

BEGINNING AND ENDING SESSION - QUESTION AND ANSWER PERIOD

A lecture given on 17 July 1958

[Based on the clearsound version only.]

Yes?

Male voice: I would like for you to go into that thing about your intention to help is so strong that it surpassed or exceeded the point where you decided you'd failed. You picked up the guy's identity to continue with. Could you straighten that out some?

Well, it's probably the primary basis of valence shifts. You tried to help somebody, tried to help somebody, tried to help somebody.

All right. In life, let us say you got married, you got a job, you did this, you did that, you gave up a lot of pursuits one way or the other to help somebody. Help your wife, you know. She didn't like dancing so you forgot about dancing. You know? And she was very fond of living in the country; you didn't much care for it but you went into the country. Get the idea? You made certain investments, you took some special training so that you could improve your job so that you could work from nine till five instead of working the midnight shift, or something of the sort. You know? All these things you did - you were trying to help somebody. See? All right. They blow up, leave, disappear out of your life for some reason or other, you see? Now you're hung with all of the computations which you did for their sake so you make that person responsible for those computations. And you go flip. Get the idea? Because you don't put the brakes on all of your help. If you were to cut off each method of help which you used to assist that person and terminate each one of those, you'd never do a valence flip.

They disappear, run off with the chauffeur or something of the sort. And you suddenly realize this is happening and if you realize at the same time that you're still strong and good-looking and can get a hundred thousand girls if you want - very few

fellows who are suddenly deserted ever remember this, by the way and girls never remember this either. They forget all about this sort of thing. But if they're clever and they know something about life and livingness, and so on, all they would have to do is turn around and see all of the places where they had grooved in to help this person, you see, and terminate those too and they'd never do an apparent valence shift.

They convince themselves of the valence shift because all of these helping mechanisms are still in continuance. The person must be there if the person who is doing the helping is still doing the helping. There must be something there to help. And a person explains it to himself by itself. See, it's obvious the person's still there if you still live in the country, are working on this nine to five shift. If life is going along in that way, then you must still be helping that person. But they're not there so you must be helping somebody so it must have been yourself. But it really helped you - flip - you have become the person and then you are helping that person. You've done a valence shift and you're sort of schizy from there on. Get the idea?

Audience: Uh-huh.

That explain it?

Male voice: There's still a little...

It's a carry-over, is all.

Male voice: Yeah.

The first postulate is the valid one. I'll give you the old one, two, three, four postulate, see. But the first postulate is always the valid one. And the first postulate was to help and the next postulate, to destroy, is invalid.

Yes?

Female voice: Doesn't it also really kind of prove what you were saying here? You said if he'd just turn around and look. If he doesn't turn around, he just keeps going right out and then becomes that terminal.

That's right. That's right, particularly if he refuses to look at the terminal anymore and turns away from the terminal, then he doesn't as-is the shadows of it and the shadows are still there and he runs straight into the shadows. Then after that he's a shadow.

Yes?

Male voice: Does this begin with a matter of opposing goals?

Usually.

Male voice: Trying to help someone with opposing goals than yours?

Yes. And it's already in extremis to change all of your goals to help somebody.

Male voice: Yeah.

Just like it would be in extremis for an auditor to assume the goal of succumb for the preclear.

Male voice: Right.

That would be something if - if I'd have a goal that it - a Scientologist doesn't have goals of this character but let's just use one. He has the goal that this person is going to go back to work and become a reputable citizen. See? He's got this as a goal. And the person wants to become a disreputable citizen and never work again. And in order to help him, then the Scientologist would say, „*Well, we'll have to audit him in the direction to uninhibit him so that he can be a disreputable citizen and never have to work again.*“ By the way, it wouldn't work, his doing this, and it would be a total surrender of your original intentions. So you've been a traitor to yourself. You see? So your task, if you are going in that direction at all, is to shift the direction of the fellow's goals - sometimes quite tricky.

Male voice: Hm.

But it's done on a basis of contribution. If he'll help you enough, he will also help you by assuming your goals on the basis that they're your goals. So if your goals are always the goals of an optimum solution, they covertly were his goals in the first place too. See? And you always win. An auditor is liable to get, if he gets too good, in being in the horrible situation of always winning.

Yes, Jack?

