

MECHANICS OF THE MIND

A lecture given on 10 January 1953

[Based on R&D transcripts. This was checked against an old reel for LGC-3, but the reel only contains the second half of this lecture. The start of the reel is marked below. We did not find any omissions.]

This is the third lecture today: In this lecture we're going to talk something about the mechanics of the mind. Now, you must realize that there's quite a bit of work and technology underlies this material in Dianetics and Scientology. The amount – the-amount of data which has been sorted really would stagger one if he summed it all up and put it in one place.

Perhaps a word about the source of this data would not be amiss. This data might be said to be a combination and a re-evaluation of Eastern and Western culture. And as much as anything else, that marriage, which hitherto has been a misalliance, is responsible for Dianetics and Scientology, making it a little more compatible.

I was very young when I first went out to the East, extremely impressionable as a child would be. I struggled along in north China, India and was back in the States and then back out there again.

And while in the States on a very early visit, a stay, I met Commander Thompson of the United States Navy who was just returned from having studied with Sigmund Freud in Vienna, Commander Thompson was a very sound man, a very solid friend of mine, He had no boy of his own and was quite interested in me, mostly as a personality.

It's very odd to realize, as I did one day, that in subsequent years I have approximated to a very remarkable degree the career of Commander Thompson – to show you what an impressed – impressionable boy can have handed to him suddenly.

I have followed that, however, fragmentarily. It just sort of dubs in to the career that I have been following to this degree that – I didn't realize this until one day I looked at a map, and in the field of expeditions, explorations, I always favored certain quarters of the world, always went there and, when there, did certain things. It fits Commander Thompson's record. Amusing.

[R&D Note: Commander Thompson: Joseph Thompson (1874-1943), a commander in the US Navy Medical Corps who studied with Sigmund Freud in Vienna and was a friend of L. Ron Hubbard when Ron was a boy.]

It just suddenly struck me one day, I hadn't ever realized it. Nothing would do at a certain place I went but what I would dig up one of the old, ancient tribal burial grounds. Never realized the significance of this until one day – I hadn't known this, you see – I was

standing in the Bishop Museum in Hawaii and saw there the exhibit of Commander Thompson on some of the men he had dug up in a tribal burying grounds. All right. He directed my attention toward many things and perhaps imparted to me, fragmentarily or otherwise, the basic tenets of Sigmund Freud and also imparted to me the fact that Freud didn't think he'd solved it.

That's an interesting datum we append right on to there; it should be more than appended. Freud wasn't at war with those other lines of thought to amount to anything: He was trying to find out, 1920 or something like that. He even wrote a paper and said he hadn't, It's called "Psychoanalysis, Terminable and Interminable." And it's rather heart broken sort of a paper,

[R&D Note: "Psychoanalysis, Terminable and Interminable": reference to Volume V of the collected papers of Sigmund Freud, entitled Analysis, Terminable and Interminable.]

Right at that time when he was writing that, I was taking a look at Hindu snake charmers, wondering why the audience believed there was a snake there.

Well now, it would be handing myself bouquets (which one should never do) to say that one would pick up where somebody else left off, but one was going forward there. There are many things in Dianetics and Scientology which are directly Sigmund Freud's – directly. They're re-evaluated. They've been fitted in at the right places for Dianetics and Scientology and have been evaluated against workability. For instance, association. There aren't as many things as you would think, by the way, but there's the whole business of associative thought, all kinds of things here and there.

In the first place, he put his stamp on this culture. He put his stamp on there with a great big stamp. And you don't realize to what degree you have been influenced by Sigmund Freud. You would have to read the literature of 1880 and then the literature of 1950 sequitur (one right after the other) to realize that something happened: the evaluation and characterization of story characters in 1880 and 1950 – quite different.

The whole literary world bought psychoanalysis, and they use it as their modus operandi for plotting. And as a result, the whole society has been salted with this as a background. It's interesting, isn't it?

And today, we find this man who began on his course of investigation into the teeth of the medical profession, was practically thrown out of everything, was hammered at and beaten at and thrown away and chewed up in general. We find that his work opened a door, and it opened a door in this fashion. It said, "Something can be done about the human mind." That doesn't sound very startling to you, but believe me, that was a startling statement to make when he was first working.

In 1894, when he released his libido theory after his work with Breuer, he was basing it on results he had had. Unfortunately, to a large extent, Freud was the sort of an auditor – let's get that straight – I said Freud was a sort of an auditor who added in a lot of extra personality factors. And every time he added one of these things into a session, he didn't know what he was doing, he never said what he was doing, he never knew what he was doing and he left all kinds of X's all over – unknowns, unknowns, unknowns, unknowns.

How can one auditor take Book One and produce miracles and another auditor not? That's because there are unknowns in the personal address of the auditor to the preclear. Just as in Group Auditing – and this becomes very pertinent to you – in Group Auditing there are unknowns from auditor to auditor before the children. They will be unknown to the Group Auditor; they are not unknown to the professional auditor. He'd know how to get rid of these unknowns. But one is confronting the group with a personality. And the tone of voice and the general personality and the stage presence of the Group Auditor will make Group Auditing different in its results from one group to the next, one Group Auditor to the next.

