

# SCIENTOLOGY AND DIANETICS

Booklet 13  
of the  
SUMMARY COURSE SERIES

BY  
L. RON HUBBARD

## Thought, Emotion, Effort: Maybes

Ron's Org Grenchen  
Switzerland

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 THROUGH AN EXECUTIVE)
- INDIVIDUAL TRACK MAP
- WHAT TO AUDIT

SCANNED, TYPED AND PROCESSED INTO READABLE  
AND DIGITAL FORM BY RON'S ORG GRENCHEN, SWITZERLAND

[WWW.RONSORG.CH](http://WWW.RONSORG.CH)

## **THOUGHT, EMOTION, EFFORT: MAYBES**

1. The running of an incident is accomplished using three factors: thought, emotion and effort, with their counterparts, counter-thought, counter-emotion and counter-effort.
2. Effort is a directed motion on the part of the individual.
3. Counter-effort is any motion in the environment which the individual does not assume as his own effort. All perceptions are counter-effort — all, that is, which depend upon MEST for their transmission.
4. Emotion is the bridge between effort and thought. Counter-emotion is the emotion of other organisms which is felt by the individual on a "broadcast" basis.
5. Thought is cause in the organism. Counter-thought is any thought which is counter to the thought of the individual. Counter-thought may be perceived through MEST channels, or through counter-emotion (supposing that counter-emotion does not travel on a MEST channel), or directly (it is assumed) as thought passing from one mind to another without benefit either of effort or emotion.
6. All these things are used in running an incident. The pre-clear may be asked specifically for any one of them or for all of them. If the pre-clear is running the incident satisfactorily and is experiencing relief from it, then he is undoubtedly doing some reevaluation of all the elements here mentioned, particularly thought and counter-thought.

7. There is one basic aberration which may be considered the common denominator of aberration by counter-effort. This is the identification of perceived data through identification of time. The individual has received so many counter-efforts in such a short time that he has been unable to differentiate them in time. He postulates an inability to differentiate. Enough of these postulates of non-differentiation, and the individual will identify everything with everything else.

Since perceptics are counter-efforts, they can become aberrated in this way. Any lack of perception in recall may be attributed to such an aberration of time differentiation. The fact that an individual has been subjected to too loud a noise at one time is no reason for him to be afraid of a moderate noise at another time, unless he is not able to distinguish clearly between the two times. If he identifies the two times, he will identify the two noises.

8. Aberration by counter-emotion may also be simplified into a single phenomenon. Just as there is an emotional curve, there is also a counter-emotional curve. The emotional curve of another person may be felt by the individual as a counter-emotional curve, and can be aberrative. The auditor may ask the pre-clear to feel the emotion of some other person or persons in his vicinity. When he has good perception of this emotion the auditor may ask him to follow it down the emotional curve which that person is experiencing and, if possible, up again to a comparatively high level. In any incident in which another person has suffered some loss in the vicinity of the pre-clear, and in which this loss was not particularly important to the pre-clear, the counter-emotional curve may require more attention than the emotional curve.

In an incident in which the pre-clear also suffered a loss, the counter-emotional curve may still be very important, particularly if the pre-clear was attempting to postulate survival factors for himself and was being interfered with by the emotional drop of the other person — which leads us into the subject of counter-thought.

9. All aberration by counter-thought may be summed up in one word: MAYBE. A maybe is a situation in which the individual cannot act, and if he cannot act he cannot further his survival. If he finds himself carrying too many maybes, he will find himself unable to act at all, and he will die.

How does a maybe come about?

10. Human thought is a process of adding up data which have pro-survival and contra-survival evaluations. The mind evaluates all the data it has in terms of survival and then adds up all the plusses and minuses to see what action should be taken: "yes, I will jump," or "no, I won't jump." If there are just as many plusses as minuses, the answer comes out "maybe". Then the individual can neither jump nor not jump — which is impossible in itself. He must just stay anxiously in one place, on the verge of jumping, but he must not jump. All the attention which he should now be giving to the next problem to come up he is still spending on the problem which he has just considered and failed to solve. He is in a state of indecision. He is at zero on the gradient scale of estimation of effort. And he is rapidly approaching death, on the tone scale.
11. In postulate processing, the auditor helps the pre-clear to find and reevaluate non-survival postulates. Chief among these,

are postulates which say "maybe: maybe I can survive and maybe I can't. Maybe I like Mankind and maybe I don't. Maybe I am afraid of animals and maybe I'm not. Maybe I can own MEST and maybe I can't. Maybe I am immortal and maybe I'm not. Maybe there is a God and maybe there isn't..."