Male voice: Yeah. Uh, it looks to me, Ron, as though affinity is the creation of willingness all the way up the line. So, therefore, if the auditor can create a pan-determined willingness in the session, he's got it made because he can - not all the time violate mechanics, but he can to some extent violate mechanics and yet, with the creation of willingness, still achieve his goals. I'm not suggesting he should, I'm just saying it's possible.

If his willingness parallels an optimum solution...

Male voice: Yeah.

.. he can pan-determine it without having to pan-determine it really at all because it's already there in the preclear.

Male voice: Well, the willingness - what I'm getting at here is, you can get a mechanical two-way situation. Remember, we used to run, „*Hello...*“

Mm-huh.

Male voice: „... *I'm fine*“ You know, that bit.

Mm-hm.

Male voice: If you could run it for hours nothing would happen. No willingness there. But if you create willingness you have affinity and, therefore, the creation of reality and communication too.

Right. Right. Very good.

Male voice: Thank you.

Okay. Any questions germane to these short cycles you're running?

Yes?

Male voice: Question on that end of session. How would it be if you bridged into the end of session, got his agreement and then said, „*Say with me, say with me, 'End of session'?*“ Yeah, that's nothing wrong with that. There's nothing wrong with that. I go so far as to make the preclear tell me that the session is over. And I tell them that's for me and make them consider they've contributed an end of session. That's quite overt. If you make them contribute your end of session - they have already been contributing to you and what you've just said would be workable, of course. You bet.

All right. Now, is there anything you are running into still with the TRs? Hm? Who feels he's had it with TRs? Can't get anyplace, can't do anything about it, hm? Boy, nobody will own up to that one.

Yes?

Female voice: Well, I still feel very stiff indeed when I'm asked just to sit upright and keep a completely straight face.

Yeah.

Female voice: And I don't want to carry that over into regular auditing. That's a terrible battle. Now, I never did slop over preclears. I've always looked at them. But this stiff thing seems as though it was a cage or something.

Well, just for the theoretical sake of it, you should be able to do it without worrying about it and I think that's what your Instructor is working on.

Female voice: I know.

That's what your Instructor is working on. There must be something there your Instructor is trying to get at, one way or the other.

Female voice: That's how it is.

Yeah. I'm afraid.

Yes?

Male voice: Well, Ron, I'm having a little bit of trouble with the TRs in this respect: that the TRs are running me while I'm running the session. In other words, I'm always aware of, well, did I create my space? Am I confronting? Oh, yeah? Something like asking a sculptor how he sculpts.

Male voice: That's right. That's right.

Uh, sure.

Male voice: Why I gave you this, I wanted to know how do you get back from this and just know you're doing it all right? Well, it sounds like one of these brush-off answers, but it isn't. It's: you do it. You just make up your mind to do a session that way...

Male voice: Oh, yeah, I get it.

.. and not to consider that there's any other way and just to do a session that way. And you all of a sudden will find yourself at cause over the TRs and as soon as you do that, they smooth right out.

You can take somebody who's been auditing fairly well and then shove all of the horrible, skeletal bric-a-brac at him of communication and all the rest of this sort of thing and get him terribly aware of the bones. And after that he can't tell a hip joint from an eye socket, you know? The way to get him back in the groove - he hasn't lost anything. He's in some sort of a borderline between „*It's uncomfortable to know*,“ you see, and an attempt to suppress what he is already doing, which is probably right. You know? And it's like somebody studying the Axioms. They very often, a third or half of the way through studying an axiom will restimulate the forgetter, the inhibitor, that they have put on the axiom in the first place. And the axiom is very close to home, you see and this doggone inhibitor will get restimulated to such a degree that they lose their memory of the axiom. And they go over the axiom and they've got it just fine and then the person who is coaching them - helping them with it, you know - looks alertly for them to quote the axiom now and the fellow goes, daaaaaaah. See, it's gone. And then in a moment or two it'll flicker back again and then it will flicker out. And it'll flicker back. And it's just not consistently there.

Well, if he continues to create the axiom, you know, he continues to create the Axiom, he will blow the necessity for the inhibitor and the axiom will blow into view.

And something can happen in studying the Axioms which is fascinating: is that they can actually be blown out of the considerations of the person. Quite often happens. The person feels much freer after they've studied the Axioms. They don't quite realize what's taken place.

