

Now, you might accept this idea that fear of being located or dislike of being located or even tremendous desire to be located, such as your exhibitionist (and we've had lots of those since Freud invented them); these factors must contain in them a certain amount of truth if their use on the spirit of man and with his cooperation produces marked changes in his behavior, in his intelligence, in his ability, in his perception and his willingness to be perceived. And if we use these factors and produce marked changes in the ideas, personalities of people, and we better them and make them freer, then I feel that we must be talking somewhere close to truth. It is not necessarily true that we are speaking the truth; we are merely speaking the workability.

Truth is a very interesting thing, since the only way we get any persistence of any kind or any form or any energy or any mass is by changing it. Only if we alter truth do we get persistence. This is fabulous, but very true.

That means some pessimist is going to come along and he's going to think to himself now—he's going to think to himself, "You mean that everything at which I look has a lie in it?" Well, if you want to state it crudely, yes. If a lie can be defined as an alteration of truth, or a departure from the truest true you know, then that's perfectly true. The floor is there because it's a damned lie.

4 JUNE 1955

But one can easily accustom himself to these lies. It's only when the individual becomes hectic and very upset about lies that stuff that is composed of lies goes out of his control.

Nor does this give anyone like Hitler a license to deal only in lies. If he deals only in lies, he'll as-is everything, too. He will bring about a condition of such persistency of lies that he won't have any truth left. You must always have a certain amount of truth left; because it is the alteration of truth which gives us persistence, which gives us survival. We must alter or repostulate truth. And if you alter lies and continue to alter lies, you get something else entirely different because you haven't got the first postulate to be followed by the second. Some truth must always be present, and it is only when no truth is left that we get the bad end of nothing.

- 13 Therefore, the lessons which we learn in processing today in Scientology are very, very interesting lessons. They bridge upon and across some of the greatest philosophic conundrums that have ever been advanced by man. What is justice? What is right? What is wrong? What is good behavior? What is bad behavior? There's many a person going around, the only thing that's wrong with them at all, that they conceive to be wrong with them, is that they can't quite figure out how it all ought to be. They see badness and viciousness and villainy on every side succeeding. They see this consistently. They see injustice, bought courts, they see

perjury and false witnesses being rewarded on every hand. And something in them says that the only thing upon which this whole universe and all of us within it can possibly depend is truth. And truth, somehow, is decency and goodness and charity and mercy and kindness. They see this, and yet all they see rewarded is viciousness. And they get this sort of a conundrum in their heads and they just say, "*Vr-rr-rr-rr-rr!* I don't like it!"

The only thing that's wrong with them is, is they have lost so much of their own basic truth that they are no longer able to combat an untruth. And the only thing you have to do with them is let them recover some of their basic truth; let them see that there is a reward for decency and kindness and justice and mercy and charity; let them see that these things are basic; let them see that communication is not bad, it's good; let them see that decency, honor are extant.

How would you let them see this? Processing. Almost any processing leads in this direction today.

An individual who has had all of his truth perverted has nothing left. Because the only actuality there is, must begin with a certain amount of truth. And then for the actuality to persist, it must be altered. And when we alter the alteration, and then alter that alteration, we then begin to walk through a cobweb of lies which is liable to trap anyone—and has even trapped some of the best thinking minds of the last several thousand years.

4 JUNE 1955

If you don't believe this, read some of the books of the philosophers. Read Plato's dissertation on man. If you've ever read a mad-dog piece of writing, that's one. He had departed far enough from the truth—even Plato—so that he had conceived that man himself was a pretty evil rat.

- 14 Now, processing today depends less upon the alteration of the moral nature of the individual than upon the rehabilitation in the individual of his ability to recognize and to be truth.

Well, what is truth?

If you want to know what truth is for this universe, it's the definition of a static, and, I am afraid, a fairly close path of the fifty-one Axioms in *The Creation of Human Ability*. They work, because they bring an individual closer to truth and much further away from disaster and lies than anything else has brought him. So there must be an interweave of truth in these Axioms, because in their use, one recovers truth.

What is the basic truth?

The basic truth is that an individual can survive without any communication with his fellows. He can. He can persist one way or the other by his own postulates. He can. And he won't have any games—not a one. He won't have any fun—none. But maybe that's all right, too. And that every individual has within himself free choice to go where he wills, do what he would, think what he wants.

DIRECTION OF TRUTH IN PROCESSING

It's by the interruption of that free choice by himself and by his agreements that we get solidities, barriers. And these barriers only become onerous and very bad to have around when the individual has more barriers than he has truth.

And therefore we say to the preclear who can't exteriorize well that we've got to give him some more processing. Why? We've got to change his level of truth, which is to say, we've got to give less stress to these barriers and more stress to the individual. Therefore, when we process a chronic somatic, when we process a body, when we process space, energy and mass, we're changing barriers, and they only persist by being changed. Which leaves us one whole sphere to process, which is much more important than the sphere of barriers, and that whole sphere is the processing of truth itself, which in you, and which is you, a thetan.

And a thetan, thereby and therefore, can be processed infinitely without bringing about a persistence of bad conditions. He can be processed without any liabilities. His problems can be addressed and changed without liability, and the only liability there could possibly be in auditing would be to address barriers, because we would make barriers persist. So therefore, we no longer process barriers of any kind. All we do, perhaps, is to get the individual habituated to the idea that there might possibly be some barriers somewhere, and that he could recognize this fact without dying. And when we've done that, we can go on and process the individual.

4 JUNE 1955

Therefore, we are not in the healing sciences—because there is absolutely nothing wrong of any kind whatsoever with that which we treat, which is the thetan, the spirit of man.

Thank you.



THE TONE SCALE—THREE PRIMARY BUTTONS OF EXTERIORIZATION

A LECTURE GIVEN ON 4 JUNE 1955

62 MINUTES

Okay. Let's get down to business. 2
Now, we've fooled around long enough, that's a fact.

Now, I know you expected me to process you in this hour—I'm not going to. Your seminar leader is doing a very, very good job, and when you get along just a little bit further along the line with your seminar leaders—in pretty good shape—I'm going to run a process on you which erases the chair and the body and the room.

So, in this particular congress, I sort of have to hold back on the processing. I have to hold back on it a little bit. But you'll get it.

Anyhow, the most significant developments in research in Scientology have to do, today, with exteriorization and the isolation of the three primary buttons of exteriorization. All right. All has to do with the Tone Scale.