One of the easy ways to get around this, and to minimize it and also to save oneself, is to make somebody else do it under supervision and then change the auditor to the group, change the auditor to the group. Then you've minimized that, you see? You make – in a group of adults, you make them consecutively change. You just take group members and make them audit the group, group members and audit the group, group members and audit the group. And that's all. You just coach them up and make sure it's done right.

And in children, this becomes rather difficult until you have spread across various classes. If you're just dealing with one or two classes, it's very difficult. They're all in one age level. But you could reach into your upper-age levels, and you would be surprised at the capability and competence of children toward children. It's fascinating how well children can sometimes handle children. So you can even minimize it there if you don't feel you're getting along too well with them – you wouldn't have this feeling about it.

But you're going to get a difference of factor. Sigmund Freud was getting results better than anybody has ever gotten since with psychoanalysis. His clinic got better results than anybody has ever gotten since. And the reputation of his clinic today carries psychoanalysis on in the world into the teeth of every one of his disciples who says that, "Sigmund Freud? Well, we don't believe that anymore and that's all been modified by Zilch." The heck it has! That's very interesting about Sigmund Freud.

So his clinical work had a great deal to do with his personal ability and the character of that clinic itself, which throws the results out. And down along the line, his data is integrated by an undisciplined mind. That's a hell of a thing to say about Freud, but it's true. It's not a mathematically disciplined mind. He scatters around, he gets hopeful, he isn't critical of himself sufficiently. But all these are minor things. Think of what the man did do! He all of a sudden opened the doors wide and said, "The human mind is susceptible to a solution." Now, that all by itself was one of the greatest contributions, and was probably THE greatest contribution of the nineteenth century, which came just as it ends.

Sounds like it wouldn't be very much, because in that century you saw Thomas A. Edison, you saw Maxwell, you saw all sorts of people around. Today, we've got nice electric lights and we've got an atom bomb, we've got a lot of other things. And we've got three times the number of institutions.

But somebody did say this. All right, he was a wildcat. That is to say, he was off the field, he was not in the field. He was a pariah. He was frowned upon by all of the conservative thought of the day. And yet, today, this work and that basic postulate is more or less accepted.

Picked up really from that, from scratch; at one time I thought there had been some interim work. I'm sorry to have to say that I don't think there has been. There had been interim work in mathematics and electronics, but not in the field of the mind.

Well, all of a sudden, as a young kid, I see the East – mysticism, occultism, spiritualism. Oh, I knew officers – meeting people; they talked about these things, very interested. I became more and more alert to them, and said, "You know that somewhere around here there's an answer to something. It would be very nice if you could do some of these things, but I'm not sure that these people know what they're doing, And the reason they don't know what they're doing is because the more they work in that field, the loonier they get." This doesn't question the truth of that field, but it just says there's something wrong with it! There's a lot right with it and there's something wrong with it.

Western culture I took up, and was forced into engineering, mathematics, majoring in nuclear physics – very antipathetic to me, but there was order and there was discipline. But all through the university, I wrote and supported myself by writing. And I became interested in people by being interested in what people were interested in, and eventually became interested enough that I began to look into man's mind to find out: what might possibly make him tick. And all of this data started to integrate.

What data had I inspected? The data of the West in its most – its purest, most severe, naked fashion, which is the severity of science as practised in the field of physics and nuclear physics. And if you don't think that's a discipline, that is the discipline of today. If there ever will be one, that's it.

And the East: "Well, we don't know, and we'll all bow down to the great god Whumpbug. And the thing to be is to negate everything and deny everything and run away from everything, and then we'll arrive there. And our greatest goal is to become part of a cloud and float somewhere and to be completely unfeeling and to do this and to do that, and anything but live. e And the Western culture says, "Above all things, whatever else you do, live!" Two directly opposed vectors – out of all of them, we got sense. It's – possibly this material would have been drummed up by anybody. Would have been drummed up by anyone who had taken a look at these two spheres and recognized their differences, and then integrated them and taken them apart again with a highly questioning attitude. Because when you say what I believe – I don't believe there are very many people who even – who knew me very well, who knows what I believe.

I have the same level of belief in a datum as it's workable. I have absolutely no affection for any single datum in Dianetics or Scientology, There isn't any "Well, there's that old datum; that's real good."

There's one difference about this. There are two axioms which are very amusing to me because they were the first two axioms. They were way back in the middle of the thirties. "The cell has as its goal survival and only survival" and "The body is a colonial aggregation of cells, so therefore the goal of the body is survival." QED.