Well, similarly, the rules of communication are also buried and you can go through a period of the TRs going flicker-flack. They're in view, very prominent, you know? But then you get at it again and it seems to be going smoothly and then they'll sort of flip-flop on you and you have to retreat and it's whether you're the cause of the TRs or not. As long as the TRs, in your opinion, belong to somebody else they'll continue to raise their heads and bite. But when you yourself are willing to adopt them and take them for your own and create them as you go, why, then they just smoothly flow out and after that not only do the TRs not bother you but neither does auditing.

Male voice: Thank you.

You bet.

Yes?

Female voice: Ron, on the very touchy subject of money...

Yes?

Female voice: ... would you mind telling me why it seems to be that around HASI's there has to be a mocked-up shortage of this stuff? It's an interesting fact, isn't it?

Female voice: Yes, it is.

We have talks to the staff about this every once in a while. It's true, we do. We do. There isn't any real shortage of it. The truth of the matter is people on staff would rather give away what we are doing than charge for it. This is the first thing we run into, you see.

Female voice: Oh, yeah, I see.

And they don't like going through a via, particularly. And they forget this every once in a while and they'd give away the front of the building if you'd let them.

And then the other way this happens is equally simple: is, the organization does so much - one of these organizations - one of the most complicated organizations in the world from the standpoint of the number of things that it's doing - and to do all these things comfortably would require, oh, it would require the annual contribution that the government makes to psychiatry and psychology. It would require the annual budget of the Ford Foundation or something of this character. And we buy so darn much for so very little that there's always a shortage. There's always so much more we could be doing.

Talking to somebody the other day, he said, „*Why don't we - why don't we just set up a clinic and audit the government?*“ Simple, isn't it? Love to do it - be very successful. I never go up on Capitol Hill but what I find myself in an auditing session with some bigwig; get him to start telling me his troubles and we're right off to the races, you know? He generally doesn't know what's happened to him.

It'd be a very simple thing. All you would do is open a nice, big clinic that's very imposing and you - it merely said the Psychological Orientation Clinic or something of the sort, you know, and it had some noncommittal name and just start writing letters. Probably years would go by before they found out it wasn't a government department. It's quite simple but it's just beyond our ability to finance.

Now, that is a shortage of money. That definitely is a shortage of money when we can't do something like that. Now, that's the one we're trying to solve. We're trying to solve that one heavily. How can we get enough money to do these things and still not violate the help-contribute angle and so on? For instance, I run all sorts of help curves. The one that is totally unhelpful and this seems to be utterly non sequitur - Alexandre Dumas wrote an enormous cookbook, Alexandre Dumas, Senior. It's probably the world's finest cookbook. I don't think any copies of it are available in English.

I was in an American restaurant the other day; they didn't even know they were eating Spanish food. Spanish food is what's served here in America. Everybody thinks Spanish food, you know, is tortillas and frijoles and that sort of thing. Nobody's ever heard of those in Spain. It's beefsteak and potatoes and salad and just what we eat in this country. We eat almost totally Spanish cookery.

Now here's all of this - this tremendous tome of French cookery which is lying there undistributed, you know. It's one of the most fascinating books you ever got your

nose into. It's how they buy peaches at the royal palace, for instance; long dissertation on the subject of how you tell a good peach from a bad peach and - just this fantastic man wrote this fantastic cookbook, you know? And I'd like to publish it. Utterly non sequitur. There's no reason for it at all, you know. I just think it would be an amusing thing to do; bring out this book with this great big title across the top of it, you know, „*Alexandre Dumas*,“ you know, write it BIG, you know, and then „*Cookbook*.“ It would be an awful shock to people. They would undoubtedly have his cookery confused with d'Artagnan's rapier. But that's just a foolish project, an amusing project.

Anything foolish or amusing just has to go by the boards around this organization. You have to cut it close. You generally can appropriate a budget which will be adequate for about one-fifth and then do twice as much work with it.

Well, we've had suggestions of running the staff on money. As a matter of fact, by the way, we started doing that some time ago.

Female voice: Good.

You know how to cure somebody of money difficulties?

It's quite easy. You give them a dollar bill and a fifty-cent piece or a pound note and a shilling. And you have them alternate - place them alternately left to right. Have him keep them from going away and hold them still and make them more solid. And if you run it properly, why, you will first run Help on money, you see, and then you'll run this one on money. And the first thing, you know, he's worried. He's trying to stop his abilities because it would ruin the game if he could - he realizes suddenly that he might be able to mock up money. You know, just mock up a perfectly valid stack of twenty-dollar bills or five-pound notes or something of the sort. And if everybody could do that, money would have no value and then he can't conceive how you would solve the barter system and we're off to the races.