4 JUNE 1955

There is, and has been in existence for a long time, a thing called the Tone Scale. Has to do with human tone or human emotion. The first rendition of it is found in *Dianetics: Modern Science of Mental Health*, and we have borrowed it from Dianetics. It's the first chart in *Dianetics: Modern Science of Mental Health*. So this thing really has precedence. I mean, it goes way back.

Now, this chart was further developed in *Science of Survival*. And *Science of Survival*, a rather thick book, is devoted entirely to this chart and various levels on it. Now, actually, *Science of Survival* treats of what you would call "thetan plus body"—spirit plus body—and these two combined make a certain combination which is predictable. And *Science of Survival* is devoted to that.

All right. Now, the next development along this line—a similar chart—was the Chart of Attitudes. And another development along this line appeared in *Scientology 8-80*, which is the Subzero Tone Scale, which goes down to -8.0.

Now, here we have—here we have, today, a further development of this Tone Scale. Now, there are some little pads which are available to you here at this congress, which we've had made up, which are plotting pads. They plot the preclear on the Tone Scale. And we have gone out sideways and we've put the Know to Mystery Scale at right angles to the Tone Scale.

THE TONE SCALE—THREE PRIMARY BUTTONS OF EXTERIORIZATION

And you will see that on these little plotted sheets, which you can get here. All right.

These plotted sheets have to do with running cases. We're not interested right now in running cases. What we're interested in is the development of this scale.

First and foremost, we should see this scale as a gradient scale of survival—potentialities of survival. Naturally, when we say survival, we are talking—in an ultimate survival—about immortality. Now, please take a good look at that. You think we're way out of gear on religion or something of this sort—we've been talking about immortality here for years. Now, the immortality would be way up top. It would be a person surviving over an infinite time, knowing who and what he was. 3

Now we drop way downscale and we get the condition which evidently exists on this planet at this time, which is, the individual gets born, he says, "I'm a body." He says, "Now I'm a dead body, now I'm somebody else, now I'm a dead body, now I'm somebody else, now I'm . . ."—he gets confused after a while. And in one of the healing sciences—heh! By the way, I've had to invent that. You know, Korzybski—quite a man, Korzybski; wonderful guy, the late Alfred Korzybski—he had a little symbol: He put quotes. You know, when a word didn't quite mean what it was supposed to mean and you meant to exaggerate its meaning or something of the sort,

4 JUNE 1955

why, you'd put little "quote, unquote." I think he was the sole author of that, I mean, it's gotten into popular ken now. You hear somebody in ordinary conversation say, "Well, I'm pretty (quote) hep (unquote)," so on. Well now, that's a little symbol there. Well, I've had another one which means—which means, "Heh!" And I've been using that as a—similarly to the use of "quote, unquote," you know—"heh!" You say it like that; you say, "psychology—heh!" you know. That means, "I am not seriously uttering this word."

So anyway, here we have this science of—heh!—psychiatry, talking about multivalent personalities. Would you please explain to me how an individual could keep from getting mixed up about who he is if every few years he insists on kicking the bucket and being somebody else? And what a perfect control that individual would have to have of his position on the time track to always know who he was at the time.

So we get all sorts of weird things. We get an individual who is going along fine, and a fellow just told me something here—he said the head of the Mental Health Division went—has taken up house robbing up in New York City. Well, of course! Mental Health—heh!—Division. Now, this fellow has been going along being the judge, being the judge, being the judge, being the judge, being the judge, being the judge, being the judge, and one day, he did just eighteen thousand too many overt acts, you see, and he found himself the victim. Well now, that is a valence shift from win

THE TONE SCALE—THREE PRIMARY BUTTONS OF EXTERIORIZATION

to lose. But where does this fellow get the complete package of being a burglar? Out of the fellows he's been talking to?

Now there is the primary error that has been made. We say we go into Father's valence. We say we go into Mother's valence. And these valences are all very well, but how do they become so expertly, completely packaged so that a person knows far more about how to be Father and how to be Mother and how to be a house burglar or a Mental Health—heh!—Division Chief than he would ever know in standing and talking to one? Here you stand, you've talked to your father—you just know that it's impossible probably to understand your father, or maybe you understand him too well. But you talk to him a long time—how do you pick up every single quirk this individual has? Or are you picking up every single quirk he has, or are you simply skidding on the track into a whole packaged identity you have which matched Father's identity? Which is it? Possibly could be any of it. That's an interesting thought, isn't it? That you have the ability to reassume any identity which you have already had. And that you can assume any identity which you have had again, if it is restimulated by the presence of a similar identity.

Did you ever know somebody, every time he talked to a tramp, he became a tramp; every time he talked to a cop he became a cop; every time he talked to anything he became that. But all of a sudden one day he's talking to a housewife and he just can't understand that. Well, he just never 4

4 JUNE 1955

happens to have been one. But he has been a tramp or a judge or a cop or something. So it's a very easy thing. So he has two sources: He has this valence proposition—you know, just a stimulation—restimulation where he just shifts valence, you might say, right out of the engram bank. The safest thing to be when you're in the dentist's chair is the dentist and not yourself, and he can sort of shift valence into the dentist. He can pick up the dentist's bag of tricks one way or the other, but quite something else is *akro* operative. The fellow may have a whole past life as a dentist.

Now, I'm not asking you to accept transmigration of the human soul. I'm merely saying you better had—since man didn't start to go to pieces until he forgot about it.

All right. Here we have an individual, then, playing this cute little game: the glorious irresponsibility of being a baby. “*Da-da, ga-ga*—I don't know anything.” But if you look real quick at a baby, and if you don't pull your punches around the baby with what you're talking about, you'll get response—you'll get response. You can say the darnedest things to babies, which of course they can't understand, because—oh, this is the biggest joke in the world. Back in the old days of Dianetics, why, the medicos used to come around and say, “It's impossible for anybody to remember birth because there's no myelin sheathing on a baby's nerves.” I never found out what this stuff is, but as near as I can figure out, their picture of a baby is a coil of telephone cable. But anyway if the baby can't remember—who's asking him

THE TONE SCALE—THREE PRIMARY BUTTONS OF EXTERIORIZATION

to remember? Nobody asked this body to remember anything, but there's somebody there and there's something there which is doing remembering and it doesn't happen to have any myelin sheathing or need any.

Darnedest thing, my little girl Diana—when she was first born we used to say, “Well I think we're going to keep you.” Just—when she was a baby. She'd say, “*(sigh!)*.” Inevitable result—she didn't sigh in that way unless that was said to her.

