SCIENTOLOGY AND DIANETICS

BY

L. RON HUBBARD

Effort And Counter-Effort;

Responsibility; A-R-C

TO THE STEADFAST AND LOYAL SUPPORTERS OF
TOMORROW AND THE THINKING MEN OF YESTERDAY

COMPILED IN WRITTEN FORM BY

D. FOLGERE
AKA RICHARD DE MILLE

COPYRIGHT 1952
BY L. RON HUBBARD

ADDITIONAL STUDY MATERIAL FOR THIS LECTURE MAY BE FOUND IN THE
FOLLOWING BOOKS:

- ADVANCED PROCEDURE AND AXIOMS

- SELF ANALYSIS

- HANDBOOK FOR PRECLEARS

- DIANETICS: MODERN SCIENCE OF MENTAL HEALTH (1950)

- SCIENCE OF SURVIVAL (1951)

- SYMBOLOGICAL PROCESSING

- LECTURES OF L. RON HUBBARD

    PAMPHLET COVERS ONE LECTURE

- COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEMS (HOW TO LIVE THOUGH AN EXECUTIVE)

- INDIVIDUAL TRACK MAP

- WHAT TO AUDIT

EFFORT AND COUNTER-EFFORT;
RESPONSIBILITY; A-R-C

1.   Motion is the common denominator of the physical universe.

2.   Force is a characteristic of motion.

3.   Force with direction is effort. When thought causes a force to be used, thought directs that force, and the action is called "effort".

4.   Evaluation is estimation of effort.

5.   Imagination is used for estimation of efforts for the future.

6.   Worry is the estimation of counter-efforts without the estimation of efforts. It is the lower part of fear. The individual is thinking, "Is he going to hit me on the nose or in the stomach?" instead of, "Am I going to hit him in the stomach or on the nose, in order to prevent him from hitting me?"

7.   The conservative estimates the counter-efforts that are coming at him so that he can estimate the efforts which will be sufficient to balance the counter-efforts, in order to preserve the status quo.

8.   In apathy, the individual records counter-efforts.

9.   In grief, he estimates the effort required to call for help or bewail his fate.

10.   In fear, the upper part of fear, he is estimating counter-efforts in order to estimate the effort necessary to flee from them if they come against him.

11.   At antagonism, he estimates the effort required to send the counter-effort back where it came from destructively.

12. At boredom, he estimates counter-efforts to find out whether any of them will need to be answered with an effort.

13. At 3.5, he estimates the effort required to turn the counter-effort to his advantage, without adding anything to it.

14. At 4.0, he estimates the efforts necessary to use all counter-efforts as part of his own effort in the carrying out of an overall plan. He does not expect any counter-efforts to be unusable.

15. Counter-effort is the effort or force in the environment which counters one's survival.

16. The mind willingly accepts as its own effort, any effort in the environment which assists its survival.

17. Responsibility is accepting motions in the environment as one's own efforts. FULL RESPONSIBILITY is the acceptance of all motion as one's own effort.

    The more responsibility an individual assumes, the better he survives.

18. RESPONSIBILITY is not to be confused with BLAME.

    Responsibility is the assuming of motions as one's own efforts.

    Blame is the shifting of responsibility upon someone else. It is the refusal to accept responsibility.

    If the individual who has been blamed accepts – not the blame – but the responsibility, he thereby becomes blameless. He says, "Yes, I must have let the cow out of the barn when I went in to get the pitchfork…" He does not apologize, he just says, blandly, that he is a CAUSE. The other individual can waste the opportunity to enlist the aid of this

CAUSE in catching the cow; he can recriminate and jump up and down. Or, he can say, "If you will help me, we can catch the cow in about five minutes." He also assumes responsibility for the cow, and the problem becomes, not how to punish the hired man, but how to catch the cow.

If the individual, however, persists in his blaming, in shifting the responsibility to the hired man, the hired man may shift it right back. He may say, "Well, you never told me you were going to put the cow in that side of the barn. It's your fault." If the hired man is using reasonable data, the blamer discovers that the responsibility which he has been trying to get rid of has come back soaked in vinegar.

Blame is created by avoiding responsibility.

There is only one person in the whole universe who can create blame which will stick to John Jones, and that is John Jones himself. He does it by disowning responsibility.

There is only one person who can absolve John Jones from blame which he has thus created, and that, again is John Jones. He does it by assuming responsibility.

19. Blame and responsibility have become confused in our society by the simple mechanism of punishment-drive control.

In a society of self-determined people, no one would be blamed for anything. Everyone would do as much as he could to create survival potentials, and everyone would know that his neighbor was also doing as much as he could.

Only in a society where it is assumed that a man's productivity can be increased by beating him with a whip can failure to produce be followed by blame. A self-determined individual does what he can, and no good can come of shouting at

him for not doing more. An other-determined individual, in-sofar as he is other-determined, does only destructive acts, and shouting at him will only make him less self-determined and more destructive.