I've had people get worried. Every time this has ever been run, the person, sooner or later, gets worried about this factor but you certainly can solve money.

Yes?

Male voice: Doesn't this - in running this, don't they go on a gradient scale up on this? First they start to collect the result of the money before they actually collect money?

Yes. You mean the results of running the process on somebody? Yeah.

Male voice: Because then they collect a lot of mass, a lot of MEST and still no money.
Yeah.

Male voice: Then they go to no MEST and a lot of money.

Yeah.

Male voice: And then they go to no money and no MEST.

Maybe not quite that bad. If you're good enough with an intention, you could walk up to somebody and without saying anything to him, why, have him hand you a dollar bill. If you're good enough with Tone 40.

Yes, Jack?

Male voice: I've - just a comment on that, Ron. When I was down here during the 19th you told me about that. And on the airplane back, when I went back to Chicago, I mocked up twenty-dollar bills and kept them from going away. And for about the next two months I had a stack of twenty-dollar bills, one way or another, in my wallet..

Yeah.

Male voice: ... until I finally got kind of worried about that and carried tens around instead.

Works too good.

Yes?

Male voice: Ron, I had an idea on the money there. I was looking at an auditor when he's not willing to charge money when he's auditing, this appears to be a lack of certainty as to the value of what he's giving out. Well now, it seems to me that with a HASI or a Scientologist, he doesn't want money. What he wants is a flow and he will get money in and out to the degree that he is certain on the third dynamic that what he is doing is valuable. It just seems to me that all an auditor or an organization needs is a group certainty on the third dynamic of their value therein.

Hm. Very good comment. Very good comment.

An auditor will also refuse money if he can't receive some help. You find it works both... But the value and certainty of what he is doing, yeah. You'll notice an auditor who has muffed a case do a bad downcurve for a few days, sometimes. Every once in a while an auditor gets somebody who kicks the bucket or does something like that. It isn't very often. And he wants to help somebody, you know, and a lot of factors enter into it and get in his road and prevent him; his certainty gets pretty shattered for a short time.

The thing for him to do is go and build his certainty back up again and he'd be okay. The thing he has done when he does that, by the way, is interesting. It's - was in the lecture today. It's the survive-succumb, opposite goals and he only gets a failure when he muffs that one. He muffed goals.

Male voice: He's Q-and-Aed with the succumb goals?

Yeah, that's right.

Male voice: Yeah.

Yes?

Female voice: Ron, could you tell me the value of an intensive as against running, say, two sessions a week of, say, two-and-a-half hours each? What is the value of an intensive over just a time span of five hours a week carried over, say, about five or six weeks?

Oh, the main value is that you get the person up above the environmental invalidation and you get him uphill faster than people can knock him down. And most people who are getting auditing, lots of people, have people around them who would, you know, try to chip at them, invalidate them a bit. And the value of an intensive is to get them up there in a hurry and they can't be kicked downstairs again.

There's another value in that if you give auditing sessions too infrequently, you'll find nearly all of your sessions are involved with the PT problems which have occurred between sessions. And an intensive minimizes this. So there are advantages to an intensive but it isn't at all destructive to audit a person at wide intervals; it just isn't as efficient.

Female voice: May I ask one more question on that please?

Yes.

Female voice: What about the question of process lag, which has more of a chance to run out over a period of time and if you're running an intensive, you're not allowing process lag a chance?

It shouldn't happen. Process lag, theoretically, shouldn't happen and is actually a mistake or an error. It's an auditor error.

When you get an unstable gain there are three methods by which you determine the failures of profiles to improve. Profile unchanged, beginning and end of an intensive, profile unchanged. PT problem not resolved. In other words, preclear not contributing to the auditing session. That's invariable.

ARC break is profile depressed. At the end of the intensive, the profile is lower than it was at the beginning of the intensive. This is definitely and always an ARC break between the auditor and the preclear which the auditor has not repaired. And again, the preclear is not contributing to the session, but so much less is he contributing that he actually gets worse receiving help he's not willing to have.

And the third one is the unstable gain. The profile goes up and then a few days later we give him another profile and we find a sag from where it was. Well, this is unflattened processes and where you have an unflattened process, the physical universe will complete the running out of the process. So anything might happen. It might go up, it might go down but it's certainly unstable.