Now it's quite remarkable—other thing—you talk to children, around them and so forth, and they apparently are paying no attention. But what's paying no attention? Their body is paying no attention. Well, their body is incapable of paying attention unless something is there saying, “Look” or “Listen.” And the body is going through random motions. That doesn't mean that this person is not listening. This doesn't mean that this person has no capabilities of listening. But this person does have the capability of forgetting. And as life goes on with him, he says, “It's far, far better to be this little boy or this little girl than that old man or that old woman I once was.” And so he says, “Now I've forgotten all that and that's gone.”

When we are investigating phenomena of various kinds, we leave unaccounted for 99 and $\frac{44}{100}$ ^{ths} percent of the mental phenomena known to the human race, if we discount the factor of continuous life-to-life existence and a human spirit. In other words, the finest way in the world to find out nothing about the mind would be to just discount all this parade of

4 JUNE 1955

lives and to discount at the same time the existence of a spirit, and say we're all machines. And in that way, you would happily dispose of practically every possible explanation. And then you could really be in mystery. You could really get lost, then. So that's where they've been getting lost. They disposed of these two factors and we've had mystery ever since. All right.

Everybody knows it's very, very dangerous to fool around with your mind. Everybody knows this. We all agree with this. And I agree with this, too. And I believe this, too. It is very, very dangerous to fool around with a nonexistent something. It is only safe to fool around with those things which do exist—namely, a tetan. That is fairly safe. But if you fool around with nonexistences such as the think—this is a nonexistence—the thinkingness of his myelin sheathing.

5 You know, the electronic-brain boys are great boys. I like them—they're practical. One of them wrote a book the other day—I know this fellow—he wrote a book on the subject of communication. And I read the first pages, and—how can anybody write this uncommunicably about communication? What was communication to this electronic-brain boy? What was communication? It was the impedance in an electric circuit—the amount of resistance in the circuit was communication—all done with calculus incorrectly used where another mathematics would have served

THE TONE SCALE—THREE PRIMARY BUTTONS OF EXTERIORIZATION

much better. It was the most horribly botched job I ever saw in my life! How could he stand to do this?

Now, there's a psychiatrist that did write a pretty good book on communication. It's down in the library. It's not a bad book at all on communication. It's kind of tangled up, he can't solve anything with it, but it's about communication. And it's a pretty good book for a psychiatrist. That's a pretty stinking compliment, isn't it? I have to be honest. I would be very happy to grant the man a lot of beingness, and he says it's a great book on communication. But it *would* be a great book on communication if it put everybody into better communication, that'd be a good book—it's not.

All right. The electronic-brain boy completely omits this interesting factor—he completely omits it. And that is that his beautiful machine with its coffee-grinder handles and its big slots and its mechanical banks and its feeders and its thousands and thousands and thousands of tubes and transistors and resistors has to have somebody there to tell it what its goals are! And its goals had to be built into it by somebody. And somebody has to receive the answer. There is no single part in an electronic brain which, after the little card or tape falls out, says, "Ah!" So when we take out this little element that says "Ah!" what have we got? We've got some wheels that go round and round without any meaning at all. And we get the most senior characteristic of life—the ability to put meaning into and take

4 JUNE 1955

meaning from other life units, life-forms, spaces, energies, objects and time. And that is the best thing in living that it does. Of course, there is something *else* that it does up above that, and that's it makes postulates. Makes a postulate (*snap*) and makes them (*snap*) stick or unstick.

But this is not a third dynamic operation, this making of postulates—not necessarily at all. Here we have the business of living, the game called life. And this game called life has as its highest manifestation, a manifestation higher than logic. It's an interesting thing, but we have gone above logic today with Scientology and so we have exceeded its definition as a science. You'll see what happens when we run Meaningness Processing—what happens to your logic. That's wonderful. Putting meaning into and taking meaning out of things, objects, spaces, people, situations, times, energies, masses—the most senior thing it does.

6 Actually, one of the total battles of life is the battle of who is going to put meaning into it. It's the only reason these judges sit on benches. They've got to be the one who puts meaning into it.

The only way you can learn anything from life is be willing to have somebody else give some meaning, too. Now this ascends—transcends the granting of beingness. So we're really getting there. This is a process which leads further and does more, by far, than the granting of beingness, and exceeds logic—so we must be getting somewhere in Scientology.

THE TONE SCALE—THREE PRIMARY BUTTONS OF EXTERIORIZATION

Now, that is the high tide of current research and investigation—the discovery of those principles and facts and their uses in processing. It's all a nicely done job right now.

But what's this have to do with the Tone Scale? Has a great deal to do with the Tone Scale. We always knew that there was some level on the Tone Scale which would exceed logic; because logic is an agreed-upon pattern of thought which follows—bing, bing, bing—by gradient scale from one subject to another subject and brings about an association amongst meaningfulnesses. And that's logic.

Therefore, we would believe that as we ran up the Tone Scale and got up toward 40.0 on the Tone Scale, we would get out of this associative trick. And we have done so. Meaningness breaks down this associative trick and makes a person capable of associating or not associating at his will, knowingness and command.

And so Book One had some rightness about it—had some rightness about it. The Tone Scale did have a point where differentiation was much, much higher and more workable than association. So we have gone much higher than we have gone before. There is a point, then, on the Tone Scale of independent existence which isn't simply the postulate—that's way up: You simply make a postulate and something occurs; you make another postulate and it unoccurs. That's an unimaginably high level; it's almost ungraspable by the routine preclar. But this Meaningness Processing is not,

4 JUNE 1955

and it lies below that level. So we're building a bridge on this up to that high level of make (*snaf*) (*snaf*) a postulate, unmake it, and so forth, and part of that postulate scheme as it winds up there, falls down into meaningness. Now we've got this lower level.

Now let's go down a little lower on the Tone Scale, let's describe this thing a little bit better. We've got this terrifically imaginative, high-flown level of Serenity where the individual, exteriorized in no universe, simply says, "Let there be light" and *bang!* there's light. "I want it dark"—*bang!* there's darkness, as something else than he had before, see. He's all set now, see, he can go on and make a universe. But that's awfully high. That is such a high principle that man has assigned that attribute only to God.

All right. Let's come downscale and get amongst us—heh!—amongst us, Theta Exteriors. And what have we got? First level down from the top is meaningness. You got an object, what's it mean? It's what it says it means; it's what you say it means; you're what it says you mean—any way you want to play it. And then we go down and we get an agreed-upon set of meaningnesses, and we get logic. And there is our first level of thinking as we know thinking.