All right, those two sit in the list of axioms and if there's – if there's anything that has any affection for me, it would be that two. Because I remember the tremendous amazement

and surprise one morning that I felt when I was climbing half out of bed; I just stuck right there. And I said, "An anthropoid ape is trying to live. Hm. And a clam is trying to live. An algae is trying to live. A man is trying to live. Living is duration through time, and the proper word to describe that is survive. And, my god, I've done it!" And I went straight over to my typewriter and took down all of the data which boiled this down and turned it into theory. That's the beginning, actually, the real entrance wedge. So there are two points on this time track that I can point to from my viewpoint which were the opening wedges. One is some fellow – a very bright man indeed – saying at the end of the nineteenth century, "The human mind is susceptible to survival in computation and so forth, and it will survive and can go on, and it doesn't die all by itself." You see, something can be patched up about it; it can go on, it isn't a finite thing. Furthermore, it can be understood. "Something can be done about the human mind," somebody said there. He didn't say anything about survival – that was left. And in the middle of the thirties, suddenly realizes survival was the pin on which you could hang the rest of this with adequate and ample proof.

And where did mysticism fit in? Well, I didn't know that until relatively recent days. It all fits. It's the easiest problem anybody ever looked at. It's a very simple problem, idiotically simple. That's why it never got it solved. Nobody had ever looked at anything being that simple to do that much.

So what do we find as the simplicities of solution? The simplicities of solution lie in this: That life, all life is trying to survive. And life is composed of two things: the material universe and an x factor. And this x factor is something that can evidently organize, mobilize the material universe. This x factor.

What is this x factor? Well, it just drifted along for a longest time as an x factor until, all of a sudden, one day I got a description of it. I figured out a description of this x factor. What is it?

Well, it obviously had – and I won't go into that derivation too long – it obviously had no wavelength. It didn't have any energy in it, and therefore it couldn't have any space or time. It was zero! Well, that's fascinating! But how could it be zero? You mean zero lives? Ah! Zero for this universe.

And the second we tried to equate it on the basis of it had time in it, it had energy, it had wavelength, it had finite position, we went way wrong – oh, but wrong. So the material universe is an artificiality bent out – built out of that instead of the reverse.

So we're dealing with these big ideas of space and time and energy and matter, and we have to readjust.

This is all real. Why is it real? It's real because we agree it's real; not for any other reason. And we look it all over very carefully, and we find out that matter, energy, space and time are evidently a product of this universal mind. And then we have the concept of the Supreme Being and so forth, but unfortunately, we have the concept of you.

And do you know that in the subsequent months and years, since that theta-MEST theory was advanced, that every datum which comes forth won't go anyplace else but into that theory.

You know, I'd be just as happy about this theory if it would just suddenly disappear or go away or die or get lost in the wastebasket. Because it's very easy to come by theories. Anybody can come by theories. It's easy. If you don't believe it, read the books of the philosophers. There are theories by the billion. You can make them up any day of the week.

I used to have an organization with a little bunch of engineers. And we had a club; we called it the Green Cheese Club. And it was called Green Cheese Club just for one reason: Its members, any one of them, was perfectly willing to believe the Moon was made of the green cheese – of green cheese if it could be proven adequately. So that made it a pretty wild club, you see?

Do you know that most people working in this field, they get an affection for their data. Whoa, they just got to hold on to that theory because theories are terribly scarce, you see? And we've just got to hold on to that theory and nurse it and pat it and go around and sell everybody on this theory and talk about this theory.

It works the same way with techniques, You see auditors doing this sometimes. (I wouldn't mention names.) But they get a new idea, you see? And instead of practicing on a preclear and being willing to throw it in the first wastebasket that he'd see if it doesn't work, they say, "Gosh, that must be awfully valuable! I get so few of them." So they go around and explain to everybody how this works. Well, the dickens with explaining how it works. Let's work it? Does it work? Well, if it works, okay, we don't – but there's no scarcity of ideas. We can dream up all kinds of therapies.

A new therapy is the "druggest" drug on the market we can get, but we don't need any. That's really abundance right now in Scientology. But this isn't an abundance: the idea that one can have enough ideas to throw away ideas. That little sentence right there explains a lot of differences that you will see.

We got lots of them – throw them away. Do they work? Oh, they don't work? Dickens with them; get another one tomorrow morning. Maybe wake up at midnight with one.

So there have just been thousands of things, and there's no reason why we should be holding on to this theta-MEST theory. No reason at all, except it works.

So, if you will – if you will see a gradient scale, whereby at one end of it we have nothing and at the other end of it we have solid matter, we'll call that – we will call that the Tone Scale. And up the top, we have nothing but capability, and at the bottom we have nothing but object. Now that's the scale.

And we find out that a person is as sane as he is capable and as insane as he is an object. Simple, isn't it? And that's the gradient scale which we call the Tone Scale, Now, we put some arbitrary numbers on it. We've said the top is 40.0 and the middle is 20.0 and the bottom is 0.0. And what's at 0.0? Well, you're dead at 0.0, you're MEST. You're matter, energy, space and time with no life-animating factor. You're dead, in other words.

And at the top? You don't even vaguely have a body or energy. All you've got is the capability of making a lot of space because you can make space. That's the gradient scale and that's the Tone Scale.

