

GENERAL HANDLING OF A PC

A lecture given on
26 April 1954

Okay. This is the 26th of April 1954.

Want to talk to you now about the general handling of a preclear and what you do, when you do it.

First, goals. Here we have this composite being; he's a somethingness, he's a nothingness. He is in continuous contact with empty space and solid forms and fluid energies. He's able to duplicate; he's able to produce space; he's able to handle energy; he's able to actually make objects. He's able to create; he's able to destroy; and he certainly is surviving.

Well, what are we going to do with this fellow? Basically, we're trying to pick up his level of knowingness; that's what we're really trying to do. But below that level, when we have to do with space, energy, masses, objects and so forth, we are trying to get him to be willing to assume any viewpoint in the whole universe; trying to get him willing to assume any viewpoint in the universe.

I went over this about glasses. An individual who is unwilling to see is an individual who is unwilling to assume a viewpoint. Person goes around with a pair of glasses on and you process him and process him and process him. Oh sure, you're getting his ideas shifted around, you're getting him changed, but he has not yet become willing to accept the viewpoint of himself - his own viewpoint. He's still wearing glasses. He doesn't want a blurred viewpoint, and this protest against a blurred viewpoint makes his eyes more and more blurred. Any optometrist can tell you that the more glasses you fit on people, the more glasses you're going to fit on people. The glasses themselves are a protest against a viewpoint. They're also an effort to protect the eyes, which is protection of a viewpoint. They're an invisible barrier. But it's an unwillingness to assume a viewpoint.

Now, how does this all work out for an auditor? It works out that an auditor progresses a case as far as he is able to make the case tolerant of other viewpoints than his own. This would sound to you as though nobody would be well unless he was out of valence into everybody else's valence over the whole universe. That doesn't happen to be true. That's the bottom of the Tone Scale. The individual is compulsively out of valence on his own choice. He could be in anything's, anybody's valence assuming any spot in space to view from, or to create any spot in space to view from. And it tells you very, very adequately what is the value of ethics and human decency and so forth. Are these things all kind of lowscale and kind of no good, and is that individual best off who is the most cruel and selfish and so on? Well, the moment that you really establish in the field of your own knowingness this fact about viewpoints, all those questions about ethics, mores, blow up. They all blow up.

What is the optimum nature for man? What is it? Cruelty? Force? Meanness? Viciousness? Sweetness and light? What is it? If you've ever known anybody who was obsessively cruel, you might also know this: that he sure wouldn't permit anybody to be cruel to him. Did you ever notice that?

I can imagine back in the medieval times when they had these boys in charge of these torture chambers that if you had approached any one of those torturers with a good hot iron he would have pleaded very, very hard with you. I dare say he would have abased himself.

Of course, we can talk about the DED-DEDEX, overt act-motivator sequence, and so forth, but this is just phenomena. The fact of the matter is that an individual who is motivator hungry has blocked himself off from assuming too many viewpoints by creating too many motivators. He's knocked off too many people. He's killed too many back along the track. He's been too cruel.

too mean. And he finally gets to the point where he realizes that he has just shut off any idea of having feminine viewpoints or masculine viewpoints or viewpoints of horses or dogs or anything else. Why? He was cruel to all of these beings, and so if he assumes their viewpoints, he assumes the viewpoint of something that is having cruelty done to it, so he can't assume this viewpoint. And so he feels, though, that there must be some mechanism by which he can sort of cave things in on himself so he can get himself up to a point of where he can have those viewpoints back.

Well, the best way to do that is to be motivator hungry, that is to say let himself be hammered and pounded and chewed up and pushed in on and so on. Well, this is covered elsewhere at much greater length. You'll find many a preclear that comes to you simply is motivator hungry. He really isn't aberrated, as you would think of aberration. He's just so motivator hungry that he wants you to key in a lot of engrams on him so that he'll get a lot of somatics. He's trying to equalize this problem here of viewpoints. He wants you to beat him up real bad.

The truth of the matter is if you were to simply haul off and slug him every time he came to a session he would probably go away feeling much better. You see? He's trying to prove many things, amongst them that it's - you can tolerate being slugged as hard as he has slugged people. See, he's trying to prove this, so he lets himself get slugged.