7 Now, thinking is an agreed-upon association of ideas—an agreed-upon associating of ideas leading along certain gradient scales to the production

THE TONE SCALE—THREE PRIMARY BUTTONS OF EXTERIORIZATION

of certain answers and conclusions. In other words, it's a slow way to make a postulate. And it's a good way to justify having made one.

But we come down below that and we come down below logic and we get into another interesting process. And that process is covered quite adequately in *Dianetics 1955!*—that process is simply communication. Whether it's "hellos and okays" or "That's the way it is" or anything of the sort, communication lies below logic. Actually has no dependency on logic, but nevertheless lies *above* any level of energy, space, mass. So look at all the levels we have now above universes. Communication is above universes—because it destroys them, so therefore it must be senior to them. It makes them or breaks them, so it must be senior to universes.

If you just have a fellow—say he's got a bad leg. Now we know that if we move masses around and try to combine with operations and steel tubes and other medical remedies this bad leg, we know we're going to get a persistence of the condition. We conceive this to be fairly inevitable. But if we have this fellow sit there and have his leg say hello to him and he says hello to his leg—just this kind of a drill; nothing fancier than that—he will experience changes in the legs which does not carry with it any great responsibility of change, you see. The leg will change. Something will happen to the masses of that leg. That's a cinch. So we're above the level of the behavior of masses, spaces and energies if we have thought alone handling them.

4 JUNE 1955

Now, any religious leader in any time would have given away his finest mountain, his very best cassock (or hassock or whatever they wear), if he could have demonstrated that thought was senior to masses and wealth and swords and matter. Now, he knew this instinctively. He'd see these armies clashing with armies and these populaces struggling, these palaces building, and he could become philosophic about it. And he knew there was something that was superior to all this. But all he did was say, "It is superior. The spirit, the concerns of the spirit, are superior." And when he'd gone completely into apathy, he then began to say, "The mind has something to do with it." He no longer dared quite say, "It is a spiritual manifestation." He said, "It's some kind of a mechanical gimmick that works this out"—and we got the first psychologist. He said, "The mind is a pretty mighty thing." See, that's way downscale.

Let's look at this other, though. Supposing this person wishing to demonstrate this, had at his command just one function that a spirit could perform—just one—and by its performance could demonstrate that all masses, spaces and objects were apparently, at least, junior to thought; because thought could be seen to erase them, eradicate them, change them, alter their persistence and characteristics. And we, today, have that in Scientology. And we have it in communication.

8 Let me tell you something that happened. A fellow came in—he wanted to make a big bargain with the HASI. He wanted to make a big

THE TONE SCALE—THREE PRIMARY BUTTONS OF EXTERIORIZATION

bargain. He wanted, I don't know, eight or nine thousand hours of processing or something, and pay us at the end of the time if he could see any visible results. Well, I'd looked at this sort of thing before and I told one of the boys to go ahead—give him twenty-five hours and kiss him goodbye, because he obviously is going to swindle us one way or the other.

The fellow was incapable in processing, by the way, of thinking an independent thought. He couldn't think a thought. You would say, "Think a thought" and that'd be the end of him. He was rough—rough shape. But he had two eyes which were both blue with cataracts, and one of which, the left, had no vision in it at all. So we just set him up on the research line—poor auditor. I said to the auditor, "Dick, I want you to give 'hellos' and okays' to that eye for twenty-five hours. And only the left eye, Dick, not the right."

This was no intention whatsoever to alter the person's spiritual outlook or beingness. The sole and entire intention was simply to demonstrate, one way or the other—not to the fellow, but to the Research Department—that communication was senior to any healing or masses or spaces or considerations of any kind. This fellow couldn't even put up a tough enough consideration to bar this from happening. It was his service facsimile. He didn't want to lose that any more than he wanted to lose his wife and farm and town. He needed those cataracts and that blind eye, he knew that—he was convincing somebody of something. And an auditor sits

4 JUNE 1955

there calmly and dispassionately without anything else for twenty-five hours and has hellos and okays going between himself and that eye, and at the end of twenty-five hours the man could see with that eye and it had no cataract. But the right eye still had its cataract complete. Black magic—or a higher level of religious performance than man has been accustomed to.

Now, of course, if Dick had been hotter than he is, undoubtedly Dick would simply have had to have said, “Alaikum salaam, presto cataract gone-o,” and the guy would have gotten immediate change and consideration on the Cadillac and the preclear would have drove off in a hayrick, stone stark staring mad. This you could have been fairly certain of—this would have been such a shock. Well, Dick didn’t do that. He merely took the cataract out of the man’s eye.

By the way, the preclear had not been changed. We had changed him physically but he had not been changed spiritually to any degree whatsoever. He came in at the end of the week and he says, “Well, I want more processing. My wife, who was violently opposed to Scientology last week, having watched this, insists that I get more processing now. And I want more processing. And I want processing until I can see some visible result.” His wife, his auditor, everybody at the Guidance Center, the Registrar, and so forth, all witness to the fact that this has really changed, you know, and he said, “I have no visible result. I can see my hand now in front of my face with this eye and I have no visible results if processing is

THE TONE SCALE—THREE PRIMARY BUTTONS OF EXTERIORIZATION

doing me any good whatsoever.” No. He was talking exactly the same way as he was talking the first day he walked in—really mixed up, incapable of receiving a proof or observing a fact or noting any change of any kind. So nothing had changed about the person, we had simply changed an eye.

What’s startling about this? It’s startling in that it isn’t being done every day. That’s what makes things startling. And it’s our goal and mission to make it much less startling in the very near future.

Now, our business is not medicine. That’s a fairly low level of operation that has to do with patch-up, rehabilitation. And here we have, however, something far more important: We can demonstrate today that thought, and an action of thought, is senior to matter. That little experiment is just one of many.

We can upset a preclear considerably by making the walls disappear for him, just by using communication. If you were to set a preclear down and have him simply have the walls say hello and he says okay, and then he says hello and the wall says okay, and you keep this up back and forth, various things will happen to his case, this is certain. But after a while, something—he’s going to get into a level where something is going to start happening to that wall. If he’s in horrible shape, maybe it’d take seventy-five or a hundred hours of such an exercise to finally bring him up to a point

4 JUNE 1955

where something started to happen to the wall. But something is going to happen to the wall.