Now, man seems to exist on this scale, arbitrarily, between 4.0 and 0.0; 4.0 is enthusiasm, 0.0 is dead, 0.1 is apathy, 3.5 is conservatism. In other words, we just – we come down – we come downscale from 4.0 toward death. And a person is as alive as he has life in him. Sounds obvious, doesn't it? But when we turn it around the other way and say he's as dead as he's got object, makes more sense.

You ever know a capitalist? They're really interesting people in terms of how much life they've got left in them, and the more matter they get, the longer they'll survive. Mm-hm. But what survives? An object survives. The pyramids are still there, but they certainly don't talk or have a good time, Now, what, then, is our goal? And why do we have this Tone Scale?

Well, you will find down at the bottom, you – neurotic, psychotic people consider words as objects. The words are objects to them. And time is an object. I've had people walk up to me and say, "Well, I'd gladly come out and see you, but have you got a radio?" "Well, what do you want a radio for?"

"Well, we've got to have a radio, so we can turn it on and get the time signal." "Why do you want a time signal?" "So I can keep track of the time."

They keep themselves tuned up with time, all right. There it goes, tickety-tick, tickety-tick.

Once in a while you will ask one of these people for a circuit or a phrase or something of the sort, and he'll reach in his pockets to find it for you, That's right. Words and thoughts are objects at that level of the scale. You'll have to observe this to really understand how this can be. But you'll find in processing a group, there'll be somebody in that group who's going to be literal-minded.

And they will say, "Did you say that? Well now, that couldn't be because ... That couldn't be. No. You really meant ..." And he'll be talking about some tiny, little fraction of a phrase. "Did you say 'of the walk' or 'on the walk'? Or did you say ... ?" And he'll be so puzzled.

And one day you'll be quoting something or something of the sort, and he'll say, "Ab-duh-uhem-bzzzt." He's just lost this idea. You're trying to get an idea across, you see? And he's lost the idea that you're trying to get an idea across, and say, "On the second line of that" – this is just like fingernails over the blackboard" to him, you see – "on the second line of that, it's THE not AND."

Words are objects. And this person is just getting solid. His thinking is solid, too. He's doing this stream of consciousness I've talked to you about. On and on and on, he does his stream of consciousness. Horrible? He thinks he thinks. All right.

The energy of the mind, then, is actually making a postulate, and the object and matter around it go into action. You tell something to go work and it works, because the human mind – I mean, the theta level way up at the top, 40.0 of the Tone Scale – actually, all he has to do to move an object is make a postulate to move it. And it works as well as it doesn't have any energy in it. and One can make postulates and have them work as well as he doesn't have any energy. But people think they've got a past, present and future in terms of energy. You ask

somebody, "Where's the past? By the way, do you know where the past is in relationship to your face? Do you know where the future is in relationship to your face? Do you know where present time is in relationship to your face?"

That immediately should appear to you as rather dull because most everybody has this. He thinks the future is over there to the right, and the past is over here to the left and slightly behind him, and present time is right out in front.

And that's just he's spent energy in thinking. And it's finally become a deposit. And when it becomes enough of a deposit, he's right there, he is. He gets an object, finally, as a time track.

Actually, time consists of nothing else but the position of particles. There's no energy mixed up in thinking and so on.

You can – there's another little technique that proves this. You can just suddenly decide that you're going to let go of some particles. You find some – there's – you always notice a slight pressure on the front of your face, so you decide one day that you don't like the pressure on the front of your face, so you decide to let go of the particles that are holding the particles that are pressing in. In other words, there's – just because there's pressure from outside, there must be some resistance toward that to make the pressure possible. All right, just let go of the particles that are holding that motion.

You can let go; the motion collapses. Now, you can do that consecutively. You just keep letting go of pressure areas – one side or the other – what's keeping the pressure from coming in and what's making the pressure come in, You can just keep letting go. It's a technique all by itself. You just sit there and you just find out what you're holding on to and let go, that's all.

Darnedest things happen. You get terrible pains and all sorts of things. You're just backing off, in other words, from particles. And the more particles you let go of, the better you feel. Isn't that odd?

This doesn't mean that you have to desert the universe in order to be healthy in it. No, you can eat up the whole universe if your digestion is zero enough.

Now, energy on a thought level and energy on a – that's the strange one, you know, that energy on a thought level was always thought to be something else. They kept telling you, "Well, this didn't – this energy is kind of an energy, but it's not like" – you find this in more books – "it's not like that stuff up there in the electric light. The energy of thought is something else." The dickens it is.

That electric light got there because somebody thought, not the reverse. Why every man wanted to go into the bottom of the scale and try to work up to the top, I don't know.

But you see, they say, "Well now, that stuff is crude and that's no good, and we don't want anything to do with it! That's material. And a materialist would be a person who would do something about that." Nobody ever thought of "It might be a product of some universal mind of some sort or another which can produce, by postulate, particles." That would be the

other way to, wouldn't it? That sounds wild, but it unfortunately works out that way, that this mind produces – theta-MEST produces these terminals and flows.