Overt act-motivator sequences in terms of viewpoints become very interesting, but that's only one set of phenomena. The point is that you want your preclear to be able to tolerate any viewpoint in the whole universe. And he should be able to tolerate it with the idea that he might be inhabiting just that viewpoint forever on. Take the viewpoint now of a bacteria in a cesspool. Get the idea now of being nothing but that for the next, oh, couple of centuries. Get that idea? Your preclear who's having a rough time says, "Oh no, no. Terrible. Gosh no!" Well, that's the surest cure because if he keeps saying, "No-no, no-no"... I mean, the surest road downward if he keeps saying, "No no, bacteria, oh the idea of bugs and disease and... oh no, not for me!" Well, one day so he's a bacteria. He resists it, you see. He doesn't want that viewpoint, doesn't want that viewpoint, which is what then?

Now get this: A viewpoint makes space, doesn't it? All right, if he doesn't want that viewpoint and doesn't want that viewpoint, his own viewpoint is collapsing in all the time, isn't it? He's trying to get back away from that viewpoint which extends the space commanded by the other viewpoint. It extends the space of the unwanted viewpoint. Pulling back from a viewpoint then extends the space of an unwanted viewpoint. You could see this in a graph. Do you see this? Get a mental picture of that. You've got Bill, and Bill keeps pulling back because he doesn't want Joe's viewpoint, and of course he is extending... all the time he's extending Joe's viewpoint.

Well, he gets the idea finally that there's only one viewpoint left in the world. Well, it's because that's the only space, see. The only space left in the world is being made by Joe. In order to have any space at all, he has to be Joe. And there is the basic mechanism behind the winning valence. In order to have any space at all, he eventually has to assume the viewpoint which he's been negating against, and that's the mechanism of the winning valence.

Now, if you understand that you'll see how your preclear being up against a (quote) "detestable person," has eventually withdrawn, resisted, withdrawn, pulled back from, jockeyed around with that other viewpoint until that other viewpoint apparently is the only thing that is making space anywhere around him. So in order to have any space, he has to flick over and be that other viewpoint, and we get a change of valence. That which men fear, they become. That's a cinch. That which men resist, they become.

Now, you know the Christian idea of turn the other cheek? Well, let's get a comparable idea in Scientology. Not comparing Scientology to Christianity, but let's get the comparable idea. The Christian idea of turn the other cheek had a little truth in it. Let's get the comparable idea, and that is assume the other viewpoint. No more vicious and horrible person could possibly be alive than one who is willing to assume any viewpoint whatsoever. The MEST universe has rigged up

more fairy tales to condemn people who would do this. "Why, the dog! He... Everything was going along and it started to go sort of in reverse where he was so he just changed his viewpoint. Kill him!"

The Khan is king and the Khan is king and long live the Khan, long live the Khan, long live the Khan. The Khan squared comes along and kills the Khan, so he says, "Long live Khan squared, long live Khan squared, long..." He doesn't give a damn who's king. He'd just as soon be king as not. Well, you say, "Well look, he doesn't get into many games that way." He sure doesn't get in much trouble either. But if Khan squared suddenly finds out that this fellow was saying, "Long live the Khan," why, Khan squared is immediately upset by this.

You see, the MEST universe really wouldn't be here at all unless people didn't object to shifting viewpoints. People insist continually on a persistent viewpoint. They say you must have the same viewpoint over and over, day after day, year after year, century after century, and if they could enforce it they would put you into solid concrete and give you just the one viewpoint at the center of the solid concrete and say, "There you are and you had certainly better stay there or we'll get impatient with you." You can't control anybody who won't assume the same viewpoint continuously.

Now, in essence what are we fighting, then, on this top of the curve - create, survive, destroy; what are we fighting? As an auditor we're actually resisting something else. We're resisting a persistence.

Here this preclear sits there and he won't change his ideas and he won't change his ideas and he won't change his ideas and he won't change...uhrnrnrnnn, won't change. What's he really doing? He's persisting in the same viewpoint. Now, a viewpoint could mean opinion but it actually means a point from which one views. And the fact that one is viewing things from a point, that itself creates space. There is no space without a view. I mean, if one didn't view, if there weren't viewpoints there wouldn't be any space.