I well recall a DScn in Phoenix. He's very, very good—exterior—and he was doing a very nice job of auditing around, and so on. And I showed him how to as-is a molecule. And, you know, you get exactly—you make an exact duplicate of it at the place with the material and with the consideration with which it was made. And we made an exact duplicate of a molecule and the molecule goes *plffsst!* All right. I said, "Now let's take a corner of that brick. Now make an exact duplicate of every molecule, atom or electron or proton that you find there. Make an exact duplicate."

Being exterior, he goes over, you know . . . "Hey!" There was a chip gone out of the top corner of the brick. Now if we'd kept it up . . .

It's a very interesting thing, that the old—a very interesting thing, the old, old story of the line of mice, you know—or cockroaches or whatever it is in the fairy tale—that go into the silo and each one carries out a grain of wheat. I suppose that would be one way to get the job of making this universe vanish—if that was one's job—come about. You know, just sort of chip away, atom by atom, molecule by molecule. I suppose something would happen eventually.

But the point is, Mahomet (and that is not Mohammed, by the way, that's another one) didn't come to the mountain or go to the mountain or

THE TONE SCALE—THREE PRIMARY BUTTONS OF EXTERIORIZATION

anything of the sort—the religious leader didn't—but there was another fellow, a monk, who couldn't make the mountain move. And we hope to get good enough one of these days so that he could have used this. You see, you just as-is it where it is, *pshevv!*—which is no mountain—and mock it up where you are. It's actually in the tradition of religion that these things can occur. And in Scientology, we're moving forward with very solid technologies (not mysteries) that demonstrate their occurrence, which is a fantastic thing. All right.

Now let's take something much more important and much more factual on this Tone Scale. We have come down to a point which is senior to spaces, energies and masses. We have two specific, highly workable processes which are above these levels. One of them is communication, just as such. And the other one is Meaningness Processing. And we all know about postulates—so there's actually three processes above any level where we have anything like a universe.

But when we come down and get into masses, spaces, energies, time, and so forth, we drop lower on—lower on the Tone Scale to the degree that we get into more masses, more energies, more spaces and more time. And we get a foreverness at the bottom of the Tone Scale, which is an interesting thing—that is *not* suddenly appeared. That is a foreverness, that mass which you see. It's a foreverness persisting. The trick is, it has *no* time in it. It doesn't have time in it, and so of course it persists.

4 JUNE 1955

10 You have time to the degree that you postulate it. And if you depend on this stuff to give you the time, you will very shortly have no time at all. Because it has no time and you will have duplicated it. And thus we get the fellow rushing around in circles saying he has no time to do anything, he has no time to play, he has no time to work, he has no time, no time, no time, no time. We'll find out this fellow is very MESTY, he's very solid with regard to existence. He's duplicating the physical universe with no time. If we just have him make some time for a while, he'll come out of this.

We say, "All right, invent some time." Or "Make some time. And make some time. Make some time. Make some more time. Make some more time." He's liable to comm lag on it by the hour before he finally gets down to a point to where he understands your question. But then he (*snap*) starts (*snap*) postulating (*snap*) time (*snap*), you see. And as soon as he starts postulating time, he then has time, and starts coming up Tone Scale.

But one of the characteristics of the Tone Scale is that as you go downscale, less and less time is postulated and more and more time is apparent. See? We're getting away from the postulate, and at the exact bottom of the scale, on a level of unimaginable depth, there wouldn't even be a universe there anymore because people wouldn't have the sensibility sufficient to perceive it. And we've noticed that fairly well upscale before we get to that, a thetan stops perceiving the universe. He stops perceiving it because he stops putting it there. When he no longer puts it there, he can't

THE TONE SCALE—THREE PRIMARY BUTTONS OF EXTERIORIZATION

perceive it. And you get somebody three feet back of his head and he doesn't see any walls and he can't find his body and he doesn't know what it's all about and he's confused or he sees it all as blackness or shooting stars or something. There's nothing in the world wrong with him except he's just stopped putting the universe there. And of course it's not there unless he puts it there. There's no time there unless he puts it there. Time is a created thing. The manifestations of life are created by the thetan, they're not found by him.

And as soon as we recognize this clearly, we begin to make wonderful progress. But more important, we begin to understand this thing called the Tone Scale. And the Tone Scale could be called "from the level of the postulate to the foreverness of lifelessness, a progress into space, energy, time and matter." The Tone Scale is a deeper and deeper progress into MEST. But the funny part of it is, when you hit the bottom, all MEST ceases. You can go out the bottom of the scale; you can go out the top of it. But these fellows who try to go out the bottom of it and take a body with them are rarely successful. Because the body won't go down that low.

Now let's take the next characteristic of this scale. The scale is a very wide scale for the thetan—the spirit. It goes from Lord knows what minus point to goodness knows what tremendous height. We could only guess at these things in terms of that and then set them down in MEST, because there's not enough MEST to set them down in. Because he goes down to a

4 JUNE 1955

level where there isn't any, and he goes up to a point of where he can create it. All right. Then if we're talking about a spirit with this enormous band, we must be talking, really, about two sections of the same Tone Scale: we're talking about the body's position on the scale and the spirit's position on the scale. And we've got this *tremendous* scale where we have to do with the thetan; we've got this little tiny scale where it has to do with the body. And we demark on this Tone Scale the numbers 0.0 to 4.0 to more or less denote the boundaries of the body.

Now, the body is very well boundaried. It goes down in the earth a few miles or up into the air a few miles and it no longer exists. It gets a few degrees too hot or a few degrees too cold and it can no longer exist. It gets a little bit too much or a little bit too little oxygen and it no longer exists. Very fragile thing. Feed it too much or you feed it too little, you give it one one-millionth of an ounce of the latest psychiatric—huh!—cure; one one-millionth of an ounce of a drug that we investigated many, many years ago called LSD, which is the new psychiatric cure: It makes everybody a schizophrenic. That's right. And it was just advised that everybody should use this now. No curative value known. But it does—when you give it to nurses in mental hospitals, it does give them a better insight into the patient. Talk about descent into MEST!

Anyway, the boundaries of the body are narrow. The body can command an awful lot of interest because it can be in so much peril. Turn

THE TONE SCALE—THREE PRIMARY BUTTONS OF EXTERIORIZATION

on the gas for a couple of minutes in the house—body doesn't like it. You could be in a room *as* a spirit—a room totally filled with phosgene gas—and say, “(sniff-sniff) Phosgene gas.”