Now, let's look at this another way. They missed something on the design of the electric motor. Every time they write up the electric The motor, they write it up wrong. You can go and get your best textbooks on this subject, and a nuclear physicist looking this over, if he ever went back and looked them over, would immediately catch this blunder. I just happened to catch it in passing one day and I was very struck by it because they say – they give you everything necessary to make current with an electric generator. They tell you all about this and give you all the data you need, only if you'd never seen one, you'd never get any current out of one, because they neglect to describe the most important thing there: the base of the motor.

Of course, you know, huh – you think I mean some kind of a strange base like a logarithmic base. But I'm talking about that metal thing the motor is sitting on. It's just wonderful how they could neglect this one. But they don't give it any description. It's just not described, that's all.

It's what holds the terminals in time and space? And you get an electrical current just as long as you've got a base sitting there holding the terminals, the two terminals of the motor, in position.

And when you don't have a base sitting there to hold the two terminals of the motor in position, the two terminals snap together and you get no current. Kind of obvious. If you look in an electric motor, you'll find there's a positive side of it and there's a negative side of it, and those are terminals. And the wheel goes round and round and goes around inside of magnets, and mechanical effort makes it go around inside of magnets, that makes positive-negative, positive-negative, and you get a flow. It's a very simple thing, a motor.

If you didn't have any base there holding those positive and negative terminals apart, you wouldn't have any current because the positive and negative current – terminals would be right together. It takes a base to hold those two things apart, and that base is fastened to a table – or a platform, and that platform is generally fastened into the earth.

And the earth, by gravity and centrifugal and centripetal force, is fastened to the Moon – Sun just as the Moon is fastened to Earth. Earth is fixed in relationship to the Sun. And Earth is fixed in relationship to the Sun; and the Sun is fixed by gravity in relationship to the other galaxy, planets and that's – planets and the solar system, isn't it? And the solar system, well, that's fixed in relationship by gravity and so forth into – hm. Well, wait a minute, that's just fixed into the other systems and they composite into a galaxy, and the galaxy is held there as an island universe which is in position with an island of galaxies and that pass into a ... Oh, no? All we're doing all the way up is locating two terminals in space. Oh, no? No, no, this shouldn't happen to us. You mean God is the base of a motor? (audience laughter) No, fortunately that isn't true. He would be what is saying, "Stay apart" to the first two terminals that begins this endless chain, Anybody – time anybody said "Create," he must have said then "two terminals." And sure enough, by dymaxion geometry and many other proofs, the basic unit of the material universe happens to be two, not one.

So it's location and fixation in time and space which makes it possible for energy to be developed and used and transferred and handled, And you don't get location, fixed location, you're in bad shape.

Well now, we know about facsimiles and pictures in the mind, and we know all about these various things, and we know there are electronic things that go on with relationship to the body and we can measure these on an E-Meter; and we know that a person is as sane as he can hold them in time and space. And when he can't locate them and hold them fixed in time and space, he's very, very aberrated. And you patch him up by fixing it so that he can locate some of his memories and his beingness in time and space.

All you got to do is tell a psychotic, "Look at the wall," and he says, "What wall?"

And you say, "Well, go over and feel it and find out if there's a wall there."

He's liable to find out there's a wall there and get sane on you. He's located himself in time and space. Now, isn't this interesting?

We have a husband and wife. Husband is very unhappy, he's very upset, the wife is very unhappy. They're going in all directions and so forth. Well, the trouble is there, there are two terminals and they don't have a smooth flow between them. There's no interchange of flow, that's all. And so the both of them have a down-energy level. You spring them apart and team them up otherwise and they just work fine. It's almost as mechanical – they're just bodies, so they're almost as mechanical to handle as terminals on an electric motor, Oh, there's all sorts of manifestations occur on this basis. But at that moment, the second we realize this, that theta creates space and time and it also fixes or locates things in space and time, and the second we realize it does that, this problem falls apart. It's just like so much – just is poof. There isn't any problem to it. You could do anything with this, then, from there on.

Why? That's because when it gets down into the Levels of energy, you simply follow the parallel rules of energy and you're on safe ground, safe ground all the way down.

But isn't it interesting that I said that as more a mind got into energy and the more it handled energy, the less sane it was. Uh-oh. So this material universe and the solid object of insanity consists of more and more energy and thinking, and more and more energy and more and more energy, and then the guy is out the bottom.

Therefore, the more energy he had in terms of energy that he was using and the more he used these terminals and the more he got upset this way and that way by this, the worse off he'd get. Does it work out in the real universe? Believe me, it does.

You find the fellows who have agreed solidly with these terminals and energies and used terminals and energies – are they aberrated. They're in bad shape. Look at engineers. (audience laughter) And you go right down the line with this. So what's the solution, what's the solution? To follow these terminals? To locate new terminals? Well, by empirical testing taking place over a period of many years, it is discovered that this is not the route. It's a good route, but it's interminable. A guy gets better but he doesn't go out through the roof.