All right, here's our problem with the preclear: He's sitting there, won't change his viewpoint, won't change his viewpoint. Well, supposing you just started to straightwire him. Let's say you ran technique Zed and technique Alpha and technique Q and technique "Alpea" and all sorts of techniques on this preclear, and he's just stirring the energy round and round and round and round and he's still wearing glasses. His eyesight is still the same; he isn't getting any perception increases and decreases, nothing like this. Oh, he's just sitting there stirring energy. He probably has a machine going which he has set up some time or another to get him out of a theta trap, and all it does is sit there and dig. And all really you're doing is you've got your preclear sitting there watching this machine dig in a mass of energy. He won't get anyplace.

Every once in a while I see an auditor working hard, earnest and very, very alert, on the ball, doing everything he's supposed to do he thinks, working with a preclear who is doing this trick. But one of these machines is just shoveling universes around, shoveling this around, shoveling that around, just an automaticity going on. And the preclear fully, fully believes he's being audited for the good reason that somatics turn on and off. He sees changes in his perceptic field. Sure he does. If you dumped a ton of molasses in front of him, he'd see a different set of molasses, wouldn't he? He'd see a ton of molasses. In other words, he'd sure get a perception change. Well, he's working on a machine there that is just simply shoveling the molasses around. It'll shovel them in and shovel it out and so on. No increase in case level. You want to watch this preclear that's doing this to you.

How do you know he's doing it to you? Well, he didn't get well in ten minutes, so he's doing it to you. I mean, let's just be completely extreme about the whole thing. Let's be completely unreasonable. If he didn't get completely well and Clear in ten minutes, then he's just shoveling energy around and he's dodging. You could take the completely unreasonable attitude as an auditor... You'd get a long ways if you did this. You would. You'd get a long ways if you did this. A completely unreasonable attitude as an auditor that it's a personal affront that he didn't get cleared in ten minutes. He's gone through a little Opening Procedure. You said, "Be three

feet back of your head, duplicate the room several times, duplicate nothing several times. Okay, now grab onto the two back corners of the room. Now, give me some places where you're not. Okay. Now, how's your perception?" "Oh, ... urn-urn-urn-urn, it's all black." "Well, you dirty dog. Here I've given you some of the best seconds of my life and you're not cleared."

Well, of course, if he said, well, his perception is fair and so forth, you just run him on through a two-minute Grand Tour, you know. "Sun moon Earth sun moon Earth sun moon Earth sun moon Earth, be in the center of the sun, center of the moon, center of the Earth, got that? Okay. Be outside the Earth, inside the Earth, outside the Earth, inside the Earth, outside the Earth, inside the Earth, outside the Earth, inside the Earth, sun moon Earth, sun moon Earth sun moon Earth sun moon Earth sun moon, outside the sun, inside the sun, outside the sun, inside the sun, outside the sun, inside the sun, inside the moon, outside the moon, inside the sun. Okay, take a dive through Mars. Oh, you bopped. Well, let's get back up and dive real slow down to the surface till you establish where the force screen area is. That's right. Now go on through it. Now go on through the rest of Mars and out the other side. Good, you did that? Swell. Be in the center of Mars, outside of Mars, center of Mars, outside of Mars, center of Mars, outside of Mars. Okay, duplicate yourself several times. Pull in four or five universes on yourself Now throw them away. Now duplicate all the universes you're mixed up in. Now separate them all. Okay, that's good. Now take any viewpoint you please. Now take a look around. Now take the viewpoint inside of a pretty girl's head. Now make her swear. Oh, she did, good. Now be three feet back of her head, be three feet back of your chair. Thank you very much. Pay the cashier twenty-five dollars."

That's the way a case ought to work, see. If they don't, it's a personal affront. It means that they're running down your ability and your magnetism. They're running down your understanding. They're avoiding you. They don't mean business. They came in there to be hit, be kicked in the shins. They're motivator hungry. They don't know where they are. They don't want to know where they are. They're uncooperative. Hell with them. Complete. I mean, you get a lot further with a completely unreasonable attitude. Sure, you're perfectly willing to be a preclear that can't see, can't feel, can't hear. As a matter of fact mock yourself up as one. You do? Now mock yourself up as one that can. Okay, you can. All right, that's fine. I mean, if you had this completely unserious sort of an outrageous attitude about it, oh, you'd be a hell of an auditor, believe me.