If an auditor has audited properly and has audited to get each one of his processes flat, has left the case in a very stable condition, that is to say, with each process flattened, each one taken care of, the gain attained will remain there not for just a week or two weeks but actually, in our experience, has been found to stay there for three or four years. Right there, bang! So the process lag of the process running out is also discovered in clearing. You clear somebody and then he runs on out. What you've got

there is the accumulation of incomplete processes at work. And these processes have been left incomplete one way or the other from maybe way back when, you see. Some process run on him two or three years ago now decides to run itself out. Now, he's - runs that out and he runs something else out but in each case it's an unflattened process.

In an intensive you don't run into it as often because you're keeping much closer check on the pre-clear and fewer present time difficulties are coming up. So you're not spending much time in cleaning up the present time or taking care of the existing situation. You are merely spending time plugging right straight ahead, whamity-bam, on the project of auditing. So you do flatten the processes that you run and you get very little process lag and you get a considerable stability that you would not get otherwise. That's another argument in favor of an intensive. You get to complete what you start. And when you're auditing sporadically and it's only two-and-a-half hours a crack and it happens every week or two times a week, you'll sometimes slip, you know, and you'll have been running Step 6. And the next time he comes back he's apparently flat on it, you know, kind of, so we go into Help, but we just didn't run Step 6 on that full cycle.

Well, the MEST universe is going to run it out someday and you'll get much more variability of case on seldom auditing. As a matter of fact, staff auditors and staff in general, were they here, would be saying at this moment, „*You said it!*“ You know? That's certainly true. Because these poor guys - these poor guys running on their own Clear project work so hard day and night that they seldom get a chance to get in their co-auditing sessions and they often have a change of auditors.

And all of a sudden they won't get any auditing for a couple of weeks on this Clear project, you see? And their auditor, expecting to audit them the next night - see, he's running Help on something or other. A couple of weeks later they're involved with something else and they get some other thing run on them or they change auditors and they're not up-to-date with the thing and they can be very uncomfortable for a few days.

There's one staff member I know of, particularly, who's very, very uncomfortable, or was, over a period of about ten days. Auditor left the area for an out-in-the-field job for the organization and won't be back for a while. See? This poor pc was halfway through Help on the Rock itself and, man, that was rough. That was rough. Finally, somebody started in on the case and patched it up a little bit, just continued it through to a flatter spot.

But this auditor, her auditor, believed implicitly that tomorrow night was the next session and so didn't much care where he left the Rock, see? But tomorrow night never arrived. The following morning there was an emergency call somewhere far away from here and the auditor went. It's amusing, the complications that evolve from this sort of thing.

Yes?

Female voice: Ron, in the case of the points being up to a hundred plus, would the drop still be undesirable?

Well, now, I didn't quite get that now.

Female voice: Oh, where the points are up to a hundred plus on the profile...

Yeah.

Female voice:... would a drop in the after-intensive - would that still be desirable?

If they're up, they're up. Up is up. Anybody that's tried to tell you that you should adjust your profile downwards told you that you should agree with the human race.

Back in Wichita - back in Wichita we got to kicking around how right you could get. And we had a very interesting conversation on this subject of whether you could be right at all. And the outcome of the conversation was that it would be utterly impossible to be right and be human. You couldn't possibly be right and be human. And you had to be wrong enough to agree with your environment and that kept you from being right. I wish I had a tape of the conversation. It was the most complicated conversation I've ever been part of. It was a very complicated conversation but it all worked on down and all the explanations were highly explicit. It was just a gag; we were just fooling around, you know. It was pretty wild, though. You can't be right and be human; no slightest possibility of it ever occurring.

So somebody tells you you ought to downgrade a profile to be more what? To be more human. Well, that would be to be more wrong, obviously.

Yes?

Female voice: Well, I was told that if it was above ninety, why, it was unreality, the pc had no reality on.

Oh, I doubt that.

Female voice: Oh, it was.

I doubt that. An awful lot of randomness resulted, by the way, from these Clear tests that were given at the congress. They were highly specific and we know our business around here as far as Clear tests are concerned, you know? And it is true - it is true that somebody could be Clear tested and then could slip. It is true, particularly if they're Clear tested immediately at the end of the intensive and not rechecked a few days later or something like this.

We found out, though, that when those profiles and IQs are not met, the Clear check won't meet it on the meter either. It takes that much profile and IQ to meet it on the meter. And where you get a profile and IQ which is less than the Clear standard, you also get vagaries on the E-Meter and vice versa. When you get vagaries on the E-Meter, you find the Clear checkout specifications are not met.