So what do you do? Well, you back him off from doing this, obviously, if that one didn't work. But that's right all the way, then let's put him up Tone Scale, which is all we've been trying to do anyway, and let's get him out to a basis where he's again operating in postulates and is not using terminals, where he is creating particles, not using particles he already finds lying around. Let's get him into a level of creation where he is able to command what he wants, not have to beg for it. And we find he's in good shape. So, we've got Creative Processing, and that's why Creative Processing produces such a fantastic result. It's very rapid.

Now, when you address a person, then, and start giving him mock-ups, you're calling upon him to create. You're calling upon him to create energy, to create new terminals. And you're calling upon him to perform the highest function of theta. And so he gets better and better and better and better, and then he can go right on up the Tone Scale.

But if you turned around and you said, "Now look, you're not supposed to create any of these things. You use the electrodes which we provide, and you use the MEST universe only," you get sick.

And does this work out in practice? Yes, and believe me it does, And so Creative Processing – we have that right as the heart of Creative Processing.

Huh, if a guy got very sick by using all the terminals he finds lying around that he didn't create here in the MEST universe, then he should get well by creating his own terminals. You rehabilitate his ability to create terminals, and the stress, strain, importance of energy in this universe becomes less and less important.

Does this mean he backs out of this universe and leaves it forever? No. He becomes quite capable of handling it.

[At this point there is a gap in the original recording.]

===== LGC-3 continued

[This is where the old reel labeled LGC-3 begins. The R&D version was checked against the old reel from here on.]

Continuing this third lecture, we find out, as we'll hear later, that from zero, one can create a particle. And I mean zero time, space.

I mean 40.0 on this Tone Scale. But when one is holding a lot of particles, he can't create particles. This is all quite interesting, and you will much more readily suppose it to be terribly technical and out of the reach of your grasp the more you try to think about it. And if you try to think hard enough about it and if you ponder it enough, I can convince you without any trouble that you'll be having an awful time with it.

It's actually a terrible simplicity, and you sort of have to let go of an awful lot of particles to grasp it. We don't need a lot of theories. It's strange, now that we have this, how all of this data, and what tremendous data, comes tumbling into our hands.

For instance, not too long ago – solved sex. You know, this would be very interesting, if you solved sex in terms – in such terms that you could solve all this fellow's sexual problems and all the children's sexual problems and all this sort of thing – I mean, that should be first-line news. Why? Because the libido theory in 1894, it said sex was the root of everything. It doesn't happen to be; it's quite important though. And if you could solve that, why, gee, you ought to rush out here on the street and throw up banners and say, "Hurray, hurray, hurray. We've solved this big riddle, or we've solved this big problem and Sigmund Freud was so puzzled with it and now we've solved psychoanalysis and we got the basis of psychoanalysis and we can make psychoanalysis work everyday."

You'd think you'd do that. It's not that important. And yet it's solved. It's not important.

The reason it's not important is because what is important here is a terrible simplicity. That is to say, you're operating, The best of a man is that which has no substance in it, and the worst of a man is that which has lots of substance in it in terms of materialism. And there's where your big argument came in between the materialist and the fellow who figured he should be soulful or something of the sort.

And there's your Hindu trying to desert MEST; he's trying to deny himself everything and so forth. Well, he does all that except one thing: he didn't know how to get out of his body.

There's just nothing to these tricks they pull on you. It's the essence of simplicity. They denied themselves everything except living – I mean, except dying (going on reverse flow here). Anyway ...

Now, a particle would be any object whether as so minute as to be minute beyond minute beyond minute, submicroscopic, or the Empire State Building. It wouldn't matter. In other words, you could have a particle that you couldn't see in a microscope, or a particle the size – a complex particle the size of this galaxy. They would still be a particle, you see? We could say one particle.

Well, we deal a lot with particles. We have to know quite a little bit about particles; we know this subject well But we don't have to know anything like you'd think we'd have to know. We just have to know there's such a thing as a particle. A particle is a particle. A particle only does three things; a particle starts, stops, changes. Those are the laws of motion: start, stop, change. All right.

So particles start, particles stop and particles change. And if you've ever had a lot of children – I mean, you know that they sure can start, stop and change at the darnedest times.

Now therefore, a person – he gets so that he can only start and he can't stop or he can keep going. He can persist, in other words, without changing. See, no change is the trouble with him. He can't change – inability.

And your child is very stupid, let's say. All right, the trouble with that child is he's very stupid, and there's something that doesn't permit him to change. No matter how hard you try, he stays on being stupid. So much so that it was officially released and is accepted as a scientific datum that IQ cannot be altered! That is nothing like nailing everybody to the cross and saying, "Oh, let's all give up and die." IQ certainly is one of the most alterable things. As a matter of fact, an auditor simply by starting to audit out an engram can shift IQ as much as fifteen points. One session, he just starts and, say, ten minutes of auditing – shift, I'm not saying bad or good. You can drive them down and drive them up and make them level off. IQs are very easy to alter. Well, we evidently were dramatizing a no-change there, you see?