So we're looking, when we look at the body, at this fragility—great fragility. And Body Death is at 0.0 on this Tone Scale, and about the highest point the body reaches is maybe 5.0 in the extreme. Here's this tiny little scale. This huge Tone Scale and this tiny little scale.

The big advance about the Tone Scale—quite in addition to being able **11** to demonstrate its positions on the upper scale—occurred, however, in the Subzero Tone Scale, not in the body scale. The big advance has been between -8.0 and 0.0.

Now, there are some fill-ins which are still accurate which occur on the minus zero scale of *Scientology 8-80*. That minus scale is still valid. But these new ones are so startling and so powerful and so much the key to exteriorization that it was necessary to crowd out the others—such as Approval from Bodies, and so forth, on the old Subzero Scale—and just put these new ones in. You'll see that on your plotting sheets.

Now, what are these buttons on the minus zero Tone Scale? A spirit obviously can go lower downscale than Body Death. That's very obvious. Body dies, spirit might even stay in it but he'd still be alive, and then will exteriorize. But he's at a lower level than the body. He can see less well

4 JUNE 1955

than the body. He can do all sorts of things less well than the body. And so he gets onto the minus scale. So Body Death is that high level of 0.0, and a thetan can go on down to -8.0 .

Well now, let's progress upward from -8.0 , which is about as far south as you're going to find the thetan. Now he can get further south, but you're not going to find him. And that at -8.0 is Hide.

And just above Hide is Protect. Now, those are two old buttons, but they're quite important. How far south can you go? Hide. And when you come just a little bit north from that, you start to protect. That's as a thetan.

Now, when you get just a little bit above Protect, you get Own. Ownership. And there's where Ownership belongs. We're not up to Body Death yet. We get Ownership. And we go just a bit above Ownership and we get Responsibility—the idea of being responsible for. And we go just a little bit above Responsibility and we get Control. And we go just a little bit above Control and we get Body Death on this scale.

What's important about this? It's just this: that Ownership, Responsibility and the Start, Stop and Change of Control (see, control is start, stop and change)—just this—that Ownership, Responsibility and Control are the three buttons which are most pertinent to exteriorization. And these have been isolated.

THE TONE SCALE—THREE PRIMARY BUTTONS OF EXTERIORIZATION

And so if you can get a person upscale to a point where he can work with these buttons, it is a great certainty that you will exteriorize him one way or the other. In other words, a person is held down—a person is held down in a body by Hiding, Protection, Ownership, Responsibility, Control, then a little bit higher than that, Body Death.

Now, the only method of exteriorization known (as I will talk about later) to man at this time—or a little earlier (he doesn't know about it now—see, he doesn't know about exteriorization, but a little bit earlier he knew about it) and that was death.

How do you exteriorize? Well, you die, of course. And then you'll get out of the body. Simple. Boy, if that doesn't look like about the weakest line of self-determinism I ever heard of! You mean you've got to kill this object called a body in order to get out of it? Well, what are you doing in it? How'd you get into that kind of a condition?

And yet do you know, actually, that there are people walking the streets today that do not know they are in a body? They believe they *are* a body. Now that's the darnedest thing! And there are a lot of other people walking the streets today who are *in* a body. Can you imagine anybody getting into a body? Why would you get into a body? Well, it's all very well for you to say, "Well, the body grabbed me and pulled me in." But it seems to be a remarkable place to get yourself parked. You know, you'd have to think a long time to think of that. There are all kinds of places where you

4 JUNE 1955

could get stuck—much more interesting, I'm sure. And you could also get in—stuck in other people's bodies, as far as that's concerned. But to be parked in the middle of a body or in its head or its left ear or two inches in front of its eyes or something like this, and stuck there, is one of the more remarkable things that could happen to a spirit. It is singular. It is remarkable. It takes a great deal of hard, earnest, honest doing to get stuck in a body.

- 12 Well, the process which an individual uses to get stuck in a body is to get all mixed up with control with energy. You know, let's start energy by pushing and pulling energy; and let's get everything stopped or changed by changing its mass. In other words, it's almost a complete desertion of the use of a postulate in handling energy. In other words, that is *control*: handling start, stop, change with energy.

When an individual starts doing this—he starts making his legs move by himself mocking up a moving beam of energy—he's the most remarkable-looking puppet you ever saw in your life. He's all strung up with wires and crossbars, all kinds of clanky systems. All he has to do is say, "The body will now walk," and it'll walk. But instead of that, he gets all these systems rigged up so that he can start, stop and change this body. Well now, that's one of the primary reasons he gets stuck in one: He starts changing everything so he persists in every position he occupies. *Drrrr!* He walks down the street. How many—assuming that positions are one foot

THE TONE SCALE—THREE PRIMARY BUTTONS OF EXTERIORIZATION

apart, how many positions does he pass through in walking one block? Three hundred. If he's moving the body down the street, see, with energy, he's now stuck in three hundred places. Each position is persisting. Fantastic. How can anybody get in this much trouble? Well, maybe they think it's fun.

All right. Now let's go down one step lower and let him conceive of responsibility. That he is responsible for an action, which he means "to blame for an action," which infers there is something wrong with the action which has occurred. We get an action and he says, "Oh," he says, "I'm responsible for that." Means there must have been something wrong with this action, you see. He is the person who has been selected out as the cause of all the wrongness of the action, and that's what we really mean by that level of responsibility.

By the way, did you ever know any people like this: All the wrong actions that occurred in their vicinity, *you* did; and all the right actions, *they* did. Well, a person begins to assume that he is responsible across the boards for all of the wrong actions, and that sticks him.

Then he thinks that he owns it. He owns the body or he owns this or he owns that or he owns somebody else's postulates—they're his—and he gets his ownership mixed up and we practically have finished him right there at that point. He's really stuck. Now he's stuck. And unless he undoes some of this remarkable mental gymnastic and changes his mind about it

4 JUNE 1955

slightly, he'll go right on being stuck, stupid, a machine. And he will be liable to all of the things to which a machine is liable. He'll be liable to illness, to destruction, to misplaced nuts and bolts and lack of oiling. He will have to seek out the medicos, the electric-shock machines, if anything happens to him. He reminds you of the Tin Woodman from Oz, going around trying to find an oilcan. He behaves like this, and he also behaves without moral value or consideration for his fellows, or good communication with them—which is about all you need to say about his conduct.