That's how they were arrived at, by the way. You know, you could artificially establish what a Clear should get as a profile and what he should get as an IQ. Just take the fifty-one of the fifty percent of the human race that can be exteriorized easily and can

operate for a few days exterior, bang him out of his head, give him an APA and IQ real quick and you're getting one that's uninfluenced by body considerations, you see? And you'll get in excess of 135 and you'll get an APA in excess of that. It'll all collapse in a very short time but that's testing a Theta Clear, which is just a roundabout method of testing a ME5T Clear. Do you see? But a MEST Clear meets these standards in spite of body influences. That's much harder to do, much harder to do.

Yes, Anne?

Female voice: I think where some of this is coming from is the APA manual itself and its explanation in correlating some of those traits with the others. It definitely mentions if certain traits are above 90, well, this is an indication of a martyr complex and that is telling...

Who's telling this?

Female voice: The APA manual itself gives this explanation.

Oh, it does, huh?

Female voice: Oh, yes. It's all through there on - on how if the affinity is too high - well, this is more of a sort of a cultural thing, you know, and not quite true. There's quite a bit on here in explanation.

Is that so?

Female voice: Yes. Certain traits being above 90 it definitely says that the preferable place is around 75 and above 90 is a little too high, that it's going out of reality.

Well, out of reality...

Female voice: It's detailed in this manual that we go by.

Well, then that - it's still true. It's going out of reality of the human race, that's for true. You must - you must remember - you must remember this one fact that that is a psychological test of some age and standing. So are the IQ tests that we use. And we use those tests and keep them to themselves and keep them as they are with malice aforethought. We have purposely never developed Scientology tests to take their place because they themselves are a frame of reference in agreement with the society. Therefore, these tests mean something to psychology.

But I'm glad you called that to my attention. I'll have to look at that manual.

Female voice: It - it's all there when you're ready.

That's very amusing. I've never read the manual on them. What I have read on them is not their administration but I've read their rationale, description and development. And I had a good laugh over it.

The tests are supposed to be the most stable tests psychology has to offer, both those tests. That's why they are there. They will not change and under no circumstances can they change more than a plus or minus 4, regardless of what happens to the person. And they're an arrow into the teeth of vested interests, you see, and it frightens them.

The effect that one produces with these tests, groups of these tests, when he submits them to a government agency or a bunch of psychologists and so on, is very gratifying. They fall back and they faint and they looked frightened and they start shivering.

Now, you think I'm exaggerating this reaction but I'm really not exaggerating the reaction. I've had witnesses to this when I have suddenly, casually pulled these tests out, said what tests they were and have laid them on a table, a hundred such tests, you see, a hundred profiles, you know, and a hundred IQs and just laid them on the table casually in front of some psychologist, you know, who is very authoritative and so forth. In one case, one of the psychologists of the group who were present - we just use these things to make sure our anchor points are out, see; we don't intend them to do anything about it particularly because they wouldn't. They - they wouldn't be capable of doing anything about it. Now, and this psychologist began to shake visibly, you know, like this: *„So just-just-just one of these tests - just-just-just-just one of these tests published in the psychological journal would upset the whole field of ps-psychology.“*

Male voice: It sure would, Ron.

„And our press...“

Male voice: They would all go to pieces.

Oh, sure. Our press relations man was sitting there and I actually had to kick him sideways underneath the table to keep him from bursting out loud with laughter. It was such a pat fright.

A very high officer of the government just a few days ago wrote us a panic letter - panic - on this. It was fascinating. I've still got the letter up there. You'd be surprised at the person - who it is. I wouldn't say - not with the tape running.

And we submitted a standard submission. You see, we're in the position of possibly withholding from government use valuable materials which could be used in the defense picture. And we must keep ourselves innocent of this action. So we continue to submit to all agencies. Anybody who comes up and suddenly takes over some big defense post or something like that gets dropped in his lap a very neat presentation of Scientology. It's actually not only neat, but it's really got mass. It's a series of envelopes about that high, 8 1/2" x 11" envelopes, one sheet at a time, you know, each sheet very significant, stacked up that high. It requires a very strong porter to deliver them. And he gets something like this.

Quite often he will write us for it; quite often we receive a request for this sort of thing, you know? Please tell us what you are doing these days, you know. Defense mobilization, something like that. Well, we give him three or four days so that it looked like we just got the thing together, you know, and we change the headline on the letter of submission and so forth and we send it over by messenger to his office, something like this, see. And they always give it personal attention.

