so nice. And after a while they wear them out, and boy, are they disgusted.

Now, here we have—here we have the mechanism of memory by pictures, and we also have along with that just the mechanism of memory. So that keynote here that threw everybody astray on the subject of the mind was this whole thing called memory. One remembered things. Now, let me show you this trick. How do we keep one of these minds in suspension? How do we keep it near and jammed up and quickly available and all that sort of thing? Well, we alter-is every picture. See, we alter-is every picture one way or the other, that keeps it in suspension. In other words, it isn't just a direct picture of the MEST universe, it is a picture alter-ised in some fashion; we have changed it around. How've we done that? We've kept it forever simply by changing our minds about it. How did we change our minds about it? Well, as we looked at the wall we felt in a certain way and afterwards, why, we recalled just looking at the wall. Now, how did we feel while we looked at the wall? What did we think? We thought we were in present time, didn't we? What did we think when we looked back at the picture? We say it's in the past, don't we?

Get that? That's the basic alter-iness. Very basic. Get that? We look at the wall and we're in present time while we're looking at the wall. We say this is present time, we "look at the wall." Now, when we remember having looked at the wall, we say, "I *looked* at the wall in the past." This would also apply to the future. We say, "That *will* happen." "That wall is going to come down" and we very often will kind of mock up a picture of the wall coming down when we say this, and we say that it is in the future and we get another type of suspension that is much less generally used.

But this "past" mechanism is the real trick one. And a person can get himself pinned on the time track like mad. Every consecutive moment of time contains in it an awareness of the present. And if we only remember it as the past, we have alter-ised it most gorgeously.

Now, here's a rather curious thing. If we simply have somebody recall a time when he was in present time, we get a whole interesting series of pictures which are rather interesting mechanisms, I mean because we are recalling the single consecutive common denominator postulate to every picture, which is what? Present time.

Now, if we ask a person to recall a time when he was remembering something, we run out this other mechanism. And when we say—ask the person

THE MIND: ITS STRUCTURE IN RELATION TO THETAN AND MEST

to recall a time when he was planning something, we get the future mechanism. And so we get the three things that would bring this to view. And one is recall a time when he was in present time or experience a present time in the past or something of the sort, you know? You get these consecutive present times. You see, in any instant you are in present time while you are looking at present time and your feeling is there-ness, see? Your feeling is there-ness. And then you say, "Well, I'm—I—" you remember the incident and get not-there-ness. See, that's past. "I'm not there any longer," you say, but the postulate which the picture contains is there-ness and you remember it with not-there-ness, don't you see?

And similarly with the future. You plan something to happen in the future, but you plan it with an "it will be," and when you hit it you see it with a "will be," so your picture—or pardon, you hit it with an "is." You say it will be and then you get there and you say, "Well, it is." And so you keep the future in suspense too. And these two things together tend to jam a track. Quite interesting isn't it?

Well, you'd have to ask these three auditing questions evidently—just a cursory glance, this has never been audited on anybody, it's just a demonstration—you'd have to ask him for a time when he considered himself in present time. That's not the auditing command, that's just the gist of it. You'd have to ask him for a time when he considered himself in present time in order to really strip a picture out, and then you would—we did that, by the way, with Dianetic return; that was one of its basic mechanisms—and then we would say—we would ask a person for all the times he was remembering something in the past and he would pick up all the times he was worried. Quite interesting.

And we'd ask him for all the times he was planning something or looking forward to something or dreading something—regardless of—dependent on where he was on the Tone Scale—and we would get those moments stretched out too and the three of them would perform the thought as-is-ness of the pictures. But wait, that's just the thought as-is-ness of the pictures. All right, although thought is the creative end of the effect line, we nevertheless wouldn't get the pictures gone because there's MEST on the other end of it. So there'd still be the MEST to handle. Well, that could be handled in various ways. You could tell him to look around and find something he wouldn't mind having created. And you get him over his allergies, one way or another, to this continuous hanging on to things or creating a universe or doing other things that he's doing.

Well, you could also do something like this: you could say to the individual, as far as the future was concerned, you would say to him, "Tell me something you aren't dreading." See, you could handle the immediate future. Or "Tell me something that you wouldn't mind forgetting." Or something of this sort.

Well, oddly enough if facsimiles are thinnies this would be the technique which would produce the structural end of the thing and occasion a reorientation. We'd ask an individual where he wouldn't mind being, as though he were right there, right now, and we would of course pick up all sorts of pleasure moments on the track. Now we ask the individual where he'd certainly hate to be, right now, and we'd pick up all these remote viewpoints that he's left parked around in various sceneries and he would view these things again. And we ask him where he would dread to be and we're liable to go on the backtrack and pick up things that he was dreading to be, way back when,

26 JULY 1957

forward from the time which is now past, from where he is right this minute. Very confusing, isn't it?

Well, there are a lot of ways of handling this—we have lots of processes that handle this. Then and Now Solids handles this very, very well; but the purposes of the pictures, the purposes of the pictures must be given some attention. And these pictures do have purposes.

They make, as I've already gone over—they have automatic responses, tells you how to behave in a situation where every time you see a green wall you behave in a certain way and there you have a picture of it and it runs off as a behavior pattern and it's all very well done. But you've got automatici-ties galore which can be used in the picture lineup.

But there are other things that you can do with pictures. You can find an area where you just don't want to be at all; you can always get a past picture of an area where you've been and be there for a little while, sort of, kind of. Yes, very fascinating. But the technique, no matter how good it is, won't overthrow the *need* of pictures, fancied or real, by a thetan. He does have a feeling that he needs pictures. He uses them for various things. Actually he handles, to a large degree, a body through a gradient scale, of which pictures are an incidental part. And he handles the wall through a gradient scale.

And now, we spoke of destruction very early and when he meets some being that he doesn't think should go on existing he's got pictures and he's got all kinds of things and destruction and bacteria and other things that he can mock up and throw at this other person to get him out of the road. He thinks that's the way to handle this person. Way not to confront again is to make somebody sick or lame or give him a bunch of pictures that'll blow up in his face or mess up his bank in some fashion. A lot of thetans, you know, still slide pictures into your bank. It's quite an interesting phenomenon. But in the final analysis it is a defense measure, and a person who is not himself, as a thetan, very confident, will use pictures for defense of one kind or another. Either give him service facsimiles so people will feel bad or so he can control other people, numerous other things—and these defense mechanisms are all very well. He uses pictures on the reverse vector—now, this is throwing pictures *at* people, see? He uses that, therefore he thinks he needs pictures.

There's the other receiving end of the situation which pays off almost equally. And that is, he keeps bodies and people from going away with the opposite vector. He also, on a higher level, holds them still and makes them more solid and does other things. But keeping the body from going away is one of the basic functions of pictures. An individual uses his mind, this thought-energy structure, in order to keep the body from going away. Therefore, he as a thetan doesn't have to be aware of the fact that he's always hanging on, himself, to a head, to a being. He doesn't have to get this idea of association with structure all the time because he's got a lot of pictures of the association, he plasters these on the structure, associates himself with a picture and sticks.

But to strip somebody totally of his mind, it would then—the harmful content of it—it would only be necessary then to get him up to a point where he didn't have to use these pictures. Now, that would be in making a record of the past. He wouldn't have to have them in order to have a record of the past—he wouldn't have to have these things in order to handle other people because he could directly. And he wouldn't have to have them to keep things

THE MIND: ITS STRUCTURE IN RELATION TO THETAN AND MEST

from going away because he could keep them and position himself rather easily and well.

And you get him over those things, you would still have his idea that he should have some mass, and you'd have to get him to recover from his ideas about needing mass before he'd be willing to give up all sorts of pictures in all directions. But given those four things and perhaps one or two other minor ones that would turn up, special considerations he had—but given those four basic things, why, you would then be able to get a thetan to give up or disentangle this thing he is laughingly calling a mind and which in the final analysis is only an outward manifestation of his own weakness. So we get him to recover from his weakness—I could shorten it up—his feeling of weakness and inefficiency and he would of course give up pictures and he would then get out of trouble.

Thank you.

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

L. Ron Hubbard's many works on the subjects of Dianetics and Scientology reflect a profound knowledge of man's nature—knowledge gained through lifelong experience with people from all walks of life and every part of society.

Ron's quest for knowledge on the nature of man began at a very early age, when he studied the Greek philosophers and other classics. He traveled across the United States and throughout the Pacific and Asia. By the time he was nineteen he had covered more than a quarter of a million miles. And during the course of leading expeditions, on three of which he carried the flag of the Explorers Club, he studied twenty-one different races and cultures around the world.

In the fall of 1930, Ron enrolled at George Washington University where he studied mathematics, engineering and attended one of the first classes in nuclear physics taught in the United States. This background allowed him to apply a scientific methodology to questions of man's spiritual potential. After realizing that neither the philosophy of the East nor the materialism of the West held the answers, Ron was determined to fill the gap.

He financed his early research through fiction writing and soon became one of the most highly demanded authors in this golden age of popular fiction. His prolific output as a writer during the 30s and 40s was interrupted only by his service in the US Navy during World War II.

Partially disabled at war's end, Ron applied his discoveries about the human mind to restore his own health and that of other injured servicemen.

In late 1947, Ron detailed these discoveries in a manuscript which enjoyed a wide circulation amongst friends and colleagues who copied it and passed it on to others. (This manuscript was published in 1951 as *Dianetics: The Original Thesis*, and later republished as *The Dynamics of Life*.) As his original thesis continued to circulate, Ron found himself besieged with inquiries from interested readers; and with the first publication of his work on Dianetics in the *Explorers Club Journal* in late 1949, the flood of letters was so great that it placed enormous demands on his time. It was in response to these requests for more information about his discoveries that he wrote a comprehensive text on the subject.

Published on May 9, 1950, *Dianetics: The Modern Science of Mental Health* made his breakthrough technology broadly available for the first time. *Dianetics* shot to the top of the *New York Times* bestseller list and remained

ILLUSION OR TRUTH LECTURE TRANSCRIPTS

there week after week. By the end of four months, 750 Dianetics study groups had sprung up, prompting such headlines as: "Dianetics Takes US by Storm."

Responding to this groundswell of enthusiasm, Ron delivered lectures to packed halls across the country. Before the year's end, tens of thousands had not only read his book, but were readily applying it to better their lives. Meanwhile, he continued his research, and further breakthroughs followed. In 1951, he wrote and published six more books, including *Science of Survival*, the authoritative work on the subject of human behavior.

In the autumn of that year, and in spite of growing demands on his time, he intensified research into the true source of life energy. This research led him to identify the very nature of life itself, and formed the basis of the applied philosophy of Scientology—the study of the spirit in relationship to itself, universes and other life. This track of research, begun so many years earlier as a young man traveling the globe in search of answers to life itself, was to span the next three decades.

Through the 1950s, Ron continued to advance Scientology techniques with the development of hundreds of new processes, delving deeper into the true nature of man. And as more and more people discovered Ron's breakthroughs, Scientology churches around the world opened to provide services to them. Ron visited many of these churches, giving lectures and guidance to the church members to help them expand Scientology in their areas.

In 1959, Ron purchased a home in England, Saint Hill Manor, where he lectured to hundreds of Scientology students who came from as far away as the United States, Australia and South Africa. A new era for Scientology began with the opening of the Saint Hill Special Briefing Course in May of 1961 to train expert auditors. Between 1961 and 1966, Ron not only personally supervised these students, but also delivered more than 440 lectures and auditing demonstrations while continuing his research and overseeing the expanding affairs of Scientology internationally.

He released the Scientology Classification, Gradation and Awareness Chart at Saint Hill in 1965, laying out the standard step-by-step route for preclears and auditors. Additionally, because of Scientology's rapid expansion, Ron developed administrative policies for Scientology organizations which have proven to be universal in their application.

On the threshold of breakthroughs never before envisaged, Ron resigned from all directorships in Scientology organizations in 1966 to devote himself more fully to research.

The following years saw the discovery and codification of the technology which allows anyone to move through the levels of Operating Thetan, the highest states of spiritual awareness and ability.

Ron continued to seek out methods to help his fellows. As he encountered ever-worsening conditions in society, he developed procedures to address and resolve a wide range of man's problems. He even refined the techniques of Dianetics in 1978 to bring about faster and easier-to-attain results—New Era Dianetics.

No area of life was left untouched in this search for ways to improve the human condition. His work provided solutions to such social ills as declining educational standards, moral decay and drug use. He codified the administration of organizations, the principles of ethics, the subjects of art and logic and much more. And yet he never lost sight of the man on the street and his day-to-day problems of living in these complex and troubled times. Thus in Scientology one finds solutions to any difficulty one can encounter in life.

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

This series of lectures represents but a small part of the more than forty million words of Ron's recorded lectures, books and writings on Dianetics and Scientology.

With his research fully completed and codified, L. Ron Hubbard departed his body on January 24, 1986. Ron's legacy lives on through his works which are applied daily by millions around the world to bring understanding and freedom.

Thanks to his efforts, there is today a pathway for anyone to travel to attain full spiritual freedom. The entrance is wide and the route is sure.

GLOSSARY

To assist in your understanding of these lectures, hard-to-find terms and other words which you may not be familiar with are included in this glossary. An example of usage from the lectures is included at the end of each definition. These definitions give only the meanings of the words as they are used in the lectures; this glossary is not meant as a substitute for a dictionary.