And particles of motion: As one continues through time, then, one has these three things that can happen. Of course, the reverse of them can happen. There's the person who can't start, there's the person who can't stop, and there's the person who can't change, as well as the person who starts and the person who stops and the person who changes. He's got those various characteristics.

Now, the three parts of behavior are thought, emotion and effort. You think about something, that's pretty high on the scale. A little bit lower than that, you feel some emotion about it – sensation of emotion. Much lower on the scale, you get in there and put some strength to it. You think about opening the door, there's possibly some emotion about opening doors, and then you put the effort to the doorknob and open the door. Human activity is divisible into these three parts,

We have, then, three more important data that you should run into in this subject and know, and that's affinity, reality, communication.

What is affinity? Affinity is what they've been calling love and a lot of other things. In the material universe it's known as cohesiveness and adhesiveness; in human behavior, call it affinity. There's affinity or no affinity. All the emotions come under that heading. And the emotions are all graphed on this Tone Scale as you can see in a copy of Self Analysis.

Reality. Reality is that on which we're agreed. Any philosopher writing down through the ages has come to that as an agreement, by the way. "We don't know what we sense, we just know that we know that we sense; we don't know that the perception is there, we simply know that we know a perception is there." And they've talked about this for a long time. And you work this around and stir it around and so forth, and there's one positive thing that you can come up against. You can be fairly sure that reality and agreement have something a great deal in common; more than that, they're interchangeable.

There's reality – really consists of agreement and disagreement. In electric-terminal flow there is merely agreement and disagreement: one way, and then they go the other way. And you find out that as people agree, they have a flow somewhere around them. And as they disagree, there's a flow. If you get the feeling of agreeing with something, you're liable to pick up a flow. Sometimes you get the feeling of disagreeing with something, you're liable to feel like you've had your head knocked off or something by a flow. And it's very interesting that agreement and disagreement are in terms of flows and that these do composite what most people say is reality. They say, "It isn't real." "Well, why isn't it real?" They won't be able to answer that unless you sort it out in terms of agreement.

"Well, did somebody tell you it wasn't real?"

"Yeah."

"Did you agree with that person?"

"Yeah."

"It's not real, then, is it?"

"No."

"Well, why isn't it real?"

"Well, it's just not real."

I mean, they'll come back to that one and sag every time, because they think there's something real about the word real. It's an object, you see? And it has no meaning at all!

What's real? You go down to the tribe of the Wongabullas and you'll find out that anything that we consider reality up here probably is unreality down there in terms of customs and behavior or anything else. And you go over to Ireland and you go around in some of the back roads of Ireland, you're going to find that there's a great deal of reality as to leprechauns and other things over there; there are all kinds of things over there. You don't agree they're there; you're not going to see them either.

Now therefore, just by that route and because it works – no other reason really than that one; this happens to work – there is reality in terms of agreement. We agree heavily enough on reality.

There are various tests one can enter on in this. You can make anything real to a person who's hypnotized. You say, if everybody got just sufficiently and thoroughly enough hypnotized, he would see a MEST universe. You don't believe this, sometimes get a hypnotist to hypnotize somebody who is a good subject and get him to paint up a whole universe and have that whole universe be real to that person. It'll work, it'll work. Of course, I'm not inferring that everybody is hypnotized into believing there's a universe here. (audience laughter) Now, a one-word description of what we are trying to do to people, though, it fits right in right there. We're trying not to force people around; we're trying to un hypnotize them. We're trying to wake them up, not put them to sleep. We're trying to make them more alert, not more dull.

And then there's a third member of that triangle – and that's a triangle, by the way. It's an interesting triangle, because at any level of this Tone Scale I talk to you about, you'll get the same levels of that triangle.

The communication, the reality and the affinity at that level will be the same for that level. You don't have communication sitting one place on that Tone Scale and reality sitting another place and affinity sitting someplace else, You'll find them all at the same level.

So, they are the three behavior characteristics of life "energy": affinity, reality and communication.

What's life composed of? It's composed of affinity, reality, communication. When a communication is low, affinity and reality are low; when reality is low, affinity and communication are low; when affinity is low – get that one, when affinity is low; because boy, does this – this theory of ARC has been just sitting around just for ages; just backed up because it was so workable, no other reason.

And all of a sudden, as I'm going to show you here in tonight's lecture, that we ran into it just head-on, on the subject of ARC. And it all comes back to ARC. You can't agree with somebody you're not in communication with. It's very hard to love somebody who doesn't exist for you. In other words, ARC: You've got to have communication to have affinity to have reality. You've got to have three of those three things, You can't have two of them.

And you'll realize this sometime. You take a little child and he comes to school and he's going uuss-phll-uuss-phll. And he's snuffling and crying and he ... You could sit him down in a chair and let him come over it. But if you'll just lead him out by making him ... I don't care what he says to you. He says, "One, two, three, four, five," or anything of the sort. If you just make him communicate, (snap) he'll snap out of it.

Why? Well, he'll realize somebody does love him. Why does he realize that? That's because he's communicating with somebody. That's all. I mean, it's just as simple – terribly mechanical like that. ARC: affinity, reality, communication. Now, there's a lot to know about those, but that's good enough.