The funny part of it is, is years ago I had a technique, you might say, whereby I asked the fellow to do this, to do that, do something else, do something else. He couldn't do these things, see. I'd get up, I'd take a look at him, I would be stunned, I would be amazed, I would be shocked. I'd walk out on the front steps and I would sit down with my chin in the palm of my hand just to get some air, just to cool off. This guy would be sitting there wondering what the hell was going on. I'd finally just give him a long communication lag. "Well, how can you live? Frankly, how can you live? What business have you got coming to see me? How could you walk up the steps? Now, do you want to try this over again, see if you can do a little better? All right, sit down on the chair. Okay, shut your eyes. Now, let's take a look at any scene you can see. Okay? Now let's take a look at your mother's face."

"Um-hum, um-hum. Yeah, I can see it. I can see it." "Take a look at your father's face." "Oh no, he was..."

"What? Take a look at your father's face again. You can't see your father... Oh, my God!" Walk outside and sit down on the steps again.

Actually, every now and then I'd get a preclear who thought he was going to run me around in circles, see, and I had no tolerance with his aberration, no patience with it or anything else.

Now, you've got to be careful how you work this. If you did this to a psycho, he'd just sit there in the middle of the floor and say, "Well, I really am crazy," and go on in and spin. But this is just a little gag technique. It has no great workability at all. The only thing it does is crowd on the force. It's a very good attitude for you as an auditor to have, not necessarily good for the

preclear. You understand that there could be processes that were terribly good for the auditor and awfully hard on the preclear. Shooting is one of them.

All right. When we go into this problem of viewpoints, what was wrong with this fellow who wouldn't see his mother's face or father's face or something of the sort? He was just unwilling to assume that viewpoint. He was scared something would happen to him. And in view of the fact all you're trying to do is get somebody to change his mind, there are many ways that you can make somebody change his mind.

Now, how could you sneak up on this? How could you sneak up on it? "Okay, now let's see. Let's check over some people that you wouldn't mind - if you had to, if you had the opportunity - let's check over some people you wouldn't mind creating. Check over some people that you wouldn't be ashamed of having created. Come on now, let's get one."

And the case that's having a rough time will just say, "My God, somebody I wouldn't mind having created, oh, oh, oh nobody human. Uh... dogs, no. Horses-oh, damn horses. Let's see. Anything I can create." Finally he'll say, "I wouldn't have minded having created Christ." Something on that order.

"All right, let's get another one." "Let's see, let's see. Well, maybe... maybe Thomas Edison. Yeah, I wouldn't have minded having created Thomas Ed-"

By the way, your preclear about this time is liable to come into the possession of some of the most horrible somatics that he's ever had just on that process. "Just check off some persons you wouldn't mind having created." A person who can't assume other viewpoints readily, of course, can't think of any. He doesn't want to have created any of them. Hell with the whole lot of them, see.

Now, there's one method of sneaking up on a case. Another method: "What would be the..." - just going in for gunshot methods, what would be the super method of all methods - "What would it be safe for you to know?" That is a Straightwire question. I asked a person this question four or five times just in fun one night when I was experimenting a little bit, and I just asked him this question in fun and he went over it. And I didn't think he was getting anything out of it at all but he was sick the next day. He called up for some sympathy, and so I said, "You don't mean it." So I straightwired him a little while longer, and we ran the somatic on through, whatever had happened on the thing, and straightened him up.

But that's a sneaker. It's funny that there are several of these little sneakers. around that you could ask a preclear and he would innocently answer them, and it'd make him sicker than a horse. Horses are ordinarily sick. I know that by reading colloquial dictionaries. Everybody gets sicker than a horse. So obviously horses are quite sick.

Anyway, we get into a point where preclears are as sick as they will not assume other viewpoints. And their ARC triangle is as good as they are willing to assume other viewpoints. And their freedom is as great as they do not add conditions to viewpoints. Every time you add a condition it's a symptom of fear. So, there you are. That means somebody is withdrawing in the face of many other viewpoints - sooner or later he's going to have to assume those viewpoints in order to be alive at all.

You might say extreme individuation is produced by nothing more nor less than being presented with detestable viewpoints. A person becomes an individual and becomes individuated, you might say, to that degree - this is stimulus-response individuation; you know, compulsive, obsessive individuation - to the degree that he has been confronted with detestable viewpoints. That would make the greatest man and the most famous man alive that man who had been consistently confronted with the most detestable viewpoints.