- 13 Now, this Tone Scale then, just to give it a rapid pass, has come from the narrow band which was occupied—well, first and foremost there was that theoretical scale in *Dianetics: The Modern Science of Mental Health*. And then there was the small band as expanded in *Science of Survival* about this Body Death to Enthusiasm and the Emotional Scale. Now that Tone Scale, covered in *Science of Survival*, was all that we used in Dianetics.

But now today we are using a very wide Tone Scale which goes from minus zero clear on up to Serenity. And with good auditing and a good understanding of the subject, we apparently have the majority of the buttons on it and can use them beneficially. The key buttons that were missing, and their proper position, were Ownership, Responsibility and Control, and they belonged on the minus zero scale.

THE TONE SCALE—THREE PRIMARY BUTTONS OF EXTERIORIZATION

Along with these came a whole bunch of processes—interesting processes. Consequence Processing: “What would happen if you hid? What would happen if you didn’t hide? What would happen if you owned something? What would happen if you controlled something?” Just ask that over and over of a preclear.

Give you an example of this type of processing—another slight type of process—not “what would happen,” but “how would you?” Asking the modus operandi: “How would you go about controlling somebody else?” I asked this of a medico who was a good friend of mine. I asked this of him, and we worked for an hour and a half and we just beat this question to pieces. I just asked him this over and over: “How would you go about controlling somebody?” And this fellow told me: drugs, poison, anesthetics, drugs, hypnotism, voodoo, distant control of his mental faculties, drugs, surgery (yeah, surgery was pretty good), poison, anesthetics, voodoo, hypnotism. He never came off of it. The process was too high for the preclear. He never flattened the comm lag on it. I had to undercut it and go down to: “How would you hide something?” And this (*snap*)—he was right there. Hide—he could get that; people hid things from him all the time.

Having the Tone Scale, we could predict where the individual would have a reality. And so we again use the reality factor. Always process the preclear at the preclear’s level of reality and advance upward from that point. You have to find his level of reality in order to process him. The 14

4 JUNE 1955

Tone Scale tells you that you will find his level of reality one point below his level of confusion. Ha, isn't that cute?

So if you find what he is doing obsessively and unknowingly, obviously and stuckedly, just drop a point and he can process at that point. In other words, this medico was controlling—he was obsessively, continually control, control, control—with these very things he told me were the methods of control. But there was no cognition, there was no thought connected with it at all. He was just going through an endless drill. These things weren't real to him. He'd put somebody on the operating table and cut his throat and it wasn't real, the blood wasn't real, nothing was real. That wasn't his level of reality. So I said, "Well, this is pretty tough, so I'm not going to drop just one level, I'm going to drop three." Dropped four, and he got it. There was his level of reality.

The Tone Scale is basically composed of affinity, communication and reality. The factors of reality and communication are today very, very well understood. There is more that could be understood about affinity, but I'm not rushing things.

Now, the Six Basic Processes and the use of this scale are knocking people out of their heads. In other words, exteriorizing them, giving them greater freedom.

THE TONE SCALE—THREE PRIMARY BUTTONS OF EXTERIORIZATION

What exteriorization is—by the way, that's one of the best little auditing tricks you ever ran into: You just ask a person for hours, "Well, what is exteriorization?" If he's not completely batty, why, after you've asked him this a lot of times, for hours, and gotten his answers and given him acknowledgment, and so forth, on the thing, he'll tell you, "I'm back of my head." Interesting.

If you even go at him accusatively and you say, "What are you doing in that body?"

And he says, "I don't know that I'm in a body."

"Yeah, I know, but what are you doing in that body?"

And he says, "Well, I don't know that I'm in a body. What do you mean? I'm a body."

You say, "Well okay, what are you doing in the body?" And you just talk to him like this—just question, question, question. "What are you doing in that body?" That's much rougher.

It's much easier to sit there and ask him, "What is exteriorization? All right, that's good. Fine. Thank you. What is exteriorization? Now, what is exteriorization?"

And the fellow is back here saying, "Well, exteriorization is some silly thetan that's gotten into a head and thinks he can control it by operating

4 JUNE 1955

wires or something, and that's . . . that's . . . that's *interiorization*. And exteriorization is not doing that, like I'm doing now, I'm back here, back of the body, and . . .”

So we've got exteriorization pretty well licked. And we also know where this affinity, reality, communication triangle stacks. We know that we have to process the preclear at his reality. And we know that communication is the solvent for anything. And we know that affinity is a lot of fun.

Thank you.



GROUP PROCESSING: MEANINGNESS

A GROUP PROCESSING SESSION GIVEN ON
4 JUNE 1955
54 MINUTES

Well, along about this time in the 2
afternoon is a very, very poor time to process anyone. But I wanted to show
you—I wanted to give you a little demonstration of how to run a preclear in
case nothing was working on him.

Now the basic, the fundamental, that we work on in such a regard, is
find the reality of the preclear. Well, that's pretty hard to do. So the next *best*
thing, as in a group session, the next *best* thing would simply be: Let the
preclear find out an auditing session is going on—that you're there, he's
there and that auditing is being done.

Now you see that as a possible modus operandi? Hm? Well, that
sounds like an awfully good place to start, isn't it? Hm? How about it?

Where are you?

4 JUNE 1955

Audience: Here.

All right. Let's locate something in the room.

Audience: Okay.

Good. Good. Let's locate something else.

Audience: Okay.

Well, fine. Let's locate something else.

Audience: Okay.

All right. Let's locate something else.

Audience: Okay.

All right. Let's locate something else.

Audience: Okay.

All right. Locate something else.

Audience: Okay.

Good. Locate something else.

Audience: Okay.

All right. Locate something else.

Audience: Okay.

Okay. Locate something else.

Audience: Okay.

All right. Locate something else.

Audience: Okay.

All right. Let's locate something else.

Audience: Okay.

Fine. Let's locate something else.

Audience: Okay.

All right. Let's locate something else.

Audience: Okay.

Good. Let's locate something else.

Audience: Okay.

All right. Let's locate something else.

Audience: Okay.

Well, fine. Let's locate something else.

Audience: Okay.

Good. Did you?

Audience: Yes.

Well, all right. Let's locate something else.

Audience: Okay.

All right. Let's locate something else.

Audience: Okay.

Good. Let's locate something else.

Audience: Okay.

Fine. Let's locate something else.

Audience: Okay.

Good. Let's locate somebody.

4 JUNE 1955

Audience: Okay.

All right. Let's locate somebody else.

Audience: Okay.