Any moment of indecision is a maybe.

12. When the individual tries to do something and fails, he has a choice of one of three postulates: (1) I can do this, and next time I make the effort to do it I will succeed, or (2) I can't do this, and I'm not going to waste any more time trying, or (3) maybe I can do this and maybe I can't.

Now, it is perfectly all right for an individual to put in his academic reports, "Maybe we can reach the moon and maybe we can't." The aberrated society in which we live is so suggestible and has so little self-determinism that it strongly resents a positive statement on anybody's part, where a maybe can be used instead — which will prove that this individual is indecisive and therefore in no way (Don't you believe it!) dangerous to the society. People have so little reality that they cringe before any reality that is presented to them, fearing that their own reality will not be able to survive if compared to the new reality. In fact, to digress still further (the writer being somewhat restimulated by this whole subject) any society in which people are always demanding validation of new ideas, instead of picking up new ideas and using them and seeing what can be done with them and making these new ideas their own property, is a society that is in miserable shape. New ideas are so hot to handle and dangerous to touch in the opinion of these

suggestible and hypnotized victims of advertising agencies, collectivist propaganda and political campaigners, that they prefer to erect an impossible barrier between themselves and any new idea. They justify themselves by calling this barrier "scientific research," and they imagine an army of trustworthy supermen in white coats who are evaluating all new ideas as fast as they come up, honestly and accurately. The fact that this army of censors (pardon!), evaluators hardly ever comes up with anything useful — except in the field of physics — only proves to the general that there is nothing new under the sun...

Well, it is all right for the individual to be a maybe-merchant in academic reports, but when it comes right down to action, he has to know whether he is going to do it — or not. There is no such thing as a scientific attitude at the moment Joe Dimaggio swings his bat. His state of mind is, "I can drive that ball out of the park, and here goes!" A maybe would be of no use to him whatsoever. In fact, it would prevent him from hitting the ball.

Scientific investigators who never get beyond a maybe in their investigations never turn up anything. Scientists may pretend, in order to survive in the society, that everything they accomplish is due to accident or the "scientific method", or a wonderful academic background, or the help and encouragement of the university or the government or of some other authoritarian agency, but they know perfectly well that if they accomplish anything it was because they say, "I can do this, I will do this, I am doing this, I have done this..." No maybe anywhere in sight.

This society is so full of maybes that any penetrating report which is made comes up with one big maybe: maybe this is a society and maybe it isn't.

13. Maybes and counter-thought are related in this fashion. When the individual has a thought and then receives a counter-thought of the same magnitude, he does not know which to act on, and a maybe results.

These maybes are discoverable and processible.

Oddly enough, they follow the same rules of overt acts which efforts follow.

14. First there is the MOTIVATOR: an incident in which the individual receives a counter-thought which is so big and convincing that he gives up his line of reasoning and adopts the counter-thought instead.

Second, is a series, long or short, of dramatizations of the motivator. The individual takes the counter-thought and uses it as his own thought (just as he takes a counter-effort and uses it as his own effort), and he impresses it upon other people as hard and as often as he can.

Third, is the OVERT ACT: an incident in which the individual tries to foist this thought off on somebody who comes up with such a surge of powerful counter-thought that the individual goes into apathy and accepts the new counter-thought.

Fourth, is sympathy with the new counter-thought. The individual tries to prove that he is right and was right all the time, because he really believed the new counter-thought all the time. When the old thought occurs to him, it makes him very uncomfortable, because his failure to be overt with it



has made him think that he hasn't the right to use it (just as with an effort). The conflict between the old thought and the new thought, if they are of nearly equal magnitude resolves into a maybe. The individual keeps the whole problem in present time and computes on it endlessly. Every time a subject comes up with either of these thoughts in it, the individual gets the whole problem all over again. The only answer the individual can give to any question which concerns this problem is "maybe", even if there is a perfectly good solution in sight in terms of present time. The data which the individual is using is not the data of present time, it is the data of the overt act, the data of the maybe.