20. Since every human being is CAUSE, no human being can make another more responsible than he chooses to be. Any interference with him makes him an EFFECT, and therefore makes him less responsible.

The best way to make sure that nothing can ever be constructively accomplished in the society is to raise all the children to think that others have the right to blame them for doing "wrong". Naturally, people so raised will take every precaution not to do anything at all that is not absolutely necessary.

And then there are the 1.1 people who falsely assume blame for everything in sight. "It's all my fault. You had nothing to do with it. I shouldn't have put them there in the first place. Anyone could have broken them. It's the most natural thing in the world..."

This crafty individual is blaming the other person by taking away his responsibility. Very soon the other person begins to feel "as though he has sneaked out of every responsibility he had ever had. He will begin to develop fears of being found out. He will begin to shift responsibility himself, and then the 1.1 can turn on him and say, "Hey – trying to get out of it, eh? Well, this is the last time you will put the blame on me for anything. I wasn't even in the house when the cat fell into the furnace."

This is the operation of blame in our society. It is the chief weapon by which morals are enforced. "You are not respon-

sible for making your own decisions, and you have failed to follow my decisions for you. You are my EFFECT, and you have not turned out as I planned you, and therefore you are to blame…"

Interesting logic.

Codes are set up which no one in his right mind would follow. The individual, as a child, does not follow the code. He is caught. The force with which he is threatened is so great that he shifts the responsibility to someone else. ("He made me do it.") And he makes himself into an EFFECT.

In a society where punishment-drive is used, all responsibility is converted automatically to blame, and all human beings become EFFECTS.

No self-determined individual is to blame for anything; but he is responsible for a lot of things.

21. The degree to which an individual accepts the motions of the environment as his own efforts determines the number of counter-efforts which will come against him.

22. Those motions which he does not accept as his own efforts come against him as counter-efforts.

23. Those motions which he accepts as his own efforts do not come against him as counter-efforts.

24. The desire of an individual to be accepted is the desire to have his efforts accepted by others as their efforts.

The feeling of truly belonging to a group comes from being able to contribute efforts to that group which are accepted as the efforts of the group.

25. The quickest way to succumb would be to disown all efforts. All efforts would then become counter-efforts.

26. When parts of the body are disowned, they turn against the individual as counter-efforts. The statement, "My foot hurts me." is an example of shifting the responsibility for the pain to a part of the body instead of accepting it as one's own effort.

27. Justification is the process of proving to yourself and others that you are not wrong. A man who is low on the tone scale cannot afford to be wrong even about the smallest thing.

28. All facsimiles of efforts and counter-efforts come from combinations of these simple factors; the individual tries to remain at rest or remain in motion or change his state; the counter-effort tries to remain at rest or remain in motion or change its state.

    When the action of the environmental motion fits in with the effort of the individual, he accepts the environmental motion as his own effort.

    When it opposes his effort, he often elects it as a counter-effort.

29. One can only experience counter-efforts which one has so elected as counter-efforts. The alternative is to accept them as one's own efforts.

30. Affinity, reality and communication (A-R-C) are the three components or aspects of theta.

31. As thought ascends and descends the tone scale, affinity, reality and communication, which are the aspects of thought, ascend and descend the tone scale in unison.

32. Axiom 168: Affinity, reality and communication co-exist in an inextricable relationship.

    The co-existent relationship between affinity, reality and communication is such that none can be increased without increasing the other two and none can be decreased without decreasing the other two.

33. Affinity is the feeling which exists between people or within a person. If the affinity between two people is at 4.0 or higher on the tone scale, we might use the word "love" as a synonym for this affinity. If affinity is at 1.5, we may use the word "hate" as a synonym for this affinity.

    Affinity, as an aspect of theta, might be compared to the magnetic and gravitic forces of the physical universe. It is that which holds things together, higher on the tone scale, and forces them apart, low on the tone scale.

    Many efforts to formulate principles of thought and life have led to the statement, in one form or another that "love" is what makes the world go 'round. Many investigators have felt that the whole subject of thought and life can be summed up in this way and can be expressed fully in terms of "love". Such statements as, "God is love", show how completely this aspect of theta is made responsible for not only life but the entire MEST universe as well.

    But there are two other aspects of theta, or ways of looking at theta.

34. Communication, in Scientology, is a big subject – bigger even than affinity, since so much has been said already about love and hate, that it seems to us a little commonplace. Communication includes telephone and telegraph and the

newspapers and radio and television and facsimile reproducers (the MEST variety) and comic books and messages from the President – but it includes important things, too.