All right. Now let's locate somebody else.

Audience: Okay.

All right. Now, did you?

Audience: Yes.

All right. Now let's locate somebody else.

Audience: Okay.

Okay. Let's locate somebody else.

Audience: Okay.

Fine. Let's locate somebody else.

Audience: Okay.

Well, okay. Let's locate somebody else.

Audience: Okay.

All right. Let's locate somebody else.

Audience: Okay.

All right. Let's locate somebody else.

Audience: Okay.

All right. Now let's locate somebody.

Audience: Okay.

Did you?

Audience: Yes.

Well, all right. Let's locate somebody.

Audience: Okay.

Well, okay. Let's locate somebody now.

Audience: Okay.

Good. Let's locate somebody.

Audience: Okay.

Good. Let's locate somebody.

Audience: Okay.

Well, fine. Let's locate somebody.

Audience: Okay.

Fine. Now let's locate the auditor.

Audience: Okay.

All right. Let's locate the auditor.

Audience: Okay.

All right. Let's locate the auditor.

Audience: Okay.

All right. Now let's locate the preclear.

Audience: Okay.

All right. Let's locate the auditor.

Audience: Okay.

Well, good. Let's locate the preclear.

4 JUNE 1955

Audience: Okay.

Good. Let's locate the auditor.

Audience: Okay.

All right. Let's locate the preclear.

Audience: Okay.

All right. Locate the auditor.

Audience: Okay.

All right. Locate the preclear.

Audience: Okay.

All right. Locate the auditor.

Audience: Okay.

All right. Did you?

Audience: Yes.

Well, fine. Now let's locate the preclear.

Audience: Okay.

All right. Let's locate the auditor.

Audience: Okay.

All right. Let's locate the session.

Audience: Okay.

All right. Let's locate the session.

Audience: Okay.

All right. Let's locate the session.

Audience: Okay.

All right. Let's locate the auditor.

Audience: Okay.

All right. Let's locate the preclear.

Audience: Okay.

All right. Let's locate the auditor.

Audience: Okay.

All right. Let's locate the preclear.

Audience: Okay.

Good. Let's locate the auditor.

Audience: Okay.

All right. Let's locate the preclear.

Audience: Okay.

Good. Let's locate the auditor.

Audience: Okay.

All right. Let's locate the preclear.

Audience: Okay.

All right. Let's locate the auditor.

Audience: Okay.

All right. Let's locate the session.

Audience: Okay.

All right. Let's locate the session.

4 JUNE 1955

Audience: Okay.

All right. Let's locate the auditing command.

Audience: Okay.

Good. Let's locate the auditing command.

Audience: Okay.

Well, good. Let's locate the auditing command.

Audience: Okay.

Well, fine. Let's locate the auditing command.

Audience: Okay.

Well, good. Let's locate the auditing command.

Audience: Okay.

All right. Let's locate the auditor.

Audience: Okay.

All right. Locate the auditing session.

Audience: Okay.

All right. Let's locate the preclear.

Audience: Okay.

All right. Now we're going to go into a much, much worse process. Now that we know an auditing session is in progress, I'm going to ask you now a question which I'm going to expect you will answer to yourself and answer, possibly, several times over before the next question. One of those confusing things that put you right out of present time.

Now if anybody starts to scream, please don't get upset. Emergency Auditors are present, the city is full of hospitals, and so forth.

And it's somebody else's responsibility anyway if some *body* starts going out of control because we have to do with the spirit, not the body. So . . .

All right, now. Now that we know what to expect—now we know what to expect. 3

What would happen if you were located?

Well, good. Give me some more things that would happen if you were located.

Fine. Let's just check off some things that would happen, now, if you were located.

Good. Good. That's fine. Now let's check off some more things that would happen if you were located. If you haven't gotten one yet, get it.

Okay. That's fine. That's fine. Now you know. All right.

Now—now, what would happen if you weren't located?

Good. Now what would happen if you weren't located? Give me some things that would happen if you weren't located.

Good. Good. Now give me some more things that would happen if you were not located.

Good. You got some now? Got some good things there? Fine. All right. Good.

4 JUNE 1955

Now tell me some things that would happen if you were located. Give me some things that would happen if you *were* located.

All right. That's fine. Some more things that would happen if you were located.

Well, that's fine. Now, that's just fine.

Now give me some things that would happen if you were *not* located.

Good. And some more things that would happen if you were not located.

Good. Some more things that would happen if you were not located.

All right. That's real good. That's real good. That's fine. That's fine.

Now what would happen to you if you were located?

Good.

Some more things that would happen to you if you were located.

All right. Now, fine. How's that now? Huh?

Audience: Okay.

Is that working all right?

Audience: Yes.

That working all right? Hm?

Audience: Yes.

Okay. You sure it's working all right? There isn't anybody collapsed.
All right.

Now I want you to have the front wall—attend now—I want you to have the front wall say to you, “We’ve got you spotted.” And you tell it okay.

Got that real good? Did you tell it okay?

Audience: Yes.

Well, fine. Now let’s have the back wall say, “We’ve got you spotted.” Give it an okay.

All right. Now let’s have the right-hand wall say, “We’ve got you spotted”—looking right at you.

Give it an okay.

And the left wall say, “We’ve got you spotted” and give it an okay. Process is known as “Dragnet.”

Now let’s have the floor say, “We’ve got you spotted,” and you say okay.

And the ceiling say, “We’ve got you spotted,” and you say okay.

Good. And the front of the room say, “We’ve got you spotted.” Have it look right straight at you and say, “We’ve got you spotted.” And you say okay.

Have it mean it: Stop playing around with that. Have it mean it.

All right. Now have the back of the room say, “We’ve got you spotted.”

And you say okay.

4 JUNE 1955

The right-hand wall say, "We've got you spotted."

And you say okay.

And the left-hand wall say, "We've got you spotted."

And you say okay.

And have the floor say, "We've got you spotted."

And you say okay.

And have the ceiling say, "We've got you spotted."

And you say okay.

All right. Now, have you reached the goldfish effect yet? Hm?

Audience: Yes.

Have you reached the goldfish effect?

Audience: (various responses)

Well, good. Now let's have the front of the room say, "We have you spotted."

And you say okay.

And have the back of the room say, "We've got you spotted."

And you say okay.

Have the right-hand wall say, "We've got you spotted."

And you say okay.

And the left-hand wall say, "We've got you spotted."

And you say okay.

And have the floor say, "We've got you spotted."