15. The existence of this overt act of thought will prevent the pre-clear from reaching the original maybe, which was the motivator. The first maybe on any line of reasoning may be considered a motivator. Every dramatization of this motivator lies between the pre-clear and the motivator. Every time the pre-clear has tried to impress some attitude upon another person he has been dramatizing a thought motivator.
16. If the auditor will take the Chart of Attitudes and go over it with the pre-clear, looking for times when the pre-clear tried to impress this idea upon other people, eventually he will reach the original time when this idea was impressed forcibly upon the pre-clear, and a resolution of the maybeness of that subject may be effected.
17. Besides the Chart of Attitudes, or rather, in conjunction with it, the auditor should use the eight dynamics as subjects upon which the pre-clear may have maybes.

The educational pattern of our time contains many interferences of thought, on each dynamic, which form locks on whatever maybes exist in the mind of the individual.

18. We may list some of the maybes.

DO I EXIST? Times when other people acted as though the pre-clear did not exist. Times when his name was not on the list, his place was not set at the table, his partner did not show up for the dance or the hayride. Times when he was poorly dressed, so that he wished others would not notice his presence. Times when he was ashamed of his complexion or anything else about his looks. Times when he blamed somebody else for something, when he disclaimed responsibility.

DO I LIKE SEX? Times when parents or other influential people in the environment enforced or denied the attractiveness or morality or timeliness of sex. Attitudes on the part of sexual partners which conflicted with the attitudes of the pre-clear, about sex, or about anything else. Aberrational chatter about sex by doctors, ministers, teachers and policemen. Attitudes on sex belonging to other aberrated individuals. Failures to win sexual partners. Failures to keep sexual partners. Failures to avoid sexual partners. Failures to satisfy sexual partners. Failures to be satisfied by sexual partners.

DO I LIKE MEN? DO I LIKE WOMEN? Incidents which may be considered as part of the "War Between the Sexes" (see James Thurber), Attitudes of influential persons about the sexes, "Men are beasts, Women can't be trusted, etc."

DO I LIKE CHILDREN? Attitudes suggesting that children are too expensive, too noisy, too big a responsibility, too dangerous to give birth to, are not considerate or grateful, always turn out badly, don't know as much as they did in my day, are always getting sick, and that it is everyone's duty to have children, etc.

CAN I CONTRIBUTE TO A GROUP? Any service in one of the armed forces may have raised a very large maybe in the mind of the pre-clear as to whether he can contribute to a group. Rejections by groups. Enforced participation in groups or pseudo-groups. Rejections by or impressment into unions.

IS MANKIND ANY GOOD? Attitudes of influential persons towards Jews, Negroes, orientals, whites, Mexicans, Injuns, Abolitionists, Crackers, Damnyankees, Communists, Socialists, Psychiatrists, Convicts, Democrats, Republicans, Seventh-Day-Adventists, Prohibitionists, Bureaucrats, Capitalists, Faith Healers, Truck Drivers, Organizers, Company Cops, Newspaper Reporters, Publishers, Editors, Homosexuals, Alcoholics, Prison Guards, and all the other buttons on the front of the little boy's jacket (richman-poorman-beggarman-thief-doctor-lawyer-merchant-chief-tinker-tailor-soldier-sailor-striptease-artistst-hugs-and-jailors, etc). Also, and particularly, anyone in the neighborhood of the pre-clear who preferred dogs to people.

AM I AFRAID OF ANIMALS? ARE ANIMALS DIRTY? Life on the farm. Biology classes, in which it may have been asserted that life was an accident of fortuitous combinations of molecules. Having to clean up after animals, particularly somebody else's animals. Being punished for injuring

animals. Punishing or wanting to punish someone for injuring an animal. Attitudes of parents and teachers toward germs.