A: abbreviation for Affinity. *See also* **affinity** in this glossary. *You probably haven't related it because the A is missing, the R is unstable at best, and the C which you expected to be inflow is almost total outflow. —CCH Related to ARC (16 July 57)*

149

aberrated: affected by *aberration*, a departure from rational thought or behavior. Aberration means basically to err, to make mistakes, or more specifically to have fixed ideas which are not true. The word is also used in its scientific sense. It means departure from a straight line. If a line should go from A to B, then if it is *aberrated* it would go from A to some other point, to some other point, to some other point, to some other point, to some other point, and finally arrive at B. Taken in its scientific sense, it would also mean the lack of straightness or to see crookedly as, for example, a man sees a horse but thinks he sees an elephant. Aberrated conduct would be wrong conduct, or conduct not supported by reason. Aberration is opposed to sanity, which would be its opposite. From the Latin, *aberrare*, to wander from; Latin, *ab*, away, *errare*, to wander. *[Definition of **computation**] The aberrated evaluation and postulate that one must be consistently in a certain state in order to succeed.*

Academy: the part of a Scientology organization in which auditor training courses are delivered. *You probably haven't yet related training in the ACC, which is Academy type training, to the ARC triangle. —CCH Related to ARC (16 July 57)*

AEC: abbreviation for Atomic Energy Commission. *See **Atomic Energy Commission*** in this glossary. *You could probably tell some scientists working on companies contracted to the AEC this and they would start to argue and they would probably flip —they'd probably spin in before dawn. —The Stability of Scientology (23 July 57)*

affinity: a degree of liking or affection or lack of it. Affinity is a tolerance of

ILLUSION OR TRUTH LECTURE TRANSCRIPTS

distance. A great affinity would be a tolerance of or liking of close proximity. A lack of affinity would be an intolerance of or dislike of close proximity. Affinity is one of the components of understanding. *It takes some good communication, it takes some good reality, and it takes some affinity, and the fellow improves!* —*Scientology and Effective Knowledge (15 July 57)*

Aleut: the native people of the Aleutian Islands (a chain of islands of Alaska, extending approx. 1,200 miles from the southwest coast) and parts of mainland Alaska. *All savage races, all savage races, even the American, has had myths concerning man's origin —the Aleut, Tlingits.* —*Scientology and Effective Knowledge (15 July 57)*

Alice in Wonderland: a story written in 1865 by Lewis Carroll (the full title is *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland*) about a little girl named Alice who falls down a rabbit hole into a strange country where very illogical things happen. *We dropped the Alice in Wonderland myth called organization.* —*Scientology and Effective Knowledge (15 July 57)*

alter-is: alter or change the reality of something. *Isness* means the way it is. When someone sees it differently he is doing an *alter-is*, in other words, is *altering* the way it is. *Well, we alter-is every picture.* — *The Mind: Its Structure in Relation to Thetan and MEST (26 July 57)*

150

American Can: a US manufacturer of cans, in operation at the time of the lecture. *And so you go in there, and one fellow would say, "Well, I sold 25,000 shares today of American Can."* -*CCH Related to ARC (16 July 57)*

ARC Straightwire: processing in which the auditor causes the preclear by straight memory to recall moments when he actually felt he was receiving or giving affinity (A) or communication (C) or actually experiencing reality (R). At the time of the lecture, ARC Straightwire was used as a training drill (TR 11), with the purpose of giving the student reality on the existence of a bank. *See also Straightwire* in this glossary. For further information, see HCOB 11 June 57, Training and CCH Processes in *Technical Bulletins Volume IV*. *And that's one that you know well and which we know now as —you knew it for a long, long while as just ARC Straightwire, which is now a training drill.* —*Auditing Styles (24 July 57)*

ARC triangle: a triangle which is a symbol of the fact that affinity, reality and communication act together as a whole entity and that one of them cannot be considered unless the other two are also taken into account. Without affinity there is no reality or communication. Without reality or some agreement, affinity and communication are absent. Without communication there can be no affinity or reality. It is only necessary to improve one corner of this very valuable triangle in Scientology in order to improve the remaining two corners. *You probably haven't yet related training in the ACC, which is Academy type training, to the ARC triangle.* -*CCH Related to ARC (16 July 57)*

arterial: a main highway. *And we stupidly, confidently drive down the arterial thinking people stop at stop signs.* —*Scales (Effect Scale) (25 July 57)*

as-is: cause to vanish or cease to exist. This is accomplished by viewing

something exactly as it is, without any distortions or lies. For further information see the Scientology Axioms in the book *Scientology 0-8: The Book of Basics*, by L. Ron Hubbard. . . . *in such a wise as to permit two-way communication to as-is many of the preclear's problems and difficulties as they come up.* —*Auditing Styles* (24 July 57)

Assumption: the name given to the act of a theta being taking over a MEST body. This takes place in most cases just prior to birth. For further information, see the book *Scientology: A History of Man* by L. Ron Hubbard. *We have processed the Assumption out of babies before it was well implanted or even cool.* —*The Stability of Scientology* (23 July 57)

Atomic Energy Commission: a federal agency created in 1946 to regulate the development of the United States atomic energy program. Its functions were transferred to the Nuclear Regulatory Commission in 1975. *Now, you could go on and blast atomic scientists and scream and fight and say, "Well, they're going to kill all of us someday" and other nonsense, and yell at the Atomic Energy Commission.* —*Scales (Effect Scale)* (25 July 57)

auditing: same as *processing*. See **processing** in this glossary. *And yet, theoretically, he could perform them beautifully, each one independently, and yet never be able to do them in an auditing session.* —*Scientology and Effective Knowledge* (15 July 57)

auditor: a person trained and qualified in applying Dianetics and/or Scientology processes and procedures to individuals for their betterment; called an auditor because *auditor* means *one who listens*. *Get him to locate the mass of the auditor.* —*CCH Related to ARC* (16 July 57)

151

autogenic: autogenetic—originating or produced within the organism. *We would find then that very probably many diseases, if not all diseases, were autogenic.* —*The Mind: Its Structure in Relation to Thetan and MEST* (26 July 57)

Axioms: statements of natural law on the order of those of the physical sciences. Full lists of the Axioms of Dianetics and the Axioms of Scientology are contained in the book *Scientology 0-8: The Book of Basics*, by L. Ron Hubbard. *The Student Manual spoke for itself; all it is, is all of the exact data of Scientology, all of the exact data: the old Dianetic Axioms, the Prelogics, The Factors, what auditing is, how it is done, all the TRs, how you sign up a preclear.* —*What Scientology Is Addressed To* (18 July 57)

Axiom 1 and 2: the first and second of the Axioms of Scientology:

"Axiom 1: Life is basically a static. [Definition: A life static has no mass, no motion, no wavelength, no location in space or in time. It has the ability to postulate and to perceive.]" "Axiom 2: The static is capable of considerations, postulates and opinions."

The Axioms of Scientology can be found in the book *Scientology 0-8: The Book of Basics*, by L. Ron Hubbard. *Well now, if you take life on an Axiom 1 basis, and 2, you will discover then that there's an interchange between matter, energy, space and time and this timeless being—this timeless living being.* —*The Mind: Its Structure in Relation to Thetan and MEST* (26 July 57)

ILLUSION OR TRUTH LECTURE TRANSCRIPTS

Axiom 10: the tenth of the Axioms of Scientology: "The highest purpose in this universe is the creation of an effect." The Axioms of Scientology can be found in the book *Scientology 0-8: The Book of Basics*, by L. Ron Hubbard. *Axiom 10 has not yet totally congealed somebody's thinking. -Scales (Effect Scale) (25 July 57)*

Ballantine: the name of a brand of American beer. *Ballantine beer sort of thing, you know. -CCH Related to ARC (16 July 57)*

bank: the mental image picture collection of a person. The term comes from computer terminology where all data is in a "bank," It is a combination of energy and significance which comprises a mass sitting in its own made-up space, plotted against the person's own experiential track. *See also mental image picture in this glossary. Our oldest property is a bank —the engram, the mental image picture. —CCH Related to ARC (16 July 57)*

Bay Head, New Jersey: a city on the Atlantic coast of the United States where LRH was living in January 1950 when he wrote the book *Dianetics: The Modern Science of Mental Health*. *Anyway, the graphic analysis of life and its behavior first came from a postulate I made, fortunately for you and for me, back in Bay Head, New Jersey when I was writing Dianetics: The Modern Science of Mental Health. —Theory and Definition of Auditing (17 July 57)*

152

beads, telling their: saying prayers using a rosary (a string of beads for keeping count in saying a series of prayers). *Instead of, as they said in the Middle Ages, "What monastery do you come from, Father?" (as they stood on the crossroads telling their beads one at another), they say, "Now, what university are you teaching at, brother?" in 1950 and 57, you see? —Scientology and Effective Knowledge (15 July 57)*

benomanas: a made-up word. *And so you can of course disintegrate a wall and get all sorts of phenomenon, benomanas and other things out of it, don't you see? —Control (22 July 57)*

Better Business Bureau: any of a nationwide system of local organizations, supported by business firms, whose stated function is to receive and investigate customer complaints of dishonest business practices. *These people, for instance, are always turning us in to people like the Better Business Bureau and so forth in an effort to really do something to quash this down. — What Scientology Is Addressed To (18 July 57)*

between-lives: reference to the period of time between the loss of a body and the assumption of another. At death, the theta being leaves the body and goes to a particular location where he "reports in," is made to forget everything, and is then sent back to Earth to a new body just before it is born. *Or it was a whole track between-lives operation where thetans were given a bunch of pictures and a bunch of pictures taken away from them or something of the sort. — The Five Categories (19 July 57)*

between-lives area: reference to one of the locations of a thetan during the period of time between lives. *See also between-lives in this glossary. We*

have pulled the dead back from the between-lives area, much to their consternation. — The Stability of Scientology (23 July 57)

binary digits: the numerals of a number system which uses a base of 2 rather than the base of 10 used in the customary number system. The binary system uses combinations of the digits 0 and 1 to express all other numbers. This results in large strings of figures to represent a number. For example, the number twenty would be written as 10100 in this system. *I already knew there was, I've forgotten, 10²¹ I believe it is, binary digits of neurons, or punched protein molecules, in the skull.*
-*What Scientology Is Addressed To (18 July 57)*

bird: (*slang*) a dismissal or rejection. The phrase began as "give the goose," meaning to hiss in disapproval at an actor on stage, similar to the way a goose hisses as a threat or warning. This phrase was modified to "give the big bird" or "give the bird" and was more broadly applied to mean any dismissal or rejection. *And naturally an individual said, "I can handle this bank" and a Scientologist today, when he receives a bird or something like that usually goes off immediately someplace where it's quiet, runs the thing out and comes back to the party. —Theory and Definition of Auditing (17 July 57)*

black five: a heavily occluded case characterized by mental pictures consisting of masses of blackness. The term *black five* came from application of an auditing procedure wherein the auditor tested the preclear at each step of the process to find a step the preclear could do and began processing at that step. A preclear who had to be started at Step V of the procedure was called a "Case V." For further information, see the book *The Creation of Human Ability* by L. Ron Hubbard. *Right now we know what they were: they were invisible cases or black fives. —What Scientology Is Addressed To (18 July 57)*

153

blanketing: throwing an electrical sheet of energy over another being or over a MEST body. Blanketing is done to obtain an emotional impact or even to kill. *Now, there's an old experience on the track known as blanketing; most any GE bank has got a blanketing in it one way or the other.*
-*Control (22 July 57)*

boards, across the: including everything or all; so that all are included. Originally a phrase in horse racing referring to equal amounts of money being bet on the same horse to place first, second or third. *He had confronted it and he'd won across the boards, don't you see? —Theory and Definition of Auditing (17 July 57)*

boil off: become groggy and seem to sleep. This manifestation denotes that some period of the person's life wherein he was unconscious has been slightly restimulated. *I'll just skip the whole thing and boil off. — Theory and Definition of Auditing (17 July 57)*

Book Auditor: a person who has read a Dianetics or Scientology book and successfully applied the data from the book to help someone else. *Informal Auditing—with no slur intended—that would be the kind of auditing done by a Book Auditor who had simply read something of the subject and plunged in. —Auditing Styles (24 July 57)*

ILLUSION OR TRUTH LECTURE TRANSCRIPTS

Book Mimicry: CCH 4, a Scientology process used to bring up the pre-clear's communication with control and duplication (control and duplication = communication). For further information see HCOB 1 Dec. 65, CCHs in *Technical Bulletins* Volume VII. *And when you've gotten up to the ones which require a little bit of criteria or judgment on his part, such as Book Mimicry, you can always go back down to the bottom and go over it again to see if it's just a little more there.* —*Auditing Styles* (24 July 57)

brains out, blow (one's): (*slang*) kill (oneself) by a shot through the head. Used figuratively in this lecture. *Anyway —these people in PE Courses almost blow their brains out trying to define it, so I was in there ahead of them in the wee small hours of that morning.* — *Theory and Definition of Auditing* (17 July 57)

breed of cat: (*informal*) type; sort; variety. Example: The new airplane is a completely different breed of cat from any that has been designed before. *Instead of, as they said in the Middle Ages, "What monastery do you come from, Father?" (as they stood on the crossroads telling their beads one at another), they say, "Now, what university are you teaching at, brother?" in 1950 and 57, you see? Same breed of cat.* —*Scientology and Effective Knowledge* (15 July 57)