Communication includes all sense perception; sight, sound, touch, taste, smell, movement of self, external motion, weight of self, external weight, heat, time, etc., etc., through fifty or a hundred possible perceptions. All these things are communication as it is performed by the organism. All these things carry information from the MEST universe, including the MEST part of the organism, to theta. All these things are preserved as facsimile recordings by theta, and each of fifty or a hundred perceptions is recorded continuously – or, if in increments, then as often as thirty to fifty times every second.

Communication is also within theta, of course, independent of an organism. Communication includes memory, which is communication with the past – or more correctly – is communication with facsimiles which, though they are independent of time, contain recordings of times which are past as far as the MEST universe is concerned. The "past" is all in the "present" for theta. The only thing which makes a facsimile "past" is the recording of past MEST time which it contains.

Talking is only a special division of hearing, but we have made it a very important division. So important, in fact, that a delusion has developed among men that words are the things they stand for – as though you could walk up to some one and say, "An iron safe is falling on you." and then see him crushed flat on the sidewalk by no visible means.

Communication in an individual has to be in a very decadent state before the idea that words are things can be entertained. Communication is in just such a state in many people.

Communication of emotion to another organism without going through MEST may be possible. It certainly is possible without any discernable means. Since emotion is half-way between theta and MEST, one suspects that it may require MEST for its communication – but again, perhaps it does not.

Communication of thought from one mind to another is certainly possible without dependence upon MEST efforts. Thought exists without any dependence whatsoever upon the physical universe. It communicates often entirely independently of MEST.

35. Reality has been a vast and controversial subject for a long time. This writer believes that reality has been formulated better in Scientology than in any other system now known.

Reality is agreement.

Agreement with what? Agreement with anything.

Agreement is like the resonance of a sound in one of Helmholz's glass bells. An idea enters a mind, like a sound entering one of those bells, and if it finds agreement with its "wavelength" it grows stronger and stronger. An idea passes near a mind, and if there is agreement in this mind for that idea, this mind begins to "resonate" to that idea.

On the negative side, agreement is the experience of not meeting resistance. When an idea is shot out into a field of thought in which there is agreement for this idea, there is nothing to stop this idea, and it will grow and grow in power

and area of influence, until it produces great and magnificent efforts in the universe of MEST.

If the idea meets disagreement, it grows weaker and weaker until it is heard no more.

Reality is agreement. The simple but not universally known fact which makes this so is the fact that reality, as a process, has nothing to do with the physical universe. Reality is not a function of the physical universe; it is a function of theta. MEST does not care whether anything is "real", because MEST does not think. MEST just is. It whirls around with boundless energy over limitless spaces through endless time using practically no matter at all – but it does not think. Reality is of no concern to MEST.

Reality is only of concern to theta. It is so much a part of theta, that it is one of the three components of theta.

How little wonder that "philosophers" who made reality a function of MEST and said that thought was the only unreal thing, failed to solve anything more complicated than whether to come in out of the rain.

So far as we can tell, the physical universe is real. So far as we can tell. But the one thing which we can KNOW is real, is theta.

The physical universe is sensed by us in a very abstract manner. We look at a great field of motion and we see, not that field, but the top of a table. This hard surface which we perceive is only an abstraction which our imperfect senses make from the detailed process which is going on at a level too minute for us to sense. The reality which we perceive is real,

only because all the other people we have ever met perceive it the same way.

Naturally. They are the same kind of organism. They have developed the same physical tools for making abstractions from this process. But suppose we should encounter a different organism and try to establish the reality of this table top with this other organism. It might not work out. The other organism might say. "I see this field at which you are pointing. It is a very active field, lots of motion. Things are moving very fast." And you say to this organism, "You're crazy. There is nothing moving on that table top. It's very hot from the sun, but there is nothing moving."

You are both viewing the same phenomenon, but you perceive it as heat and he perceives it as more motion. One of you, obviously, is seeing the "reality" while the other is not – or are you?

What is the "reality" in a situation in which no two people can agree? What would be the "reality" about the color of a red dress if you were trying to establish the color to a talking dog? You would say, "See here, Fido, this dress is the same color as that apple, but it is quite different from that leaf." And the dog would say, "Yes. You are right. I do not understand this word 'color' that you are using, but I can see clearly that the dress has the same brightness as the apple but is not so bright as the leaf." Who is seeing the "reality" – you or the dog?

The answer is that the word "reality" is misplaced. "Reality" does not and never can apply to MEST. It applies only to perceptions of MEST by organisms. When the perceptions

agree; THAT is reality. When the perceptions disagree; THAT is unreality. The MEST itself stays the same, no matter how much reality or unreality is going on in the theta which is perceiving it.

The old question, "Would the stone in the desert be a real stone, if no one ever saw it?" is a silly question. We can assume that if no organism ever saw the stone, the stone would still be there. Or, we can assume that the stone would not be there. But that has nothing to do with reality. The stone cannot be either real or unreal, except as it is perceived by an organism. Reality is not a function of stones; it is a function of thought. Stones very probably exist all over the universe without ever being perceived by organisms. They are not concerned with whether they are real or not. They just go on being stones. We are the only ones who are concerned with whether they are real – and what we mean by that is, not "Are they there?", but "Can we agree about whether they are there?