No thetan in his right mind, unless he is well outside the body, would ever think of making a body famous, or terrifically individual, or enormously individuated, because that's silly, that's a

silly thing to do. Set yourself up as a target. Well, you sure must be wanting in randomness to set yourself up as a target for all existence. Anybody that cares to review this should look over some of the more aberrated personalities of our times.

Well, let's take one. Let's take Eisenhower. Now, that surprises you. I mean, he's currently the president of the United States of America. Now, as the president of the United States ... Of course, he is the president of the United States. It has nothing to do with his official position. It just has to do with his personal beingness. Here is a man who is a very small man, and he pushed himself up through all the ranks and he pushed himself on up further and further and further and further and further. Well, the further he gets up the line the less rational he operates. Look at his career and you'll find out that he's now politically taking his finger off of his number occasionally. He gave a speech on the radio the other day, try and convince everybody that an economic depression had set into the United States. Did you hear that speech? Fascinating. There is no depression in the United States. The only way you would really get into power in the United States is to produce one. Fascinating.

We've got atom bombs, H-bombs going off down here in the South Pacific like chains of Chinese fire crackers. Why? You got a cloudy day today by the way just because of the concussion wave of the last A-bomb that went off

You think. I'm kidding and that people are being real hashed up about the weather and so on. The government is trying to get some backlash on this, saying "Well, the atom bomb can't effect the weather." The amount of rain that can be induced by target practice with naval cannon is quite measurable. What is it all about? I mean, you just send condensation and condensation-rarefaction waves through the atmosphere at a great rate of speed, and you naturally will produce changes in the particles of the atmosphere. This isn't even vaguely difficult to understand. So you explode something only four or five thousand miles from here, of the sudden shock enough to wipe out a whole island and it'll naturally throw a concussion wave through the Earth, much less through the air.

There was a mountain that blew up down in the South Pacific that actually didn't blow up with any greater - Krakatoa, I think the name of the mountain was. It blew up with considerable violence. It simply exploded. But actually there was really no more mass involved than was involved with the disappearance of that atoll that went up with the last H-bomb. About the same volume of mass and yet the world had red sunsets after Krakatoa exploded for about fifteen or twenty years. It took that long for the dust to settle out of the atmosphere. Well, if you don't think that an H-bomb can change the weather for you and give you, five or six hours after its explosion, even, a cloudy day whereby you had a clear bright day before, you'd better go back and read about Krakatoa and what it did to the weather. Boy, it changed weather all over the place.

Actually, if you'd been very alert and had known the exact instant the bomb was going off and you had experienced - you know, known the exact moment, your time, that that last H-bomb was going off - if you'd been very, very careful to be very observing, and if you'd stood in your bare feet someplace where the ground is not otherwise moving, you could have felt the thing go off

I mean, it was... it's big. It knocks all the seismographs off of their pins. The Geiger counters at Harvard blow up and fuse out every time they blow one. And a little Geiger counter which I've got - always have a little fun with the newspapers by calling up and asking very indignantly about the A-bomb. "Has there been an attack on New York?" I normally say or something of this sort just to get them upset. Because the little Geiger counter I've got sitting up there - whenever one of these things goes off - all you have to do, you know, is seal it so that if anything activates it you know it's been activated. You come back and take a look at it. You know that there's been some radioactive material someplace or another, because its needle's gone off its pins. Well, that little thing the other day went whir, click and broke itself. Just a little Geiger counter, it doesn't amount to anything. Send the government a bill, I guess.

Anyway, here you have somebody that's in there, he's really trying, see, he's got to rrrrr... Nobody quite believes he's president. They probably believed he was a general. But he's getting more backlash from the US than he could possibly stand up to. For instance, they have a big starvation of cattle and all of that sort of thing, you know, and they had... Remember that? And he didn't even give anybody any help. They just cancelled all the Democratic Party programs and everything else just suddenly. Nobody gave any food to it and the beef got upset and so forth. Well, boy, right about that time, when he took his finger off his number, he started getting backlash. You're going to find this boy... And this is just a little prediction. He's only been in office a year now. We got a three-ring circus and three years to go. Now, I don't want this publicly quoted, that's why I'm putting it on tape. We've got three years with a little man who had to be famous, and they're going to be rough.