154

Brownie box camera: the brand name of a simple camera shaped like a box, having a fixed focus and, usually, a single shutter speed. It was made in the US in the first half of the twentieth century by Eastman Kodak Company. *I did a computation with an old Brownie box camera which snaps at a fifteenth of a second.* — *What Scientology Is Addressed To* (18 July 57)

bucking one's shoulder up against: resisting or objecting strongly to (some situation or condition). *And I've been bucking my shoulder, in the organizations, up against any tendency to complicate a simple observation.* —*Scientology and Effective Knowledge* (15 July 57)

Buddha: Siddhartha Gautama Buddha (ca. 563-483 B.C.), a religious philosopher and teacher who lived in India and was the founder of Buddhism. *Buddha* is a title applied by Buddhists to someone regarded as embodying divine wisdom and virtue. *See also Buddhism* in this glossary. . . . *Gautama Siddhartha, who was known as "The Buddha," and most of the Western world refer to him as "Buddha," quite incorrectly.* —*Scientology and Effective Knowledge* (15 July 57)

Buddhism: the religion founded by Siddhartha Gautama Buddha. The hope of Buddhism was, by various practices, to break the endless chain of births and deaths and to reach salvation in one lifetime. *See also Buddha* in this glossary. . . . *and that was Buddhism, which was developed in a very formal state, but existed long before, by Gautama Siddhartha, who was known as "The Buddha," and most of the Western world refer to him as "Buddha," quite incorrectly.* —*Scientology and Effective Knowledge* (15 July 57)

bull market: a condition of a stock market in which stock prices are rising. *After the fellow had lost his pile in a bull market or something of the*

GLOSSARY

sort, why, he could go up there and, you know, cry in private. —CCH Related to ARC (16 July 57)

C: abbreviation for Communication. *You probably haven't related it because the A is missing, the R is unstable at best, and the C which you expected to be inflow is almost total outflow. —CCH Related to ARC (16 July 57)*

Cadillac: the brand name of a large American luxury car. *Get just enough chromium-plated Cadillacs that get up just close enough to the speed of the rotation of Earth so you always have high noon while driving: you've just about had it. — The Stability of Scientology (23 July 57)*

calculus: (*mathematics*) a way of making calculations about quantities which are continually changing, such as the speed of a falling stone or the slope of a curved line. *You know, like a calculus professor wants you to do, or something. -CCH Related to ARC (16 July 57)*

Capitol Hill: a hill in Washington, DC. The United States Capitol building, occupied by the national legislative body, the United States Congress, sits on this hill. *Go up on Capitol Hill before you start assigning it. -CCH Related to ARC (16 July 57)*

cards and spades: (*slang*) a liberal handicap (an advantage given a weaker opponent). The term comes originally from the card game called casino; in this game, a player may grant his opponent an advantage before play is begun; granting "cards and spades" would be giving one's opponent a considerable number of points in advance. Used figuratively in this lecture. *I mean, we could have given him cards and spades and probably beaten him at his own game if we applied our own wits to it. — What Scientology Is Addressed To (18 July 57)*

155

case: a general term for a person being treated or helped. *Case* also refers to a person's condition, which is monitored by the content of his reactive mind. A person's case is the way he responds to the world around him by reason of his aberrations. *Well, that is the entrance point of any case. —Scientology and Effective Knowledge (15 July 57)*

CCH A: one of two sections of the 18th Advanced Clinical Course which taught the CCH processes. The first of the CCH processes were taught in the section called CCH A, the remainder in CCH B. Though students had to complete both sections, they could be started in either CCH A or CCH B. *See also CCH processes in this glossary. You will be using, to a marked degree, dolls at this particular run of CCH A—in this particular run. — Question and Answer Period (15 July 57)*

CCH B: the second of two sections of the 18th ACC which taught CCH processes. *See also CCH A in this glossary. And it may be that you'll just get some fast briefing on CCH B. —Question and Answer Period (15 July 57)*

CCH processes: abbreviation for Control, Communication, *Havingness* processes: a series of Objective Processes—counseling procedures which help a person to look or place his attention outward from himself. *Objective* refers to outward things, not the thoughts or feelings of the individual. Objective Processes deal with the real and observable. They call for the

ILLUSION OR TRUTH LECTURE TRANSCRIPTS

person to spot or find something exterior to himself in order to carry out the procedures. CCHs are specifically designed to bring a person into better control of his body and surroundings, put him into better communication with his surroundings and other people, and increase his ability to have things for himself. They bring him into the present, away from his past problems. For further information see HCOB 11 June 57, Training and CCH Processes in *Technical Bulletins* Volume IV and HCOB 1 Dec. 65, CCHs in *Technical Bulletins* Volume VII. [*Definition of CCH A*] *One of two sections of the 18th Advanced Clinical Course which taught the CCH processes.*

CCH 0: a set of actions done at the start of an auditing session to assist the preclear's participation in the session and to assist the auditor in ARC. The purpose of CCH 0 is to make known the beginning of a session to a preclear and the auditor so that no error as to its beginning is made; to put the preclear in a condition to be audited. *See also CCH processes and ARC in this glossary. You can always start with CCH 0 or 1, as the case may be. —Auditing Styles (24 July 57)*

CDEI Scale: a gradient scale consisting of the points Curiosity, Desire, Enforce and Inhibit. For further information see the book *Scientology 0-8: The Book of Basics*, by L. Ron Hubbard. *Give you some small idea of the number of graphs there are in the Student Manual—scales: there's the CDEI Scale . . . —Theory and Definition of Auditing (17 July 57)*

156

chainman: a man on a surveying team who carries the surveying chain (a 66-foot-long chain used as a measuring device in surveying). *And they kept telling everybody; they were just surveyors, survey crew, just chain-men, you know, and rodmen —they're government men. —Scales (Effect Scale) (25 July 57)*

Chart of Attitudes: a chart which contains the major difficulties people have. It shows the attitudes towards life taken by people, and comes with the book *Handbook for Preclears* by L. Ron Hubbard. The chart consists of twelve columns with positive attitudes at the top of each column (such as "Survives," "Right," "Fully Responsible," etc.) and negative attitudes at the bottom (such as "Dead," "Wrong," "No Responsibility," etc.) and a gradient scale in between. For further information see the book *Scientology 8-8008* by L. Ron Hubbard. *Give you some small idea of the number of graphs there are in the Student Manual—scales: . . . the Chart of Attitudes . . . —Theory and Definition of Auditing (17 July 57)*

Chart of Human Evaluation: a chart by which one can precisely evaluate human behavior and predict what a person will do. It displays the various characteristics that exist at different levels of the Tone Scale. The chart was organized in early 1951 by L. Ron Hubbard, and published with his book *Science of Survival*. *But you follow ARC down scale as per the Chart of Human Evaluation in Science of Survival — and if you go down, there is an area below the chart, about 1,000 feet below the bottom line of the chart — now, that has to do with mass. —CCH Related to ARC (16 July 57)*

Chart of Survival: reference to the *Descriptive Graph of Survival*, a graph which represents a spectrum of life, from the zero of death or extinction

toward the infinity of potential immortality. The thrust of survival is away from death and toward immortality. For further information see the book *Dianetics: The Modern Science of Mental Health*. And the first one that this struggle occurred on is the *Chart of Survival*, that very elementary chart right in the beginning, there, of *Book One*. —*Theory and Definition of Auditing* (17 July 57)

Chinaman of Königsberg: the German philosopher Immanuel Kant (1724—1804), who was born and lived in the city of Königsberg (part of Germany in Kant's time; now part of Russia). Another German philosopher, Friedrich Nietzsche (1844-1900) referred to Kant as the "Chinaman of Königsberg" because of similarities between Kant's views on virtue and duty and those of the ancient Chinese philosopher Confucius. *Anyway, this fellow, the great Chinaman of Königsberg, he was sort of adrift but nevertheless he's on our track.* —*What Scientology Is Addressed To* (18 July 57)

circuit: a part of an individual's mind that behaves as though it were someone or something separate from him and that either talks to him or goes into action of its own accord, and may even, if severe enough, take control of him while it operates. *It blows circuits out of the preclear that he himself has found difficult to handle.* —*Auditing Styles* (24 July 57)

Clear: the name of a state achieved through auditing or an individual who has achieved this state. A Clear is a being who no longer has his own reactive mind. He is an unaberrated person and is rational in that he forms the best possible solutions he can on the data he has and from his viewpoint. *I woke up eventually to discover that these training drills all by themselves, practiced with sufficient rigor and coached well enough and instructed well enough, were steps on the road to Clear all by themselves without any further processing.* —*Scientology and Effective Knowledge* (15 July 57)

157

Code of a Scientologist: a code which governs the activity of a Scientologist in general. It was evolved from many years of observation and experience and is supported by leading Scientologists. At the time of the lecture, the code included the clause "To hear or speak no word of disparagement to the press, public or preclears concerning any of my fellow Scientologists, our professional organization or those whose names are closely connected to this science." The code in its final form is included in the book *Scientology 0-8: The Book of Basics*, by L. Ron Hubbard. (*Code of a Scientologist! Code of a Scientologist!*) "Are you sure you feel all right?" —*Auditing Styles* (24 July 57)

cognition: a new realization of life. Cognitions result in higher degrees of awareness and consequently greater abilities to succeed with one's endeavors in life. A cognition is a "What do you know, I..." statement. *But whatever cognition he achieves, his knowingness is increased and because he's being rather permissively handled—only apparently, let me assure you—his power of choice is quite important.* —*Auditing Styles* (24 July 57)

Comm Course: short for *Communication Course*, a course in which one gains the ability to effectively communicate with others. The Comm

ILLUSION OR TRUTH LECTURE TRANSCRIPTS

Course was included as part of the 18th ACC. *The Instructor noticed the most trouble in 8-C, the most trouble that was encountered was the consolidation of all the steps of the Comm Course into one process, see? — Question and Answer Period (15 July 57)*

comm lag: short for *communication lag*, the length of time intervening between the asking of the question by the auditor and the reply to that specific question by the preclear. The question must be precise; the reply must be precisely to that question. It does not matter what intervenes in the time between the asking of the question and the receipt of the answer. The preclear may outflow, jabber, discuss, pause, hedge, disperse, dither or be silent; no matter what he does or how he does it, between the asking of the question and the giving of the answer, the *time* is the communication lag. *See also auditor and preclear* in this glossary. *Actually a Wheatstone bridge with a battery in it has only the liability of a comm lag. —The Stability of Scientology (23 July 57)*

computation: the aberrated evaluation and postulate that one must be consistently in a certain state in order to succeed. A computation thus may mean that one must entertain in order to be alive or that one must be dignified in order to succeed or that one must own much in order to live. *See also aberrated and postulate* in this glossary. *[Definition of service facsimile] A computation generated by the individual to make self right and others wrong, to dominate or escape domination and to enhance own survival and injure that of others.*

158

condenser: a device for receiving and storing a charge of electricity. *You can produce practically the same phenomena with any electrical current or various electrical gimmicks of one kind or another: resistors, condensers and so forth. —Control (22 July 57)*

confront: face without flinching or avoiding. *Confront* is actually the ability to be there comfortably and perceive. *Individual couldn't confront man, so he turned around and developed a theory about man. —Scientology and Effective Knowledge (15 July 57)*

Confucius: (ca. 551-479 B.C.) an ancient Chinese philosopher and teacher whose philosophy of ethics stressed two virtues: the rules of proper conduct and benevolent love. Confucius taught many other virtues, including loyalty, faithfulness, wisdom, rightness and self-cultivation. These virtues he summed up in his ideal of the true gentleman, or "the princely or superior man." *Within seventy-five years either way of Buddhism, we have Taoism —that's the work of Lao-tse—and at the same time we have the work of Confucius. —Scientology and Effective Knowledge (15 July 57)*

cowboy in the black hat: a villain. In early black-and-white American cowboy movies, the villain always wore a black hat while the hero always wore a white hat. *And we're actually doing a cowboy in the white hat and a cowboy in the black hat, like the kids watch on TV. —What Scientology Is Addressed To (18 July 57)*

cowboy in the white hat: a law-abiding, morally upright and heroic person, as distinct from the villainous cowboy in the black hat. *See also*

cowboy in the black hat in this glossary. *And we're actually doing a cowboy in the white hat and a cowboy in the black hat, like the kids watch on TV. -What Scientology Is Addressed To (18 July 57)*

Cycle of Action Scale: a scale showing the relationship between the parts of the cycle of action (start, change, stop) and other factors of existence such as being, doing and having or space, energy and matter; the scale is useful to an auditor in assessing the condition of a preclear. For further information see the book *Scientology 0-8: The Book of Basics*, by L. Ron Hubbard. *Give you some small idea of the number of graphs there are in the Student Manual—scales:... the Cycle of Action Scale ...*
— *Theory and Definition of Auditing (17 July 57)*

deconscious: a made-up term for an imaginary aspect of the mind; extension of the terms "conscious," "subconscious," "unconscious," etc. Used as a humorous reference to the complex and meaningless terminology of psychiatry. *And this then becomes the subconscious, the reconscious, the deconscious, the Freud-onscious. — Theory and Definition of Auditing (17 July 57)*

devil's own time, a: (*informal*) a great deal of difficulty. *Now we have a devil's own time —there's some old cult or another, they existed in the middle twentieth century, that insisted that nobody ever changed at all.*
— *Auditing Styles (24 July 57)*

dialectic buffoonery: humorous variation of *dialectic materialism*. See also **dialectic materialism** in this glossary. *Let's take dialectic buffoonery, I think they call it. -The Stability of Scientology (23 July 57)*

dialectic materialism: in logic, "dialectic" is the action and reaction between opposites, out of which a new synthesis (harmony of the two opposites) emerges. This was an idea originated by the German philosopher Georg Wilhelm Hegel (1770-1831). "Materialism" is a philosophy which maintains that there is nothing in the universe but matter, that mind is a phenomenon of matter and that there is no ground for assuming a spiritual first cause. "Dialectical materialism" was an adaption of these ideas by German revolutionary leader and founder of modern socialism, Karl Marx (1818-1883), into his own "general laws of motion which govern the evolution of nature and society." He held that a conflict of opposites in human society is the evolutionary process by which a classless society would eventually be reached. *Now, that wasn't anywhere near as bad an operation, however, as this dialectic materialism-psychology mess that we've inherited in our modern times. —Control (22 July 57)*