IS THERE OR ISN'T THERE MORE THAN MEST? Santa Claus, Father, Son and Holy Ghost. Fake spiritualists. Lazarus. Rope tricks, Dickens' Christmas Carol. College bull sessions with progressives and other atheists. Being forced to go to church at the age of seven. Pictures of the practice of yoga in the National Geographic Magazine. Sentimentalism about immortality in the Reader's Digest, Invalidations of past lives by everybody from the obstetrician to movies entitled "You Only Live Once". Jokes about the Englishman, the Irishman, the Scotchman and the Jew at the Pearly Gates. People walking up and down the sidewalks of New York wearing sandwich signs which say "Repent! The Kingdom is at Hand!" Every time anyone said, "Are You religious?" Funerals, Weddings, Baptisms, Confirmations, Consecrations. Jokes about nuns. Desperate defenses of immortality by clerics who no longer believe in it, etc., etc.

IS THERE MEST? Times when it was evident to the pre-clear that he was the entity and that nothing else existed save his imaginings. People who thought that "this world" was not worth bothering with. Persons who belittled the pre-dear's control of MEST and the value of the MEST which the pre-clear controlled. Times when MEST won. Conversations with 1.1's in college who tried to convince the pre-clear that nobody should own anything. Experiences with 1.5's in industry who wanted to control everything and leave nothing to the control of the pre-clear. Relationships with 0.5's who let all property decay and rot and who always managed to

waste time and run up a big gas and electric bill during the summer and a big water bill during the winter.

IS THERE A LIMIT TO WHAT I CAN KNOW? Expressions by variegated nullification-merchants that there is a just and right limit to human knowledge and that they know exactly where that limit lies. Persons who thought that God was mad at somebody, particularly the pre-clear. Persons who could draw a picture of God or give the pre-clear his telephone number. Friends in college who thought that science knew all.

19. In the above list are many counter-thoughts which may have been motivators for the pre-clear. Whenever the pre-clear has difficulty in remembering a time when one of these attitudes was enforced on him, the auditor may ask for a time when the pre-clear tried to force the attitude on somebody else. If even that is not available, the auditor may ask for times when the pre-clear forced this attitude upon himself.
20. We have, then, in thought as in effort, motivation, the overt act, and resultant sympathy.
21. Whatever is most aberrative in this process to the pre-clear will show up in his thinking as a maybe, an unresolved problem, an undrawn conclusion, which he is keeping in present time and upon which he is computing his present-time survival.
22. The auditor may take the Chart of Attitudes and find out two things about every attitude on it. (1) When did the pre-clear force this attitude on others? (2) When did the pre-clear fail to resolve a problem on this subject? Times when he forced

the attitude on others will be hiding the time or times when the attitude was forced on him.

23. Here follow some questions which the student may do well to answer.
24. What is the goal of processing?
25. How are efforts obtained?
26. What theory predicts life on the other planets?
27. Who *is* Fred Hoyle, anyway?
28. Whose decision aberrates an individual?
29. What are the two aspects of proof of rightness following an overt act?
30. When may an effort return upon the individual as a counter-effort?
31. Who is the only person who can make an individual responsible?
32. When an individual himself feels the pain of a blow which he has inflicted upon someone else, where does this pain come from?
33. Who or what is the MOTIVATOR?
34. Are death incidents the most severe in terms of aberration, or are there incidents which are more aberrative?
35. Where does original sin come from?
36. What is the source of sunlight?
37. What is a valence?
38. What does the individual use the SERVICE FACSIMILE to prove?

39. Is it sometimes necessary to begin late in a chain of incidents and work back toward the earlier incidents?
40. Why?
41. What is the LIFE CONTINUUM?
42. What may be suspected about the past of an individual who cannot bear the thought of killing anything?
43. Is it possible to be sane without being bloodthirsty?
44. What is the full name of the E-meter?
45. Does it read minds?
46. If not, what does it read?
47. Does a certain reading on the E-meter indicate that the individual must be telling a lie?
48. What does a drop on the E-meter indicate?
49. Is every overt action considered an OVERT ACT?
50. Why is the mitten or sack worn over one hand when using the E-meter?
51. Is it a good idea to keep the meter always turned on?
52. Why is the tone control of the meter labeled "relative only"?
53. Are changes in room temperature and humidity likely to affect the reading of the E-meter?
54. What is the chance of someone's inventing or building a machine which can out-think a human being?
55. Is the traffic toll in the U.S. profitably attributable to the existence of automobiles?
56. What one thing does any computing machine lack which it would need to have in order to think?