In the first place, what's the training of a general? Well, somebody comes up and says, "Well, I don't feel like working today. Think I'll go play golf" A general says, "Sir, you will report to your quarters and hold yourself under arrest for the convenienation of the court-martial board." Private doesn't polish his shoes, "Shoot him."

As a matter of fact, this guy Eisenhower shot the only American soldier to be shot for desertion since 1854, something on that order, way back, some such date. In a century nobody has shot a soldier for desertion, and Eisenhower during the last war heard of an isolated case, little guy by the name of Slovik. He up and had him shot, just like that, boom. "Got to make that... got to make that postulate stick, see. What I say goes."

Well, the American public don't happen to be soldiers, they're not even good privates. When you get them in as officers you tear your hair out by the roots. You say, "How can this happen to an army or a navy?" Fellow comes in, throws his golf clubs in the corner of his stateroom and comes out on deck in a pair of sneakers and an old cap and thinks he's on a yachting trip, and the odd part of it is the guy will get his job done.

Well, what's the dismay of somebody who is accustomed to complete obedience all through the years of his life, who says to the American public, "Now, what we want is a reduced consumption of lollipops because our production of lollipops is something or other..." And the American public says, "Where's some more lollipops," see, chomp-chomp-chomp. "Now, I want you all to cooperate so that we won't have anymore deflationary inflation," and so forth. Everybody says, "What's that the guy... the loud voice over there someplace, hah-hah-hah." They don't want anything to do with it. They're not soldiers and this is going to drive that boy mad before he gets through. That's just a little prediction. This is 1954, look at it in 1957. Just make you a little bet, unless somebody does the same for him as they did for the last president.

The... you should know that the psychiatrist in charge of the case of the last president was a deep student of Dianetics, and never missed getting a single publication or book from the Foundation. And when you saw Truman, if you saw the Democratic convention, you saw a little man walk up there, bouncing, "Well, let's all get the show on the road," he was saying. You know, lots of pep and so forth. You know, most presidents come out of the White House saying, "Where's the sidewalk?" I don't say that Truman was processed all the way through to Release; he was only processed halfway or something. But I don't say he had any processing at all. It just is a mysterious thing that the psychiatrist who was treating him was one of my best pupils.

Anyway, we get into a problem when we get somebody getting up into these altitudes, you see. Now, I'm not talking to you politically - to hell with politics. I might as well be talking about Tiberius or Augustus or Julius Caesar or any other top dog or Menshikov or Stalinovich or Kaiser Bill or Hitler or Mussolini or any one of these boys. They've all done the same thing, you see. They get up there - strata, strata, strata, strata, strata. See? "They won't obey so I'll make them obey." So that puts them up another rank. "Oh, they won't obey here, so I'll make them obey." That puts them up another rank. "Oh, they won't obey here, so I've got to go up another rank. They won't obey here, so I've got to go another..." The only reason they don't

attend to and achieve the high station of God is because they don't live that long ordinarily. You see, they don't live long enough to get promoted up to that point. That'd be the only real reason.

And this doesn't say that every person in command is a dog. Only 99 percent of them are dogs. So let's not make this a blanket statement. I don't like to be known for careless statements - only 99 percent.

These people get up to this level on their own, being driven in. That is the type of personality which becomes Hitler, which goes up... Any man who goes up through the military is, of course, compounding the felony continually. You see, he doesn't have to accept that next rank. He doesn't have to. He gets a letter, it says, "You are now hereby promoted and so on." Well, he can look at the captain of his ship. The old man has ulcers, he has a furrowed brow, gray hair, he's in horrible shape, he's about to cave in. He looks at this old fellow, you see, and he wants a promotion to that man's rank? The guy must be crazy, and yet they grab them, they take their examination, they worry and fuss. Well, they say "More money." Yeah, but the more money he gets the more things he'll have, and the more things he possesses the more trouble they'll get him into.