Dianetics: comes from the Greek words *dia*, meaning "through" and *nous*, meaning "soul." Dianetics is a methodology developed by L. Ron Hubbard which can help alleviate such things as unwanted sensations and emotions, irrational fears and psychosomatic illnesses. It is most accurately described as *what the soul is doing to the body through the mind. And auditing therefore would then — very early in Dianetics, would have been listening and computing. —Theory and Definitions of Auditing (17 July 57)*

ILLUSION OR TRUTH LECTURE TRANSCRIPTS

Dianetics: The Evolution of a Science: an article which appeared as a book-length feature in the American magazine *Astounding Science Fiction* in May 1950. It tells the story of how Dianetics technology was initially developed. It has since been published in book form. *And that appears in Dianetics: The Evolution of a Science.* — *Theory and Definition of Auditing* (17 July 57)

Dianetics: The Modern Science of Mental Health: the basic text on Dianetics techniques, written by L. Ron Hubbard and first published in 1950. *Dianetics: The Modern Science of Mental Health covered it fairly well.* — *Theory and Definition of Auditing* (17 July 57)

dichotomies: a scale which shows twenty-nine pairs of opposites, such as right-wrong, sane-insane, win-lose, and survive-succumb. For further information see the book *Scientology 0-8: The Book of Basics*, by L. Ron Hubbard. *Give you some small idea of the number of graphs there are in the Student Manual—scales: . . . the dichotomies . . .* — *Theory and Definition of Auditing* (17 July 57)

differential equations: (*mathematics*) equations used in a type of calculus (differential calculus) as a way of making calculations about quantities which are continually changing, such as the speed of a falling stone or the slope of a curved line. Calculus measures little bits of things in order to find out what the whole thing will do. That is the whole theory of calculus. In differential calculus, the changing quantity or variable is measured in an infinitely small amount or size in order for the result of the calculation to be precise. *"Well, why are you studying differential equations?"* — *Control* (22 July 57)

160

Director of Processing: the head of the Hubbard Guidance Center in a Scientology organization, under whom come all individual cases. The Director of Processing is responsible for auditors, assignment of pre-clears to auditors and states of cases. *Much more added to it will bring it into a category where the Director of Processing understands only processing; he can never train anybody.* — *The Stability of Scientology* (23 July 57)

Director of Training: the person in a Scientology organization in charge of Instructors (Course Supervisors) and who is overall responsible for the training of auditors. *The Director of Training understands only training and can never process anyone at all.* — *The Stability of Scientology* (23 July 57)

dope off: (*slang*) start to feel tired, sleepy, foggy (as though doped or drugged). *Had a fellow one time who used to dope off all the time.* — *Scientology and Effective Knowledge* (15 July 57)

dragging a long point: exaggerating. Variation of *drawing a longbow*: a longbow is a large bow drawn by hand, as that used by English archers from the twelfth to the sixteenth centuries. It is said that a good archer could hit between the fingers of a man's hand at a considerable distance, and could propel his arrow a mile. The tales told about longbow exploits fully justify the application of the phrase. *I'm not dragging a long point here.* — *The Mind: Its Structure in Relation to Thetan and MEST* (26 July 57)

Dunkirk: a city on the northern coast of France. In 1940 it was the scene of the evacuation of more than 300,000 Allied troops, cut off from retreat on land by the Germans. A fleet of almost 1,200 British and French ships carried the Allied soldiers from Dunkirk to the coast of England. One of the most heroic and most memorable actions in naval history, it lasted from May 26 until June 4. *For instance at Dunkirk the evacuation of troops from the Dunkirk beaches found amongst them many young men who had become gray haired overnight.* — *The Mind: Its Structure in Relation to Thetan and MEST* (26 July 57)

DY, DX: (*mathematics*) symbols which are used in calculus to show the relationship of one variable (*DX*) to another (*DY*). *See also calculus* in this glossary. "DY, DX—*what is the purpose of this subject, professor?*"
-CCH Related to ARC (16 July 57)

dynamic: one of the eight urges (drives, impulses) in life. They are motives or motivations. We call them the eight dynamics. These are urges for survival as or through (1) self, (2) sex and family, (3) groups, (4) all mankind, (5) living things (plants and animals), (6) the material universe, (7) spirits and (8) infinity or the Supreme Being. *Looks to me like we've struck a third dynamic mental block in the field of the mind.* — *What Scientology Is Addressed To* (18 July 57)

Effect Scale: a scale which tells one how much cause an individual dare be, by measuring how much effect he's willing to suffer. At the top of the scale the individual can give or receive any effect, and at the bottom of the scale he can receive no effects but still feels he must give a total effect. For further information, see the book *Scientology 0-8: The Book of Basics*, by L. Ron Hubbard. *Give you some small idea of the number of graphs there are in the Student Manual—scales: . . . the Effect Scale . . .*
— *Theory and Definition of Auditing* (17 July 57)

161

8-C: the name of both a Scientology process and a training drill (Training Routine 6). The term is also commonly used in Scientology to mean good control or the action of applying good control to (someone). For further information see HCOB 11 June 57, Training and CCH Processes in *Technical Bulletins* Volume IV. *Well, we have had one change in doing 8-C.* — *Question and Answer Period* (15 July 57)

Electropsychometry: reference to a book published in 1952, which included the first operator's manual for the E-Meter. The entire LRH text of this book, *Electropsychometric Auditing*, is contained in *Technical Bulletins* Volume I. *There's a few tricks in using them, but there's even been a book written on that, Electropsychometry.* — *The Stability of Scientology* (23 July 57)

Elizabeth: a city in northeastern New Jersey. Residential suburb of New York City and location of the first Hubbard Dianetic Research Foundation, 1950-1951. *I don't know if you realize it, but A and R were designed and came about in July 1950 in Elizabeth.* — *CCH Related to ARC* (16 July 57)

E-Meter: short for *electrometer*; an electronic device for measuring the mental state or change of state of *Homo sapiens*. It is *not* a lie detector. It

ILLUSION OR TRUTH LECTURE TRANSCRIPTS

does not diagnose or cure anything. It is used by auditors to assist the preclear in locating areas of spiritual distress or travail. . . . *these things have been observed to have sufficient violence that a person holding the electrodes on an E-Meter has had an explosion occur somewhere in the vicinity of his hands enough to knock a hole in his hands and the can.*
—Control (22 July 57)

engram: a mental image picture of an experience containing pain, unconsciousness and a real or fancied threat to survival. It is a recording in the reactive mind of something which actually happened to an individual in the past and which contained pain and unconsciousness, both of which are recorded in the engram. It must, by definition, have impact or injury as part of its content. Engrams are a complete recording, down to the last accurate detail, of every perception present in a moment of partial or full unconsciousness. *See also mental image picture and reactive mind in this glossary. Our oldest property is a bank—the engram, the mental image picture.* —CCH Related to ARC (16 July 57)

engram bank: a colloquial name for the reactive mind. *Well, the auditor is greater than, equal to or less than the surcharge, it says in that book, in the engram bank—that is to say, the mental image picture collection.*
— Theory and Definition of Auditing (17 July 57)

162

Explorers Club: a private club based in New York City and founded in 1904 with the main object of promoting the science of exploration and dedicated to the search for new knowledge of the Earth and outer space. *It's well known in the Explorers Club, and it's one of the biggest jokes in the Explorers Club is the derivation of the word America: there are seven sources for the word America, none of them America Vespucci.* — What Scientology Is Addressed To (18 July 57)

facsimile: a recording in energy of an incident or part of an incident from the past. The facsimile contains all the perceptics of the original. It is an involuntary duplicate or copy (*not* a perfect duplicate). *He has facsimiles that snap back at him.* —Theory and Definition of Auditing (17 July 57)

Factors, The: a summation of the considerations and examinations of the human spirit and the material universe completed by L. Ron Hubbard between A.D. 1923 and 1953. The Factors can be found in the book *Scientology 0-8: The Book of Basics*, by L. Ron Hubbard. *This sort of thing is graphed—the ARC, The Factors, the ARC triangle, affinity, reality and communication are placed in those graphs very prominently.*
— Theory and Definition of Auditing (17 July 57)

faculty psychology: an early school of psychology that explained the various mental processes by reference to corresponding "faculties" (senses or perceptions), such as knowing, feeling, judgment, duty, etc. As an example, the process of thinking was explained by reference to the faculty of "understanding" or of "reason." *It has the background of the Greek, Roman thought, Middle Age thought (which was more or less sparked up by Saint Thomas Aquinas), fifteenth century faculty psychology—these are all backgrounds . . .* — What Scientology Is Addressed To (18 July 57)

Fields, Eugene: reference to Eugene Field (1850-1895), American poet and

journalist. He was well known for his poems for children, some of which were extremely sentimental; one of his most famous, "Little Boy Blue," concerns a young boy who has died. . . . *that's the best method of control is get them to read something like "Little Orphan Annie" and other Eugene Fields masterpieces.* — *Control* (22 July 57)

figure-figure: a coined term describing a particular type of aberration consisting of always having to have a "reason for" or a significance. Given a fact, there must always be a reason for the fact. Hence we get figure-figure. *There is a very simple process which is not too workable, which is the figure-figure end of 8-C which you might be interested in, and that's doingness.* — *Question and Answer Period* (15 July 57)

Foundation: short for the Hubbard Dianetic Research Foundation, the first organization of Dianetics. Originally opened in Elizabeth, New Jersey in June 1950, the Foundation soon had offices across the US, including Los Angeles, New York, Chicago, Washington, DC and Hawaii. *We had one that was hanging around the Foundation.* — *Auditing Styles* (24 July 57)

Freud: Sigmund Freud (1856-1939), Austrian physician and founder of psychoanalysis, a system of mental therapy developed in 1894. It depended upon the following practices for its effects: The patient was made to talk about and recall his childhood for years while the practitioner brought about a transfer of the patient's personality to his own and searched for hidden sexual incidents believed by Freud to be the only cause of aberration. The practitioner read sexual significances into all statements and evaluated them for the patient along sexual lines. Each of these points later proved to be based upon false premises and incomplete research, accounting for their lack of result and the subsequent failure of the subject and its offshoots. *Now Freud and various quacks and so forth on the track have had a holiday with this very visible reactive mind.* — *Theory and Definition of Auditing* (17 July 57)

Freud-onscious: a made-up term for an imaginary aspect of the mind; extension of the terms "conscious," "subconscious," "unconscious," etc. A play on the name of Sigmund *Freud* and used as a humorous reference to the complex and meaningless terminology of psychoanalysis and psychiatry. *See also Freud* in this glossary. *And this then becomes the subconscious, the reconscious, the deconscious, the Freud-onscious.* — *Theory and Definition of Auditing* (17 July 57)

games condition: a condition which consists of fixated attention, an inability to escape coupled with an inability to attack, to the exclusion of other games. *Because it's a games condition to end all games conditions.* — *The Stability of Scientology* (23 July 57)

GE: abbreviation for genetic entity, that beingness not dissimilar to the thetan that has carried forward and developed the body from its earliest moments along the evolutionary line on Earth and which, through experience, necessity and natural selection, has employed the counter-efforts of the environment to fashion an organism of the type best fitted for survival, limited only by the abilities of the GE. *See also thetan* in this glossary. *Bodies and the GE respond to this beautifully.* — *CCH Related to ARC* (16 July 57)

ILLUSION OR TRUTH LECTURE TRANSCRIPTS

gelt: (*slang*) money. *And in a session whereby you were "psychotherapeuting," all you had to do was pretend to plow up guilt and thus get people in the frame of mind that they could feel guilt, and they would separate with a lot of gelt. —The Mind: Its Structure in Relation to Thetan and MEST (26 July 57)*

gen: (*slang*) inside information. From military service slang, especially the British Royal Air Force; it is short for either "general information" or "genuine." *They never get the gen, in other words. —The Stability of Scientology (23 July 57)*

General Electric: short for *General Electric Company*, a large US manufacturer. The company produces a wide variety of devices for the generation, transmission, distribution, control, measurement and consumption of electric energy, and maintains numerous research laboratories. *Not a General Electric or Westinghouse electric oven; I'm talking about an oven. - The Stability of Scientology (23 July 57)*

gimmigahoogit: (*informal*) a gadget or other thing for which the speaker does not know or has forgotten the name. *In other words, somebody could mock up what we call a circuit: some kind of an electronic gimmigahoogit that talks back. — Theory and Definition of Auditing (17 July 57)*