Now, actually, the Tone Scale was originally plotted out by behavior, from observation of the behavior of a preclear as he came up Tone Scale, plotted where the emotions belonged on that Tone Scale.

The next thing that happened was to find out that ARC plotted on that Tone Scale from 0.0 at the bottom to 40.0 at the top. And it was all worked out from the basis of ARC theoretically, and then came back into the MEST universe and took a look around to find out if that still agreed. And it still agreed and it still held good and is as good today as it was years ago. So we have – we have that as a good stability to work with. And when all other problems of human relationship, all problems of human relationship seem to be bogged down, when you can't get anywhere, when there's something that can't be done, remember there's ARC. What's happening with regard to ARC? And you can solve it.

This person is making you unhappy. You say, 'This person is making me unhappy. Always makes me unhappy. Never blah-de-blah-de-blah making me unhappy. Nnaa-dduuhh-dduuhh, I blah don't see anybody – makes me unhappy.' And so on. What's your solution? Cut the communication line? What happens then? Well, you don't have an agreement or a parity level of affinity. That's simple, isn't it? That's all there is to that – person makes you unhappy. That says – well, that says that you'd have to advise some husband to leave home. Yeah, that's right. All right, we'll go on to the next one. (audience laughter) The full Tone Scale, then, interplays and interweaves thought, emotion and effort; start, stop and change; affinity, reality and communication. Because at the top of the Tone Scale things start, the middle of the Tone Scale they are holding in a consistency or changing it, and at the bottom of the Tone Scale, they're stopped, How stopped can you get? Dead!

When you're dealing with children, you will realize that the – you will sometimes believe that the child is very badly off who is in a lot of motion all the time. No, the one who is very badly off is the kid who just sits there. He just sits there. That's really bad off. He's bottom scale. So we get on the full Tone Scale an interweave, then, of these factors. And a cycle of action of life starts in at 40.0 – just thought, no energy, nothing there but space – and progresses on through its cycle of action to middle age where we have everything very conservative, to old age where you have death. And that would be the cycle of one lifetime or – get this – the cycle of any action. It starts, it persists and it stops. Then it has to change violently before it can start again, doesn't it? And so you have death intervene.

Well, we won't go into that too deeply. We know that you can plot any person in your group or plot the level of your group by using these factors, and you don't have to know too much about this.

What's the level of their communication? You have a graph in Self Analysis that tells you what their level of communication would be. That is to say, you know they don't communicate with you. There's a cut line, Well, it says in that graph in Self Analysis where a cut line is. And you can expect what the affinity and what the reality will be of that.

Now, you'll know, then, whether this group is getting better or getting worse by whether or not they change on the Tone Scale. If they don't change on the Tone Scale, they're not changing. So you want to watch – a Group Auditor wants to watch a group in terms of that Tone Scale.

And watch this, the person who sits silently, motionless, communicates nothing and so forth is down there close to death. And when this person starts to get well, this person is going to do all sorts of things. He's going to go into grief; he's got to get up to afraid of things; up above that, they get angry – and that's the worst because what you're liable to find out as a Group Auditor is all of a sudden this group is very antagonistic towards you. You know what you're doing. But don't think you've failed; you're making them well. Let them roar. You know what's wrong with them.

The next level up from that, they're all bored with it. "Do we have to do that anymore? Why do we have to do that some more? We don't have to do that anymore, do we? Ah, let's do something else. We're bored. We're bored." Keep at it because above the next level of boredom is being very conservative about how they're doing it, and right above that level they get very enthusiastic.

What do you know, so if you've stopped at boredom, you have lost the game, just as if you would have stopped at antagonism.

This group hates your guts, that's 1,5, Gee, if you haul a group up to 1,5, you've really done something? You say, "Rarr-rarr-rarr-ruff." (audience laughter)

It's interesting to watch, but if your group doesn't change its manifestation, nothing's happening, so watch that.

And you should know this Tone Scale pretty well and you have a good picture of it there in Self Analysis. As a matter of fact, it's the only published edition of it right at the moment and should give you quite a bit of material to deal with.

These are the mechanics, then, of what you're dealing ... You're trying to get a no-zero – I mean, a no-energy thing, really a no-zero thing because there is something there; no wavelength. In other words, it isn't describable in terms of the MEST universe, it's all you're saying when you say it's – hasn't any wavelength, no location. You're trying to get this capability as high and as workable and as operable as possible, And as long as that capability increases, you're all right. But when a person starts losing those capabilities of organization and so forth, alignment that are top Tone Scale, and it starts drifting down, down, down into matter, they think slower and slower, they think worse and worse, they're less and less rational and they finally go on out the bottom; or they just hang fire someplace very low on the scale and they're not much use or benefit to anyone. Their interest Level dwindles down, down, down as that scale is descended.

The people you'll be processing lie normally well below 4.0 and most commonly lie between 2.5 and 0.1.

(Recording ends abruptly)