57. What affect does removing a finger from the terminal have on the needle of the E-meter?
58. Are wavings of the arms and general restless movements which affect the needle of no use to the auditor, and should they be ignored?
59. What, if anything, do they indicate?
60. What does the auditor suspect of an individual who is eager to invalidate the E-meter?
61. What one purpose do the three controls on the meter have in common?
62. What fault did earlier instruments have?
63. How may the pre-clear misinterpret the reading on the meter to his own disadvantage?
64. What should the auditor do to prevent this?
65. Should the range expander be kept at "plus" at all times?
66. Is it a good idea to turn the meter on when all controls are fully advanced, if the auditor wants the meter to warm up quicker?
67. What is the goal of the auditor with respect to the E-meter?
68. How does the sensitivity control differ in effect from the other two controls?
69. Is it true that if an auditor has an E-meter, he does not have to worry his head too much about the details of auditing procedure?
70. Will the E-meter address envelopes?
71. What is one mistake in auditing which the E-meter will help the auditor to avoid?



72. What will the meter tell the auditor about the pre-clear's present time?
73. Who wrote "The Body Snatchers"?
74. What would be one way to avoid getting killed in a duel at five o'clock in the morning in Edinburgh, Scotland?
75. Did question number 36 annoy you?

This question, "What is the source of sunlight?" is a separator. It separates the sheep from the goats. In one list of examination questions which was given to students this question appeared and caused an uproar among the examinees. Many answered that they did not know the answer because nothing had been said on the subject during the course. Others said that they knew the answer but thought the question was out of place. Others gave explanations which were so involved that Fred Hoyle would have been hard put to it to figure them out. A few, a very few, said merely, "The sun", and passed on to the next question.

Now, the point of this question is not to find out what is the source of sunlight. It is not to find out whether the student knows what the source of sunlight is or what he thinks it is. It is not to find out whether he subscribes to the theory of continuous creation or can describe the conversion of hydrogen to helium. It is not even to find out whether the student can answer a simple question with a simple answer without being coached before hand.

The point of this question is to find out whether the student is worried about authority.

Only if the student is worried about authority will he worry about giving the right answer to this question. It has been

stated that there are no authorities in Scientology. No matter what the momentary appearances to the contrary may be, there are no authorities in Scientology, because Scientology is the science of knowledge, and authority is interference with knowledge.

In Scientology, there are good sources of data. This book which you are reading is a fair source of data. You could do worse. But this book is not an authority. This book is an invitation. The questions which appear above do not appear for the purpose of nullifying or dominating the student. They appear for the purpose of inviting the student to find out for himself whether the writer has any idea what he is writing about, or if this book, like so many others through the years, is merely a very small bomb with a very big fuse.

For all this writer knows, the source of sunlight may be the moon. The question is only there to invite the student to think about it.

If any instructor or teacher under whom the student studies Scientology seems to be an authority, the student should be advised that his instructor is suffering from *tempus contractiore* or "shortened time factor". If he were not in such a hurry, he would step more lightly upon the student's self-determinism.

The student must be alert to good sources of data. He has to decide for himself which they are. No one can tell him. Not even this writer.

76. Why is reality equated with agreement?
77. If we take away affinity from A-R-C, what is left?
78. Is a person who is talking necessarily communicating?

79. Is a person who is communicating necessarily talking?
80. What is the best magic you have ever performed?
81. What are the four kinds of altitude?
82. What is a gradient scale?
83. What is the theory of the introduction of an arbitrary?
84. What does the letter "lambda" stand for in Scientology?
85. Who was Lazarus?
86. What is the last word of the main text of SCIENCE OF SURVIVAL?
87. What are the 1.5 manifestations of sex activity?
88. Does this number mean anything to you?
89. What was the first question in the list?
90. What are you going to do tomorrow?

THOUGHT, EMOTION, EFFORT: 20  
MAYBES

Professional Course Booklet 13

## **SUMMARY LECTURE 13**

### **Seminar Questions**

1. How can an auditor tell if a pre-clear is re-evaluating a facsimile?
2. How are "maybes" non-survival?
3. Parallel the overt act in thought and effort.
4. What motivates an indecision?
5. What maybes are you using in the study of these books?