164

goldbrick: (*colloquial*) anything worthless passed off as genuine or valuable; from the swindle of selling a gilded, worthless metal bar as solid gold. *See, I mean, you can sett an awful lot of—you know, you can sell an awful lot of goldbricks and wooden nutmegs to people when they don't know what you're talking about. — Theory and Definition of Auditing (17 July 57)*

Golden Age: a period in which a nation, etc., is at its highest state of prosperity, or in which some human art or activity is at its most excellent. *It's like that ancient age in Greece that gave us so many things —the Golden Age of Greece all happened in the lifetime of one man. —Scientology and Effective Knowledge (15 July 57)*

Golden Wedding: a humorous made-up name for a brand of alcoholic beverage. *But this individual in a logging camp would get up in the morning and he'd down a pint of "Golden Wedding" and he'd go to bed at night and he would down a pint of "Golden Wedding," you know. —Scales (Effect Scale) (25 July 57)*

Grand Banks: a large shoal or "banks" in the Atlantic Ocean east and south of Newfoundland, Canada. It extends about 350 miles from east to west and is about 200 miles wide, with an average depth of 300 feet. Considered the greatest cod-fishing region in the world, for centuries it has been frequented by fishing fleets of many nations. *Those Grand Banks up there were quite well known; that's where Columbus found out about it, you know. — What Scientology Is Addressed To (18 July 57)*

"Great I Am, The": a humorous made-up name for a musical piece, alluding to a passage in the Bible in which God instructs Moses to refer to him by the name "I AM." *Then we change the violin off to the other arm and*

play "The Great I Am" on that one. — *What Scientology Is Addressed To* (18 July 57)

Great Okay: a coined term denoting the hypothetical proposition of a total acknowledgment which, when given, would cause everything (i.e., the entire physical universe) to vanish. "Great Okay" is a humorous take-off on "great Amen," an expression used in a poem (and later a song with the same lyrics) called *A Lost Chord*, by Adelaide Anne Proctor (1825-1864). The poem is about a troubled person who, while idly playing the organ, accidentally strikes a beautiful chord which brings calm and quiets her troubles: "But I struck one chord of music, Like the sound of a great Amen." She searches again for the chord but can't find it, and thinks that perhaps she will hear it again at death. *Besides the Great Okay, we have the Big Win.* — *What Scientology Is Addressed To* (18 July 57)

hamfist: (*slang*) a large (ham-sized) fist. *And they'd come in there with ham-fists, and the cook wouldn't have any dinner or something of the sort, and they were hungry and they'd knock him all over the cook shack and out the door and kick him in the ribs with their gumboots!* — *Scales (Effect Scale)* (25 July 57)

Hand Mimicry: the name of Training Routine 5, a drill to educate a student that verbal commands are not entirely necessary, to make the student physically telegraph an intention, and to show the student the necessity of having a preclear obey commands. In the drill, the student says nothing, but gets the coach to duplicate hand motions which he makes. For further information see HCOB 11 June 57, Training and CCH Processes in *Technical Bulletins* Volume IV. *There's a high possibility, a very, very high possibility that the Comm Course should finish up with some sort of a verbal drill in place of the Hand Mimicry so that we don't run into this same cockeyed thing in 8-C.* — *Question and Answer Period* (15 July 57)

165

Hand Space Mimicry: CCH 3, a Scientology process used to develop reality on the auditor and get the preclear into communication by control and duplication. For further information see HCOB 1 Dec, 65, CCHs, in *Technical Bulletins* Volume VII. *Now, when we get him up above that, well up above that, we put him back on lines again and we have Hand Space Mimicry, you know?* - *CCH Related to ARC* (16 July 57)

HASI: abbreviation for Hubbard Association of Scientologists International: the company which operated all Scientology organizations over the world and was the general membership group of the Church at the time of this lecture. The Church of Scientology International has replaced HASI in the operation of orgs, and the International Association of Scientologists (IAS) is the current membership group. *I had a girl who was weeping all over the HASI London.* - *CCH Related to ARC* (16 July 57)

havingness: the concept of being able to reach. By *havingness* we mean owning, possessing, being capable of commanding, taking charge of objects, energies and spaces. *Havingness* also refers to various processes which increase the preclear's *havingness*. *Only this time we call it control, havingness and communication.* — *CCH Related to ARC* (16 July 57)

ILLUSION OR TRUTH LECTURE TRANSCRIPTS

Havingness Scale: a scale showing various things a person can do with mass (e.g., contribute to it, confront it, waste it, find a substitute for it, etc.). For further information see the book *Scientology 0-8: The Book of Basics*, by L. Ron Hubbard. *Give you some small idea of the number of graphs there are in the Student Manual—scales: . . . the Havingness Scale—I mean there's a lot of these scales. —Theory and Definition of Auditing (17 July 57)*

HCO: abbreviation for Hubbard Communications Office, the division of a Scientology organization which is responsible for the hiring of personnel, routing of incoming and outgoing communications and maintaining ethics and justice among Scientologists on staff and in the area. HCO was originally a separate company which was the worldwide communications network for Dianetics and Scientology. It was incorporated into Scientology organizations as Division 1 in 1965 and the name *HCO* was retained as the name of this division. *Thus CCH as developed in the spring underwent some changes, and this ACC has catalyzed these changes and these changes are now being made in HCO Bulletins coming out on them and the CCH you see in the Student Manual is accurate and does express those changes. —Auditing Styles (24 July 57)*

166

HCO Bulletin: abbreviation for Hubbard Communications Office *Bulletin*, a technical issue written by L. Ron Hubbard only. An HCO Bulletin is valid from first issue unless specifically cancelled. All data for auditing and courses is contained in HCO Bulletins. They are issued in red ink on white paper, consecutive by date. *See also HCO in this glossary. Thus CCH as developed in the spring underwent some changes, and this ACC has catalyzed these changes and these changes are now being made in HCO Bulletins coming out on them and the CCH you see in the Student Manual is accurate and does express those changes. —Auditing Styles (24 July 57)*

heap savvy: a made-up phrase meaning "understand thoroughly"; a combination of *heap*, a great amount or quantity, and *savvy*, to know, understand (an American slang term taken from the Spanish word *sabe* [sah-bey], "know.") *Thank you, I see you heap savvy that. —Control (22 July 57)*

High School Indoc: the name of Training Routine 7, a precise drill with the purpose of training the student auditor to never be stopped by a pre-clear, to train him to run fine control in any circumstances and to teach him to handle rebellious people. *Now, I mean by that just that one little drill that precedes High School Indoc; perfectly all right to touch somebody and push them around one way or the other. —Question and Answer Period (15 July 57)*

hinges, come unglued at the: (*slang*) to become emotionally upset or lose one's composure; variation of *come unglued*. *Only about one fifth of the 18th has come unglued at the hinges for a little while. —Question and Answer Period (15 July 57)*

Homo novis: literally, "new man," from the Latin *homo*, man, and *novus*, new. *CCH A actually contains all the processes you would need to dig anybody out of the mire and make Homo novis out of him if you used them exactly and well. —Question and Answer Period (15 July 57)*

Homo sap: short for *Homo sapiens*. *They are automatic mechanisms which have been developed on an identical pattern by everybody, because they were the exact things that could be handled least by other Homo sap.*
-Auditing Styles (24 July 57)

hotcha: (*slang*) highly emotional or exciting jazz music. *But Buddhism did not teach that when one dies he goes up and finds some pearly gates with somebody playing hotcha on a horn.* —*The Five Categories* (19 July 57)

hurdy-gurdy-sandy-andy: a made-up rhyming phrase describing an action that repeats over and over, similar to the playing of a *hurdy-gurdy*, a musical instrument played by turning a crank round and round. . . . *they would promptly get hold of her and take her into a hotel room and tie her down on the bed until she went into apathy again and this hurdy-gurdy-sandy-andy went on about five or six times.* —*The Five Categories* (19 July 57)

invisible case: a person who cannot see mock-ups, has no mental image pictures when they close their eyes; everything is invisible. *See also case and mocked up* in this glossary. *Right now we know what they were: they were invisible cases or black fives.* — *What Scientology Is Addressed To* (18 July 57)

IQ: abbreviation for intelligence Quotient: a number intended to indicate a person's level of intelligence. Intelligence quotient (IQ) ratings are a measure of an individual's capacity for learning something new; they are a scale based upon how old in years a person has become compared to how "old" he is mentally. *The only way you can get an IQ gain on a person is to improve his ability to communicate, to live.* —*Scientology and Effective Knowledge* (15 July 57)

167

ivory tower: a place or situation remote from worldly or practical affairs. A term coined by a French literary critic of the early nineteenth century who thought of it as applicable to the aerie (a house, castle or the like, placed high on a rock or mountainside) of a poet, a place where he could retire from the world; a retreat. *There are no theories quite as towering as the theories of one who has spent his life in an ivory tower.*
-*Scientology and Effective Knowledge* (15 July 57)

Johnny-come-lately: a recently arrived person or thing, especially as compared with the more seasoned or experienced. *It's quite interesting sometimes to audit somebody who is green as can be, never heard of it before, a person who wasn't in too bad a condition, a Johnny-come-lately . . .*
-*The Stability of Scientology* (23 July 57)

jub-jub monster: a made-up name for a monster. *We say, "Everybody who looks northeast by north, up through that pass up there, is apt to see the jub-jub monster."* —*Scientology and Effective Knowledge* (15 July 57)

juju: a spirit or god worshiped by some West African tribes. The word was originally applied to objects which it was supposed the natives worshiped, and was transferred from the objects themselves to the spirits or gods supposed to dwell in them. *The juju of Africa was of great interest to me at one time.* —*What Scientology Is Addressed To* (18 July 57)

ILLUSION OR TRUTH LECTURE TRANSCRIPTS

Know to Mystery Scale: a scale which includes Know, Look, Emotion, Effort, Think, Symbols, Eat, Sex, Mystery. Everything on the Know to Mystery Scale is simply a greater condensation or reduction of knowing-ness. For further information see the book *Scientology 0-8: The Book of Basics*, by L. Ron Hubbard. *Give you some small idea of the number of graphs there are in the Student Manual—scales: . . . the Know to Mystery Scale . . . —Theory and Definition of Auditing (17 July 57)*

Kraepelin's disease: a humorous made-up name for a disease, playing on the name of Emil Kraepelin (1856-1926), a German psychiatrist who developed a system of psychiatric classification. *Well, he's got Kraepelin's disease. —Auditing Styles (24 July 57)*

Lamaism: a form of Buddhism practiced in Tibet and Mongolia, characterized by elaborate ritual and belief in good and evil gods, demons, ancestral spirits, etc. *See also Buddhism* in this glossary. *Buddhism squirreled when it went up into Tibet and became Lamaism, and many other branches and sects spread from that particular information. —Scientology and Effective Knowledge (15 July 57)*

168

Leipzig: a city in Germany; the location of Leipzig University, where Wilhelm Wundt and others developed "modern" psychology. *See also Wundt* in this glossary. *They haven't lived; they're a matter of changing fad every few minutes — beyond psychology, which was the work of a single man named Wundt in Leipzig, Germany in 1879, who believed that all men were animals and has convinced everybody since. —Scientology and Effective Knowledge (15 July 57)*

L equals MV squared: part of a humorous made-up mathematical equation, meaningless as used in the lecture. *L equals MV squared by the square root of the sine gives you the electrical output of the input on the other side of the ruddy rod. -CCH Related to ARC (16 July 57)*

Little Orphan Annie: reference to the poem "Little Orphant Annie," written in 1885 by James Whitcomb Riley. Annie tells hair-raising tales about the goblins, and is finally carried off by them. (*Orphant* is Indiana dialect for *orphan*.) *That's the best method of control is get them to read something like "Little Orphan Annie" and other Eugene Fields masterpieces. -Control (22 July 57)*

Location by Contact: CCH 5, a Scientology process used to give the pre-clear orientation and havingness and improve his perception. For further information see HCOB 11 June 57, Training and CCH Processes in *Technical Bulletins* Volume IV. *Location by Contact and so forth. — Question and Answer Period (15 July 57)*

lumbosis: a made-up name for a disease, coined by LRH and used humorously in many of his lectures and writings. *And if you go all out as an auditor to cure everybody's lumbosis, you are going to be in very fine condition yourself, let me assure you. —Scales (Effect Scale) (25 July 57)*

Mayo brothers': reference to the Mayo Clinic, an internationally known medical clinic established in Rochester, Minnesota by American surgeons William James Mayo (1861-1939) and Charles Mayo (1865-1939).