Of course, the agreement is easier if we go and look right at the stones instead of guessing about them. But the process of agreement is not different. Looking at the stones does not make them real or unreal; it only makes them easier to agree about. Two men could look at the stones, and one could say, "What pretty sponges." Poof. There goes the reality. "Well," you say, "he was just wrong."

Exactly. He was wrong – that is, one of them was, but which one?

The answer is, the "wrong" one is the one who gets the smaller number of people to agree with him when he gets home.

If he cannot get anyone to agree with him, he is very likely to be locked up in an institution for living in an unreal world. But the unreality of this world consists wholly and entirely of his lack of agreement with other people.

Let us assume that there is one MEST universe. Let us assume that rocks are hard and water flows and all cats are gray at night. It is easy for us to agree on this – but how can we demonstrate it in terms other than our own perceptions?

We cannot. That is the hard fact. That is the hardest fact in a universe of hard facts about MEST.

That is why reality is agreement.

Reality is NOT a function of MEST.

Reality is a function of theta.

36. Reality is even more important within an individual than it is between individuals. In other words, a man must agree with himself before he can agree with anyone else.

Unreality within an individual is insanity.

A man looks out the window and sees a raging, stormy sea. He turns back to his work and in a moment looks again. He sees, this time, peaceful, rolling fields, with cows gazing upon them.

This is unreality. The two sights do not agree.

The quickest way to drive someone insane is to do something to his reality, to introduce disagreements into his facsimiles. Perhaps, if our civilization were built upon affinity or communication, this might not be the quickest way. But our civilization is built solidly upon agreements about MEST. A man who looks at energy, space and time, and par-

ticularly matter, the way other men look at them is sane. A man who looks at them differently is nuts. People are glad to tell him so. Therefore, we can cut off communication with people and make them angry. We can reverse affinity against them and make them covert or grief-stricken. But when we produce disagreements in their facsimiles about MEST, we drive them crazy.

"What did you do with the picture, Paula?"

"I didn't touch it."

"It was hanging right there on the wall. Now it is gone. I have asked Nancy, and she didn't touch it. I certainly didn't touch it. That leaves only you, Paula. What did you do with the picture? Where did you hide it?"

"I didn't… I didn't… I didn't… believe me, I didn't".

"What did you do with the picture, Paula?"

Very nice.

An individual who is high on the tone scale would be annoyed by this sort of thing. An individual who was "normal" would fly into a blind, destructive rage, or plan some way to thoroughly ruin the reality of his tormenter.

An individual who was neurotic would be terrified or grief-stricken.

An individual who was psychotic would drop immediately into apathy.

37. An individual who invalidates the realities of others consistently is demonstrating that his own reality is very shaky.

38. An "auditor" who invalidates the realities of his pre-clear is doing processing in reverse. An old name for this was "hypnotism".

39. The division of the survival urge into eight dynamics gives us a useful set of tools for asking questions which will help the preclear to find his past.

40. The division of theta into three parts, affinity, communication and reality, gives us another useful tool for the same purpose.

41. The tone scale gives us another useful tool for the same purpose.

42. When these three tools are put together, they make it possible to predict, and therefore to ask questions about, any experience which may have occurred to the preclear.

    Any subject can be well outlined in terms of the dynamics, the tone scale and A-R-C.

43. A methodical (but not monotonous) working through the eight dynamics, and on each dynamic working through A-R-C, and on each of these combinations working through all levels of the tone scale, will turn up for the preclear experiences which the auditor could not even imagine.

    Some preclears have had experiences which just could not happen, but which have happened nevertheless. The use of dynamics, the tone scale, and A-R-C is a mathematical way of going through all possible incidents without having experienced them one's self.

    This is not to suggest that it is necessary or desirable to go through all the incidents of the preclear's life. It means,

rather, that there is a quick way for the auditor to discover for the preclear the few important incidents which do have to be run through.

44. In working with low-toned people, either in processing or out of it, the auditor will find it a great advantage to remember that affinity, reality, and communication affect each other mutually. What is good for one is good for the other two.

SUMMARY BOOKLET 7

Seminar Questions

1. Indicate ways to indoctrinate the pre-clear into what efforts and counter-efforts are.

2. Give examples of how a person at each tone level would handle effort and counter-effort.

3. What are the interrelations between effort, counter-effort, responsibility and blame?

4. How do efforts and counter-efforts in facsimiles affect a person's efforts and counter-efforts in present time? Bring in blame and responsibility.

5. What is meant by each part of A-R-C? How do they interrelate in a person's contact with MEST? With himself?