But in this particular case we got a panic letter. It said over and over that there was no way... We always ask for a government contract. You know, we shove it right on home. We tell them how much money we need, what the government is supposed to

do, exactly how this thing shapes up. We even tell them names and addresses of the people who will be in charge of the project. You know? It's just tailor-made.

Somebody has asked me a couple of times, „*Why don't you do it on a gradient scale?*“ Because they might buy it! Then we'd find ourselves totally tied down in the defense picture.

This letter first told us that he couldn't possibly be instrumental in getting us a government contract to process all the scientists and military officers and aviators and so forth in the country. He couldn't possibly do this. And then he repeated it, see, and said he couldn't possibly do this. And then he said he couldn't possibly do this. And then he said he couldn't possibly comment on the value of the findings. The whole letter added up that he couldn't possibly. Very amusing.

You probably didn't know that we were a pressure point, that we made Scientology a pressure point. You possibly weren't aware of the fact.

See, it would be folly to get a Republican administration to buy Scientology because Democrats would kick it out as soon as they came in, something like that. If we were to submit anything in earnest, it would be after the next election. We had a lot of fun, a lot of fun with this sort of thing.

The NAAP, for instance, is causing much more of a stir than you would ordinarily think and has caused the American Psychiatric Association to completely change its line of dissemination. The APA has sent over people to talk to us and that sort of thing. We've already had many visitors on this line and so forth.

And if you'll notice the articles which are being put out are less and less now devoted to how horrible it all is, but to how humane psychiatry is. You noticed any articles lately about how humane it all is? Well, there have been several in their favorite media. The Reader's Digest, I think, is their journal, isn't it?

Male voice: Writer's Digest.

Yeah. These people are very much influenced by what we do. It's quite amusing. We're not being stupidly - not stupidly assuming ourselves at cause where we are not. That would be a dull thing to do too. But being right here in Washington and they're right around the corner, we have a very easy grapevine.

There's another organization in the country called the American Management Association, that you'll see all over the place and that Eisenhower spoke at the other day. He gave them a talk. They're quite important people. And all we've got to do is change our format of a congress and they change their formats of their congresses. They now hold congresses and they have seminars and the same hours are used and the same program format. That's a stupid program format. It's totally designed about the fact that Ron hasn't got time to tell the rest of the office what he's going to talk about at the congress. So they just lay this program format out so that anything can happen, you know? And the APA - I mean the AMA, the American Management Association, adopted this program format about four or five months after our first pro-

gram format and they've still adhered to it. They have their seminars at the same time and it's the same number of days and all of this sort of thing.

And it's no joke that we're at cause on a lot of lines in this society that we're actually unaware of.

We're actually at cause-point also in another line, which is space opera. We're scared to death that they're going to forget space opera, you know, and start having a war here on Earth. We want them to have a war out there and our whole concentration is making them aware of this sort of thing. And we fight a rather continuing little rat-a-tat-tat on the barricades with our machine gun bullets on this particular subject.

And I got a release the other day from General Gavin. And this is another officer who is now quoting our article Fortress in the Sky about the moon and so forth. And this is a release to be given to the papers four, five weeks hence but it's just totally right down the line. And that he and his office mailed it directly to Dr. R. F. Steves is also interesting. It's as close to a credit line as the government would ever give you for anything.

We just try to stay at cause in a mild organizational sort of way where we can. We don't devote too much time to it. It would be an incredible situation if we sat back and never ourselves put out a communication line in these directions because then we would get the total effect of these directions, don't you see? So we have to keep a little line going out and we do so. It's just a line of awareness, not a line of effectiveness or action.

And it's quite amusing, some of the results of this sort of thing. And it's quite amusing what just a letter can do, what a communication line sent out unexpectedly in a certain direction, what havoc it can wreak in the best-laid plans of mice and psychiatrists, to say nothing of men.

Undoubtedly we're a dangerous organization to have around, but the truth of the matter is that it would be very dangerous to us to live in this society without ever communicating with the various parts and centers of the society which influence the rest of society. And so we do so - in our spare time.

Okay. Know anything more about this cycle of sessions you're running?

Audience: Yes.

Okay. If you do pick up any data in the lectures, if you happen to notice anything going by, you have my permission to use it.

Thank you.

[End of lecture.]