They sent me up to Mayo brothers' and charged my husband \$8,672.23. - CCH Related to ARC (16 July 57)

mechanic: technical aspect or working part; mechanism; structure. *And that is the exact mechanic of how a wonderland of pretended information which became the social sciences was created. —Scientology and Effective Knowledge (15 July 57)*

Mein Kampf: the title of an autobiographical book written by Adolf Hitler in 1924, in which he revealed his program for political action in Germany. *Mein Kampf* is German for "My Battle" or "My Struggle." *He wrote a book called Mein Kampf and we had other people at that level who were not violently pitched or framed; who were simply willing to subscribe to this philosophy as a good philosophy. —Scales (Effect Scale) (25 July 57)*

Menninger: Karl Augustus Menninger (1893-1990), American psychiatrist who, with his father, founded the Menninger Clinic in Topeka, Kansas in 1920. *It tells you that there is an enormous Valhalla mixed up with Pluto's realm, mixed up with fairy tales, mixed up with Menninger's works, lying all over below the level of truth. —Scientology and Effective Knowledge (15 July 57)*

Menninger meningitis: a humorous made-up name for a disease, playing on the name of American psychiatrist Karl Menninger (1893-1990). *Meningitis* is an actual disease—an inflammation of the membranes surrounding the brain and spinal cord resulting from infection by bacteria or viruses. *See also Menninger* in this glossary. *He's got Menninger meningitis. —Auditing Styles (24 July 57)*

169

mental image picture: a mental copy of one's perceptions sometime in the past; three-dimensional color pictures with sound and smell and all other perceptions, plus the conclusions or speculations of the individual. For example, if a person were in a car accident, he would retain "pictures" of that experience in his mind, complete with recordings of the sights, physical sensations, smells, sounds, etc., that occurred during that incident. *Our oldest property is a bank —the engram, the mental image picture. —CCH Related to ARC (16 July 57)*

Mercury: the name of a type of automobile produced by the Ford Motor Company. *They, say, "Mercury cars are so smurkery." —CCH Related to ARC (16 July 57)*

MEST: a word coined from the initial letters of *matter, energy, space and time*, which are the component parts (elements) of the physical universe. Also used as an adjective to mean physical—as in "MEST universe," meaning the "physical universe." *Anyway, here we have at the level of MEST what understanding is. —CCH Related to ARC (16 July 57)*

misemotional: a coined word in Dianetics and Scientology, often used loosely to refer to anything that is unpleasant emotion, such as antagonism, anger, fear, grief, apathy or a death feeling. The full meaning of *misemotion* is an emotion or emotional reaction that is inappropriate to the present time situation. It is taken from *mis-* (wrong) + *emotion*. To say that a person was *misemotional* would indicate that the person did

ILLUSION OR TRUTH LECTURE TRANSCRIPTS

not display the emotion called for by the actual circumstances of the situation. Being misemotional would be synonymous with being irrational. One can fairly judge the rationality of any individual by the correctness of the emotion he displays in a given set of circumstances. To be joyful and happy when circumstances call for joy and happiness would be rational. To display grief without sufficient present time cause would be irrational. *He always drives the police officer down into the misemotional bands and the police officer hits reaction.* — *The Five Categories* (19 July 57)

mocked up: created as a *mock-up*, a full-perceptive energy picture in three dimensions, created by the thetan and having location in space and time. A *mock-up* is more than a mental picture; it is a self-created object which exists as itself or symbolizes some object in the physical universe. The term was derived from the World War II phrase for miniature models that were constructed to symbolize weapons (airplanes, ships, artillery, etc.) or areas of attack (hills, rivers, buildings, etc.) for use in planning a battle. *See also thetan* in this glossary. *Psychosis is something mocked up so that it cannot be handled.* — *CCH Related to ARC* (16 July 57)

MS: abbreviation for manuscript. *And I used to put this on the heading of—make it first page on my MSes and turnovers.* — *What Scientology Is Addressed To* (18 July 57)

170

Mussolini: Benito Mussolini (1883-1945), founder and leader of the Fascist Party and premier of Italy (1922-1943). He gained and maintained his power by physical violence against his opposition. *If we believe implicitly in an organization, we have a situation whereby every agent of fascism in Italy had to phone Mussolini in Rome to make a decision.* — *Scientology and Effective Knowledge* (15 July 57)

name, rank and serial number: precise identity. Informal usage from a familiar clause of a US code of conduct for American men taken prisoner, which states that a prisoner is "bound to give only name, rank, service number and date of birth." *Well, in other words, from that point you could actually establish the customs, general orders, name, rank and serial number and anything else of that time and place with the greatest of ease.* — *The Stability of Scientology* (23 July 57)

nature of things, the: reference to an unfinished work entitled *On the Nature of Things*, written by the Roman poet Lucretius (98?-55 B.C.). The purpose of the work was to prove, by investigating the nature of the world in which man lives, that all things—including man—operate according to their own laws and are not in any way influenced by supernatural powers. *Our findings today are in no great disagreement with the earlier Greeks or a very little-known fellow who lived in the day of Julius Caesar and who wrote a book about the nature of things.* — *What Scientology Is Addressed To* (18 July 57)

Nazis: members of the National Socialist German Workers' Party which, in 1933, seized political control of Germany under the leadership of Adolf Hitler (1889-1945). In alliance with Italy and, later, Japan, Nazi-controlled Germany entered into a large-scale war with many other

nations of the world, which came to be called World War II. The Nazi party was officially abolished in 1945 at the conclusion of the war. *Nazi* comes from the German word *Nazi*(*onalsozialist*). *And when our military governments went into Sicily and Italy, they found out that the only people who were there who could do anything about the government were these former Nazis.* —*Scientology and Effective Knowledge* (15 July 57)

never-never: unreality; fantasy. *Now, let's go into wonderland —the wonderland of syllables; the wonderland beneath the earth of never-never.* —*Scientology and Effective Knowledge* (15 July 57)

nickel, worth a: worth anything (usually used in negative sentences). *It is not a police instrument that's worth a nickel.* —*The Stability of Scientology* (23 July 57)

Objective Processes: Scientology counseling procedures which help a person to look or place his attention outward from himself. *Objective* refers to outward things, not the thoughts or feelings of the individual. Objective Processes deal with the real and observable. They call for the person to spot or find something exterior to himself in order to carry out the procedures. Objective Processes locate the person in his environment, establish direct communication, and bring a person to present time. *So it boils down to the fact that Objective Processes —the best processes.* —*The Five Categories* (19 July 57)

171

1.5: the level of *anger* on the Tone Scale. *See also Tone Scale* in this glossary. *Now, you'll notice this particularly at about 1.5 on the scale, it's a pretty tight interchange, 1.5.* —*Scales (Effect Scale)* (25 July 57)

1.1: the level of *covert hostility* on the Tone Scale. *See also Tone Scale* in this glossary. *She got back the most carpingly critical, 1.1 series of slashes you ever saw, and she promptly went into tears and she was going to explain it all to them—she was going to explain it all to them, and she was going to dash off this long epistle.* —*CCH Related to ARC* (16 July 57)

Original Thesis, The: a book written by L. Ron Hubbard in 1947 as the first formal record of his research and extraordinary discoveries on the function of the human mind. It was later published as *The Dynamics of Life. Theory of auditing is actually covered in writing in The Original Thesis, written in 1947 and it has to do, more or less, with these rules.* —*Theory and Definition of Auditing* (17 July 57)

overlarded: added to too much, as with irrelevant or useless facts and information. *It's an horrible shock to this person to find out someday that the reason he could never get a reasonability in his family, late in life or early in life, was totally based on blindness which in itself was so obfuscated, overlarded that nobody even noticed the blindness.* —*Scientology and Effective Knowledge* (15 July 57)

Park Avenue: a thoroughfare in New York City along part of which there are very fine, large, expensive office and residential buildings. *Talking to him one day —has an office on Park Avenue —and he told me that this*

ILLUSION OR TRUTH LECTURE TRANSCRIPTS

whole subject of guilt was a very engrossing one. —The Mind: Its Structure in Relation to Thetan and MEST (26 July 57)

pc: short for *preclear*. See also **preclear** in this glossary. / *remember back when Mary Sue and I were cooling our heated brains over E-Meters, pcs, we covered the whole track from one end to the other and left 99 and 9,999/10,000ths in restim. -The Stability of Scientology (23 July 57)*

Pearson, Drew: (1897-1969) American newspaper columnist. His daily column, "The Washington Merry-Go-Round," was first published in 1932, when it appeared in only 12 newspapers. By the time of his death in 1969, the column was carried in more than 650 papers in the US and abroad. *Why, just this last week it was in Drew Pearson's column that they were giving up over in the London conference because they'd already said their best target was the mind of man. —What Scientology Is Addressed To (18 July 57)*

Picanthropus erectus: reference to *Pithecanthropus erectus*, an extinct type of prehistoric man. The term was coined from Greek and Latin words—*Pithecanthropus* means "ape-man"; *erectus* refers to the fact that this type of man walked erect. *Picanthropus erectus didn't have any trouble with the mind; he only had trouble with teeth. —The Mind: Its Structure in Relation to Thetan and MEST (26 July 57)*

172

pitch, brought back to the: returned to the business at hand. *Well, an auditor is necessary because at that moment he should be kicked in the shins, given an acknowledgment, brought back to the pitch, made to confront it and be pushed through it and that would be the rest of it. — Theory and Definition of Auditing (17 July 57)*

Pluto's realm: (Greek and Roman mythology) the world of the dead, of which Pluto was the ruling god. *It tells you that there is an enormous Valhalla mixed up with Pluto's realm, mixed up with fairy tales, mixed up with Menninger's works, lying all over below the level of truth. —Scientology and Effective Knowledge (15 July 57)*

postulate: (1) (*noun*) a conclusion, decision or resolution made by the individual himself to resolve a problem or to set a pattern for the future or to nullify a pattern of the past. *And reality of course is that sequence which begins with postulates and ends with mass, which we originally defined as an agreed-upon thing. —CCH Related to ARC (16 July 57)* (2) (*verb*) make & postulate. *Now, of course you can postulate that a process will produce a certain effect and then do the process and then assume that effect. — Question and Answer Period (15 July 57)*

preclear: a person not yet Clear, hence pre-Clear; generally, a person being audited. See also **Clear** in this glossary. *And therefore giving the commands perfectly while walking around, as in 8-C—one may have been able to give them more or less perfectly while sitting down facing a fixed preclear. — Question and Answer Period (15 July 57)*

Prelogics: statements of the common denominators of knowledge, written by L. Ron Hubbard in 1952. *All it is, is all of the exact data of Scientology, all of the exact data: the old Dianetic Axioms, the Prelogics, The Factors,*

what auditing is, how it is done, all the TRs, how you sign up a preclear. — What Scientology Is Addressed To (18 July 57)

processing: the application of Dianetics or Scientology processes to someone by a trained auditor. The exact definition of processing is: the action of asking a preclear a question (which he can understand and answer), getting an answer to that question and acknowledging him for that answer. Also called auditing. *It's a very funny thing for a fellow sometime in processing. — Scientology and Effective Knowledge (15 July 57)*

psychiatrologus: a made-up term for a condition. *He had compulsions and impressions and psychiatrologus and he had various things. —Theory and Definition of Auditing (17 July 57)*

psycho: short for *psychotic*. See also **psychotic** in this glossary. *But of course there's not much mass there, if there is any—psychos try to make nothing out of their mass all the time. —CCH Related to ARC (16 July 57)*

psychology: the study of the human brain and stimulus-response mechanisms. It states that "Man, to be happy, must adjust to his environment." In other words, man, to be happy, must be a total effect. *Hence, you have difficulty describing it sometimes and giving it data of comparable magnitude, and therefore in trying to talk about it people say, "Oh, you mean just like psychology!" —Scientology and Effective Knowledge (15 July 57)*

173

psychosis: any severe form of mental disorder; insanity. *I can tell you what psychosis is all about, very rapidly, right out of exactly the same material I'm giving you at this moment. —CCH Related to ARC (16 July 57)*

psychotic: an individual who is out of contact to a thorough extent with his present time environment and who does not compute into the future. He may be an acute psychotic wherein he becomes psychotic for only a few minutes at a time and only occasionally in certain environments (as in rages or apathies) or he may be a chronic psychotic, or in a continual disconnection with the future and present. Psychotics who are dramatically harmful to others are considered dangerous enough to be put away. Psychotics who are harmful on a less dramatic basis are no less harmful to their environment and are no less psychotic. *I used to try to teach people that psychotics were not understandable, which was what was wrong with psychotics —that's all. —CCH Related to ARC (16 July 57)*

Q-and-A: (from "Question and Answer") in Scientology, a coined expression which means "to not get an answer to one's question, fail to complete something, or deviate from an intended course of action." An auditor who starts a process, just gets it going, gets a new idea because of a change in the preclear, takes up the change and abandons the original process is Q-and-Aing. *Well, it is hard to explain unless you're content with this explanation, is: they Q-and-A with the circuit. —Auditing Styles (24 July 57)*

R: abbreviation for Reality. See also **reality** in this glossary. *You probably haven't related it because the A is missing, the R is unstable at best, and the C which you expected to be inflow is almost total outflow. —CCH Related to ARC (16 July 57)*

ILLUSION OR TRUTH LECTURE TRANSCRIPTS

reactive mind: that portion of a person's mind which works on a totally stimulus-response basis, which is not under his volitional control and which exerts force and the power of command over his awareness, purposes, thoughts, body and actions. The reactive mind is where engrams are stored. *See also engrain* in this glossary. *That's reactive enough for any reactive mind.* —CCH Related to ARC (16 July 57)

reality: agreement upon perceptions and data in the physical universe. All that we can be sure is real is that on which we have agreed is real. Agreement is the essence of reality. *It takes some good communication, it takes some good reality, and it takes some affinity, and the fellow improves!* — *Scientology and Effective Knowledge* (15 July 57)

Reality Scale: a scale of degrees of reality, beginning at the bottom with solid communication lines, then moving up through masses, agreements and considerations to postulates at the top. *See also reality* in this glossary. *Actually we have today the Reality Scale.* — *CCH Related to ARC* (16 July 57)

reason why, know the: (*colloquial*) be very angry or annoyed. Often used in threats. *"I'm going to control you or know the reason why."* —CCH Related to ARC (16 July 57)

174

reconscious: a made-up term for an imaginary aspect of the mind; extension of the terms "conscious," "subconscious," "unconscious," etc. Used as a humorous reference to the complex and meaningless terminology of psychiatry. *And this then becomes the subconscious, the reconscious, the deconscious, the Freud-onscious.* — *Theory and Definition of Auditing* (17 July 57)

restimulated: reactivated due to similar circumstances in the present approximating circumstances of the past. *We finally got an agreement restimulated in both of them that the other one was there.* —CCH Related to ARC (16 July 57)

return: the action of causing a preclear to go into a past period. A person can "send" a portion of his mind to a past period on either a mental or combined mental and physical basis and can reexperience incidents which have taken place in his past in the same fashion and with the same sensations as before. *You'd have to ask him for a time when he considered himself in present time in order to really strip a picture out, and then you would —we did that, by the way, with Dianetic return.* —*The Mind: Its Structure in Relation to Thetan and Mest* (26 July 57)

ridge: a solid accumulation of old, inactive energy suspended in space and time. A ridge is generated by opposing energy flows which hit one another, and continues to exist long after the energy flows have ceased. *And when the ridge snaps with which they are holding that whole wound in suspense—of course it becomes about a thousand times more painful than it ordinarily would.* —*Scales (Effect Scale)* (25 July 57)

Rising Scale Processing: processing in which one takes any point or column of the Chart of Attitudes which the preclear can reach, and asks the preclear then to shift his postulate upwards toward a higher level. It

is simply a method of shifting postulates upward toward optimum from where the preclear believes he is on the chart. It is essentially a process directed toward increasing belief in self by using all the "buttons" (attitudes towards life) on the Chart of Attitudes. *See also Chart of Attitudes* in this glossary. *You could even go through a chant like this, you could run Rising Scale Processing, get the guy Svengalied somehow into actually thinking the thoughts you wanted him to think without any other preliminary and just say, "I am energy, I'm not energy," you see.*
 -Control (22 July 57)

Rockettes, the: a large troupe of chorus girls, famed for their precision dancing. They are in continual residence at the Radio City Music Hall in New York City. *There are fellows around—I knew a stage manager one time, he actually directed the Rockettes —interesting job, you would admit —who was begging me to go with me on an expedition to look at savage peoples so that he would have something to look at. —The Five Categories* (19 July 57)

rodman: the man on a surveying team who carries the leveling rod—a graduated rod or staff used with a level to determine heights in surveying. *And they kept telling everybody; they were just surveyors, survey crew, just chainmen, you know, and rodmen —they're government men.*
 -Scales (Effect Scale) (25 July 57)

ruddy rod: a made-up term. *L equals MV squared by the square root of the sine gives you the electrical output of the input on the other side of the ruddy rod.* -CCHRelated to ARC (16 July 57)

Scale of Related Experience: a table which shows the relationship between various aspects of experience (e.g., beingness, doingness, hav-ingness; start, change, stop) in relation to levels of the Tone Scale. For further information see the book *Scientology 0-8: The Book of Basics* by L. Ron Hubbard. *Give you some small idea of the number of graphs there are in the Student Manual—scales: . . . the Scale of Related Experience . . . —Theory and Definition of Auditing* (17 July 57)

scarlet-handed: in a situation that makes one seem guilty. A variation of *red-handed* (literally, with one's hands covered with a victim's blood). *"Aha, I caught somebody; I caught somebody scarlet-handed right here."*
 -The Stability of Scientology (23 July 57)

Schicklgruber: another name for Adolf Hitler, Nazi dictator of Germany from 1933 to 1945. Hitler's father, Alois (born 1837), was illegitimate and for a time bore his mother's name, Schicklgruber, but by 1876 he had established his claim to the surname Hitler. Adolf (born 1889) never used any other name, and the name Schicklgruber was revived only by his political opponents in Germany and Austria in the 1930s. *They finally elected into power a fellow by the name of Schicklgruber.* — Scales (Effect Scale) (25 July 57)

schizophrenic: (*psychiatry*) a person suffering *schizophrenia*, a major mental disorder typically characterized by a separation of the thought processes and the emotions, a distortion of reality accompanied by delusions and hallucinations, a fragmentation of the personality, motor (involving

ILLUSION OR TRUTH LECTURE TRANSCRIPTS

muscular movement) disturbances, bizarre behavior, etc. The word *schizophrenia* means "scissors" or "two" plus "head"—a two-head, in other words. *They put him in the schizophrenic category.* —*Auditing Styles* (24 July 57)

Science of Survival: a book by L. Ron Hubbard, published in 1951, which covers the different aspects of the Tone Scale and how this technology can be used in processing and in life. The book is based on and was published with the Chart of Human Evaluation. *See also **Tone Scale and Chart of Human Evaluation** in this glossary. But you follow ARC down scale as per the Chart of Human Evaluation in Science of Survival—and if you go down, there is an area below the chart, about 1,000 feet below the bottom line of the chart—now, that has to do with mass.* -CCH Related to ARC (16 July 57)

Scientologist: one who knows he has found the way to a better life through Scientology and who, through Scientology books, tapes, training and processing, is actively attaining it. *See also **Scientology** in this glossary. We have found this to be the case, and if any auditor or Scientologist does not at some time achieve an understanding of this, then he has never understood the subject as a whole.* —*Scientology and Effective Knowledge* (15 July 57)

176

Scientology: comes from the Latin *scio*, which means "know" and the Greek word *logos*, meaning "the word or outward form by which the inward thought is expressed and made known." Thus, Scientology means knowing about knowing. Scientology is an applied religious philosophy developed by L. Ron Hubbard. It is the study and handling of the spirit in relationship to itself, universes and other life. *Now, I hope you understand that Scientology has something that is different than any other Earth organization of information or knowledge to date.* —*Scientology and Effective Knowledge* (15 July 57)

sequitur: (*Latin*) following as a consequence; following logically. *Yes, you heard more comments on the market than you heard about any other thing, but none of them were sequitur.* —CCH Related to ARC (16 July 57)

Serutan: the brand name of a laxative. Advertising for the product has included the fact that "Serutan" is "nature's" spelled backwards. *They just say, "Oh well, that's nature."* (Not meaning Serutan.) —CCH Related to ARC (16 July 57)

service facsimile: a computation generated by the individual to make self right and others wrong, to dominate or escape domination and to enhance own survival and injure that of others. This computation will cause the individual to deliberately hold in restimulation selected parts of his reactive mind to explain his failures in life. For example, a person may keep an old injury in restimulation so that his family has to look after him. *See also **computation, reactive mind and restimulated** in this glossary. Every once in a while he loses a favorite piece of bank or service facsimile or something of the sort.* —CCH Related to ARC (16 July 57)

Siddhartha, Gautama: See **Buddha** in this glossary. . . . *Buddhism, which was developed in a very formal state, but existed long before, by Gautama Siddhartha, who was known as "The Buddha," and most of the Western world refer to him as "Buddha," quite incorrectly. —Scientology and Effective Knowledge (15 July 57)*

sine: (*mathematics*) a ratio that shows the relationship between two sides of a right triangle, employed in certain types of calculations. Used as part of a humorous example in the lecture, with no particular significance. *L equals MV squared by the square root of the sine gives you the electrical output of the input on the other side of the ruddy rod. —CCH Related to ARC (16 July 57)*

smurkery: a made-up word to rhyme with *Mercury*. *They say, "Mercury cars are so smurkery." -CCH Related to ARC (16 July 57)*

snapped terminals: collapsed into or identified with each other. *They just snapped terminals and that was that! —CCH Related to ARC (16 July 57)*

somatic: a physical pain or discomfort of any kind. The word *somatic* means, actually, "bodily" or "physical." Because the word *pain* has in the past led to confusion between physical pain and mental pain, *somatic* is the term used in Scientology to denote physical pain or discomfort. *You say, "Well, you got a somatic that goes with it?" —Auditing Styles (24 July 57)*

177

Spencer, Herbert: (1820-1903) English philosopher and social scientist. He is known for his application of the scientific doctrines of evolution to philosophy and ethics, with a central principle, the "persistence of force" as the agent of all change, form and organization in the knowable universe. The only limit which Spencer placed on the application of the theory of evolution was in the area which he called the unknowable, the ultimate nature of reality. The content of the unknowable was not only theological but also included such scientific ideas as matter, space, time, motion and force. He proposed a principle of limitation of knowledge in which human thought was confined to that which could be compared with and related to other things. *But we find in his work the early ghost of Spencer's knowable and unknowable theory —we find right there. —What Scientology Is Addressed To (18 July 57)*

spin in: (*slang*) go into a state of severe mental confusion. *You could probably tell some scientists working on companies contracted to the AEC this and they would start to argue and they would probably flip — they'd probably spin in before dawn. — The Stability of Scientology (23 July 57)*

spooklei: a made-up word. *And they sound fancy titles, there's nuclei and spooklei and electrons and molecules and, oh, they get all sorts of things. - Control (22 July 57)*

square (one) up: settle or adjust (one). *If you want to do something for him, why, run Give Me Your Hand, Tone 40 8-C, plow him around and square him up. - CCH Related to ARC (16 July 57)*

square root: (*mathematics*) the number that is multiplied by itself to produce a given number. (Example: 3 is the *square root* of 9 [$3 \times 3 = 9$]).

ILLUSION OR TRUTH LECTURE TRANSCRIPTS

Used as part of a humorous example in the lecture, with no particular significance. *L equals MV squared by the square root of the sine gives you the electrical output of the input on the other side of the ruddy rod.*
-CCH Related to ARC (16 July 57)

squirreled: altered from the original (materials, procedures, etc.). *Buddhism squirreled when it went up into Tibet and became Lamaism, and many other branches and sects spread from that particular information.*
— *Scientology and Effective Knowledge* (15 July 57)

static: an actuality of no mass, no wavelength, no position in space or relation in time, but with the quality of creating or destroying mass or energy, of locating itself or creating space, and in re-relating time. *Well, I'm sorry I have to bring it up; it would be deadly if you just sat there and looked at the subject of spirits all the time—conceiving a static.*
-*The Five Categories* (19 July 57)

Stein, Gertrude: (1874-1946) American poet, novelist and critic. She was the subject of wide literary controversy in the 1920s because of her writing style, which was characterized by the use of words for their associations and sound, rather than for their literal meaning, and by an emphasis on the presentation of impressions and a particular state of mind rather than the telling of a story. *Something like Gertrude Stein's poetry, or something: "Is a girl, is a girl, is a girl, when I was a rose, oh thunder!"* —*Auditing Styles* (24 July 57)

178

Straightwire: audit *Straightwire* on. *Straightwire* is an auditing process which includes the act of stringing a line between present time and some incident in the past, and stringing that line directly and without any detours. The auditor strings a straight "wire" of memory between the actual genus (origin) of a condition and present time, thus demonstrating that there is a difference of time and space in the condition then and the condition now. The preclear, conceding this difference, can then rid himself of the condition or at least be able to handle it. *You can Straightwire somebody on that question —you'll get some very interesting results, you see.* —*The Mind: Its Structure in Relation to Thetan and Mest* (26 July 57)

stripes: any of various strips of cloth or braid worn on the sleeve of a military uniform to indicate rank, length of time of service, etc. *Or, as I did to one fortunate individual —he's fortunate because he found this out—he said, "I wonder if I have any right at all to wear these five stripes on my sleeve."* —*Scientology and Effective Knowledge* (15 July 57)

Student Manual, The: a basic handbook of auditing procedure for all student auditors, written by L. Ron Hubbard in 1957 but never published. The data it was to contain was issued in HCO Bulletins, Professional Auditor's Bulletins and other issues found in the *Technical Bulletins* Volumes and in *Organization Executive Course* Volume 4. *But there's other material as covered in the Student Manual and new things have opened up as the years have gone on until we can say at last that a preclear or a person being audited in Scientology cannot possibly audit himself.*
— *Theory and Definition of Auditing* (17 July 57)

Subzero Scale: reference to the tones of the Tone Scale that are below zero (death), down to complete unbeingness as a thetan. For further information see the Tone Scale in Full in the book *Scientology 0-8: The Book of Basics*, by L. Ron Hubbard. *The Subzero Scale shows him opening it up again on a falsity. —Theory and Definition of Auditing (17 July 57)*

Sundays, any way from: in all possible ways, directions, etc. Variation of *all ways from the middle. And you have to hunt up and down and clear this thing any way from Sundays. —The Stability of Scientology (23 July 57)*

sunosphere: a made-up word. *Now, this doesn't say that there isn't a field of Scientology today that doesn't go up into the field and the high stratosphere, the ionosphere, the sunosphere of unknown. —The Stability of Scientology (23 July 57)*

Svengalied: brought to a frame of mind where one was thinking what another wanted him to think. From *Svengali*, a person who completely dominates another, usually with selfish or sinister motives. After the evil Hungarian musician and hypnotist of the same name in the novel *Trilby* (1894) by George Du Maurier. A young artist's model in Paris (Trilby O'Ferrall) falls into the hands of Svengali and becomes a great singer under his mesmeric influence, but loses her voice when he suddenly dies of heart failure. *You could even go through a chant like this, you could run Rising Scale Processing, get the guy Svengalied somehow into actually thinking the thoughts you wanted him to think without any other preliminary and just say, "I am energy, I'm not energy," you see. —Control (22 July 57)*

179

syllabilization: a coined term for the action of uttering syllables; speaking. *Many a philosopher has been blinded to the truth by the brilliance of his own syllabilization. —Scientology and Effective Knowledge (15 July 57)*

synapses: the points of contact between adjacent neurons (nerve cells), where nerve impulses are transmitted from one neuron to the other. *If we were going around fixing up bodies —thinking that man was a body — and neurons, automaticities curved in with neurons that made a cross-circuit of synapses and all of it was a bunch of calves' brains . . . —Control (22 July 57)*

teeth, kicks (one) in the: (*slang*) gives (one) an abrupt, often humiliating setback. *It kicks him in the teeth. —Scientology and Effective Knowledge (15 July 57)*

Then and Now Solids: CCH 14, a Scientology process which accomplishes a great number of things, such as straightening out the time track of the preclear and giving the preclear practice in handling time. For further information see HCOB 11 June 57, Training and CCH Processes in *Technical Bulletins Volume IV. Then and Now Solids and some of the CCH B processes are very, very easy to do, particularly if you know CCH A. —Question and Answer Period (15 July 57)*

theta being: See **thetan** in this glossary.

theta bop: a small or wide steady dance of the needle of an E-Meter. Over a spread of one-eighth of an inch (depending on sensitivity setting, it can

ILLUSION OR TRUTH LECTURE TRANSCRIPTS

be half an inch or a whole dial), the needle goes up and down perhaps five or ten times a second. It goes up, sticks, falls, sticks, goes up, sticks, etc., always the same distance, like a slow tuning fork. It is a constant distance and a constant speed, hooking at each end of the swing. *But neither do you want it so insensitive that it will fail to pick up what we call a theta bop.* — *The Stability of Scientology* (23 July 57)

thetan: the person himself—not his body or his name, the physical universe, his mind, or anything else; that which is aware of being aware; the identity which is the individual. The term was coined to eliminate any possible confusion with older, invalid concepts. It comes from the Greek letter *theta* (θ), which the Greeks used to represent *thought* or perhaps *spirit*, to which an *n* is added to make a noun in the modern style used to create words in engineering. It is also θ^n , or "theta to the *n*th degree," meaning unlimited or vast. *Now, a thetan learns that.* — *CCH Related to ARC* (16 July 57)

thetan exterior: a thetan who is clear of the body and knows it but is not yet stable outside. *See also thetan* in this glossary. *The thing here is that an individual, to perceive, has to be brought up to a certain level of perception, and I would say the base level from which perception could be engaged upon, above the level of Homo novis, would certainly be thetan exterior.* — *The Stability of Scientology* (23 July 57)

180

3A: same as CCH A. *See CCH A* in this glossary. *Female voice: Has it been decided yet whether we're going to, in 3A, be using dolls mostly, or not?* — *Question and Answer Period* (15 July 57)

Throgmagog: a term coined by LRH to mean something an individual unknowingly mocks up that will give him all kinds of advice and tell him what to do; an automatic regulator of one's destiny so an individual doesn't have to take responsibility for anything that happens to him. *It spoke about the great god Throgmagog and it said anybody can set up an analytical mind alongside of himself which can solve his problems for him.* — *Theory and Definition of Auditing* (17 July 57)

time track: the consecutive record of mental image pictures which accumulates through a person's life. It is a very accurate record of a person's past. As a rough analogy, the time track could be likened to a motion-picture film—if that film were three-dimensional, had fifty-two perceptions and could fully react upon the observer. . . . *he continues to exist along a time track.* — *Control* (22 July 57)

Tlingits: members of any of a number of American Indians of the coastal regions of southern Alaska and northern British Columbia, Canada. *All savage races, all savage races, even the American, has had myths concerning man's origin—the Aleut, Tlingits.* — *Scientology and Effective Knowledge* (15 July 57)

tone 20: the tone level of 20 on the Tone Scale: action. For further information see the Tone Scale in Full in the book *Scientology 0-8: The Book of Basics*, by L. Ron Hubbard. *The greatest space would be something that would happen about tone 20 or 22.* — *Scales (Effect Scale)* (25 July 57)

tone 22: the tone level of 22 on the Tone Scale, between action (tone 20) and serenity of beingness (Tone 40). No name for this level had been issued at the time of the lecture, but it was designated as "games" on the Tone Scale in Full, released in 1978. For further information see the Tone Scale in Full in the book *Scientology 0-8: The Book of Basics*, by L. Ron Hubbard. *The greatest space would be something that would happen about tone 20 or 22. - Scales (Effect Scale) (25 July 57)*

Tone 40ed: made a positive postulate about, with no counter-thought expected, anticipated or anything else; that is, exerted total control over some person, thing or event. The name *Tone 40* comes from the top position of the Tone Scale which is serenity of beingness. Also used as a verb: to make such a postulate or use Tone 40. *See also postulate and Tone Scale* in this glossary. *And so she didn't know about that, but I Tone 40ed it and she sat down there and she wrote the letter and she sent that off. - CCH Related to ARC (16 July 57)*

Tone Scale: a scale, in Scientology, which shows the emotional tones of a person. These, ranged from the highest to the lowest, are, in part, serenity, enthusiasm (as we proceed downward), conservatism, boredom, antagonism, anger, no-sympathy, fear, grief, apathy. An arbitrary numerical value is given to each level on the scale. There are many aspects of the Tone Scale and using it makes possible the prediction of human behavior. For further information on the Tone Scale, read the book *Science of Survival* by L. Ron Hubbard, and the Hubbard Chart of Human Evaluation which accompanies it. *The Tone Scale, clear as a bell, describes somebody closing distance. —Theory and Definition of Auditing (17 July 57)*

181

top and bottom buttons: reference to the buttons listed at the top and bottom of the Hubbard Chart of Attitudes. Buttons are things in particular that each human being finds aberrative and has in common; the major difficulties people have. For example, right/wrong, fully responsible/no responsibility, owns all/owns nothing, faith/distrust. *See also Chart of Attitudes* in this glossary. *Give you some small idea of the number of graphs there are in the Student Manual—scales: . . . the top and bottom buttons . . . —Theory and Definition of Auditing (17 July 57)*

TR: abbreviation for draining regimen or routine, often referred to as a *training drill*. TRs are practical drills which address (and can greatly increase) a student's ability in such areas as communication and control. *All it is, is all of the exact data of Scientology, all of the exact data: the old Dianetic Axioms, the Prelogics, The Factors, what auditing is, how it is done, all the TRs, how you sign up a preclear. —What Scientology Is Addressed To (18 July 57)*

Trio: CCH 8, one of a series of processes which have as a goal the separating of time, moment from moment. This process is called "Trio" because there are three different sets of commands for the process. For further information, see HCOB 11 June 57, Training and CCH Processes in *Technical Bulletins* Volume IV. *It even includes Trio, a very redoubtable process. —Question and Answer Period (15 July 57)*

ILLUSION OR TRUTH LECTURE TRANSCRIPTS

true, for: certain; without doubt. Variation of *for sure*. *That's for true*. —*Theory and Definition of Auditing* (17 July 57)

tuberculi: humorous made-up name for the tubercles (small, soft swellings in or on the body) characteristic of the disease *tuberculosis*—an illness most commonly affecting the lungs. *Is it the tuberculi which generate tuberculi, or can the body counterfeit tuberculi?* —*The Mind: Its Structure in Relation to Thetan and MEST* (26 July 57)

tuberculouses: humorous made-up name for the bacteria which cause tuberculosis—an illness most commonly affecting the lungs and characterized by the formation of small, soft swellings called tubercles. *When set a proper example of tuberculouses, will it then generate tuberculouses?* —*The Mind: Its Structure in Relation to Thetan and MEST* (26 July 57)

turnovers: summaries, notes or treatments produced by a scriptwriter and turned over to those he is writing for. *And I used to put this on the heading of—make it first page on my MSeS and turnovers*. —*What Scientology Is Addressed To* (18 July 57)

unit: one of the three training sections into which the 18th ACC was divided. The first unit was the Communication Course, the second was the Upper Indoctrination Course and the third was the CCH Course (which itself was divided into two parts, "CCH A" and "CCH B," each part teaching one half of the CCH processes). Students went through each of the three units twice in order to complete the course. *Now, this unit's training is devoted mainly to cracking all the cases all the way south*. —*Question and Answer Period* (15 July 57)

upscale: (*verb*) move up the Tone Scale and into a better condition or state of being. See also **Tone Scale** in this glossary. *In other words, you have to upscale it in order to make it*. —*CCH Related to ARC* (16 July 57)

Valhalla: (*Norse mythology*) the great hall where the god Odin receives and holds feasts for the souls of heroes fallen bravely in battle. The word literally means *hall of the slain*. Used figuratively in this lecture. *It tells you that there is an enormous Valhalla mixed up with Pluto's realm, mixed up with fairy tales, mixed up with Menninger's works, lying all over below the level of truth*. —*Scientology and Effective Knowledge* (15 July 57)

vector: a physical quantity with both magnitude and direction, such as a force or velocity. *He uses pictures on the reverse vector—now, this is throwing pictures at people, see?* —*The Mind: Its Structure in Relation to Thetan and MEST* (26 July 57)

Vespucci, America: reference to Amerigo Vespucci (1454-1512), Italian navigator and explorer; America is supposed to have been named in his honor. *It's well known in the Explorers Club, and it's one of the biggest jokes in the Explorers Club is the derivation of the word America: there are seven sources for the word America, none of them America Vespucci*. —*What Scientology Is Addressed To* (18 July 57)

via: a relay point in a communication line. *And he eventually learns very well never to observe anything, but if he catches sight of something, to go on a via at once and look the other direction*. —*Scientology and Effective Knowledge* (15 July 57)

visio: the recall of something seen, so that it is seen again in the mind in full color, scale, dimension, brightness and detail. *And with the aid of that and a preclear with fairly good visio who wasn't scared of getting into trouble with facsimiles, you could undoubtedly map the entirety of the genetic line.* — *The Stability of Scientology* (23 July 57)

Washington Post: a large daily newspaper published in Washington, DC. *See it any day, you know, in the Washington Post; they publish dead bodies all the time.* — *The Stability of Scientology* (23 July 57)

way-stop: a stop between main stations in the course of a journey. Used figuratively in the lecture. *You look at and it's a rather total understanding and it doesn't have any way-stops.* — *Scales (Effect Scale)* (25 July 57)

Weimar Republic: a common name for the government of Germany between World War I and the assumption of power by Adolf Hitler in 1933; Weimar, Germany, was where its constitution was drawn up. The constitution abolished the several constitutional monarchies that had previously formed the German Empire. The Weimar government was unpopular because of its acceptance of the harsh provisions of the Treaty of Versailles (the treaty that officially ended World War I); the large penalties Germany had to pay caused economic chaos in the country, with German money declining daily in value. *They set up a rather successful government then, and other nations were pledged to support it—the Weimar Republic—it folded up.* — *Scales (Effect Scale)* (25 July 57)

183

Western Union: an American telegraph company. *If you go down to the library and look for texts on communication you will find electrical gimmicks and Western Union, and you'll find formulas and you'll find all sorts of things but no discussion down there about one being talking to another being because of course nobody had ever done that.* — *CCH Related to ARC* (16 July 57)

Westinghouse: short for *Westinghouse Electric*, a diversified company dealing mainly in electrical and electronic equipment. *Not a General Electric or Westinghouse electric oven; I'm talking about an oven.* — *The Stability of Scientology* (23 July 57)

Wheatstone bridge: an electrical circuit for measuring the amount of resistance to a flow of electricity. *They're simply a Wheatstone bridge, in spite of the original manufacturer's nonsense.* — *The Stability of Scientology* (23 July 57)

white suits, little boys in: humorous reference to personnel from a mental institution (where staff normally wear white). *If the little boys in white suits came by with their butterfly nets, you'd go; you'd be standing there at the radio bench repairing thin air.* — *The Mind: Its Structure in Relation to Thetan and MEST* (26 July 57)

whole track: having to do with the moment-to-moment record of a person's existence in this universe in picture and impression form including past track, prior to this lifetime. *Or it was a whole track between-lives operation where thetans were given a bunch of pictures and a bunch of pictures taken away from them or something of the sort.* — *The Five Categories* (19 July 57)

ILLUSION OR TRUTH LECTURE TRANSCRIPTS

wooden nutmeg: (*colloquial*) anything worthless passed off as genuine or valuable; a *nutmeg* is a hard, aromatic seed about the size of a marble, which is grated and used as a spice. *See, you can sell an awful lot of—you know, you can sell an awful lot of goldbricks and wooden nutmegs to people and they don't know what you're talking about. — Theory and Definition of Auditing (17 July 57)*

woof and warp: (*figurative*) the underlying structure upon which something is built; a foundation; base. Literally, the woof is the horizontal thread in a woven fabric, and the warp is the vertical thread. Together they make up the whole of a woven article. *Now, there is the woof and warp of experience: the interweave of these factors. —The Five Categories (19 July 57)*

Wundt: Wilhelm Wundt (1832-1920), German psychologist and physiologist (expert in the study of the functions of living things and the ways in which their parts and organs work); the originator of the false doctrine that man is no more than an animal. *They haven't lived; they're a matter of changing fad every few minutes — beyond psychology, which was the work of a single man named Wundt in Leipzig, Germany in 1879, who believed that all men were animals and has convinced everybody since. —Scientology and Effective Knowledge (15 July 57)*