This is the MEST universe at work. Let's get a higher rank, a greater order, let's be more thoroughly identified. In other words, let's be less free and more nailed down and specialized in that viewpoint. See this? What's this all add up to? Whether it's Eisenhower or Hitler or Augustus, who does it add up to? It adds up to a fellow who, "I must be the only one who possesses this viewpoint. I am the only one who can possess this viewpoint and I have to be very, very altitudinous and senior to my fellows before I can have any space at all. If I were down there pitching with you kids," you see, the guy is saying all the time, "If I was in there pitching with you kids, if I was in there with you sailors," something of that sort, "why, I couldn't have any space because you'd block all my space out."

Well, supposing this guy didn't have that sort of a complex. He's liable to be the happiest-go-luckiest sailor you ever want to walk into, you know. Somebody come along and say, "How about promoting you to brigadier admiral of the rear-rank echelon," or something. He'd say, "Are you nuts? What do I want all that viewpoint for? I got all the space I need right here," see. But the fellow who doesn't have any space right where he is has got to move in ranks, upward. The fellow who doesn't have any space where he is has got to move upward on a higher echelon.

Now, every once in a while, quite by accident, you get another condition taking place. Somebody is thrown up into an altitudinous position. This happens politically every once in a while. He says, "Gee whiz, you mean somebody's gotta occupy this post? Oh no. You mean nobody'll be premier?" "Oh, you have to go in and be premier, Joe." "Oh no, uh-huh." "Look, you better go in and be premier. There's nobody else going to be premier, and nobody else can take it, and nobody else will, and so on, there's got to be one." And he looks around and he sees that this is fairly well true so he goes in and is premier.

Only you'll find out that when this fellow is being premier that the number of white gloves which are used to open the doors for him, and the number of rose carpets which are being spread for him to walk across sidewalks - which should be, you know, according to the national budget - are strangely missing from the treasurer's expenditure list. Why? He's not trying to be just another fellow and just an "everyday Joe" or anything like that. It's just incomprehensible to him that he could be anything else.

Now, get that viewpoint. The politician who tries to be successful tries to mock up this mock-up, see. He tries to echo this mock-up. Hail fellow well met and so forth and goes around and kisses all the babies, and so forth, and, aw, he's just sour. He'll get away with it now that we have TV and nobody can shake the guy actually by the hand. They just look at him in phosphorescent screens. They say, "Well look, he's a human being. He has a nose and everything. He's a jolly fellow." They wait till after he's elected to start digging up stuff about

him. That's because by this time they've found out that he isn't quite this jolly fellow they thought, you know.

But the easiest guy to know you ever wanted to know, the easiest guy to know, is certainly the guy who can take yours and everybody else's viewpoint and he doesn't give a damn. See that? He can still take a viewpoint of responsibility. He can sit at an executive desk and do one whole of a job of the whole thing. Do ten times as much work as somebody else who is super worried and aberrated and conditional about everything. He can do this job. He'd also just as soon go back in the galley and sit down and eat pie. You see that - this difference? He'd just as soon drive his own car. Somebody says, "Well now..." This guy is made general manager or something or other just because he artlessly has accidentally happened to do more work than anybody else around in the joint, and the stockholders all of a sudden drafted him for general manager and he's general manager.

Well, up to this time the general manager of the plant has had eighteen hot and cold running secretaries, and he's had a chauffeur and he's had this and he's had that. And we give this guy... This guy goes out and here's the general manager's car and there's a fellow sitting there at the wheel. And he opens up the chauffeur's door and he steps in and he says, "Okay, "he says, "You can go back to the garage now, I've got it." "No, I'm supposed to drive you." "Oh, you are, why? Uh...Oh, .uh... oh, yeah. Well, sit over there; we'll go for a drive." Next thing you know the employees are seeing their general manager driving around. Finally, he doesn't like that car very much. It's completely dissimilar sort of a car to anybody else's car. It doesn't behave well, anyhow. You're liable to see him riding around there on a scooter.

It's fantastic what such men can do with men. Fantastic. I've seen it take place. There was an old three striper - he just never could seem to fill out all the papers necessary to get his promotion up to rear admiral of the second upper echelon or something. Only, during the war - the war came along and all of a sudden hung him with this rank and he thought it was very funny. He went around his base in a set of dungarees riding a small scooter. It wasn't that this fellow neglected his job; he wasn't a hail fellow well met particularly; and he wasn't a bad guy, not by a long ways.

His son, for instance, brought the cruiser San Francisco through the whole Japanese battle line and brought her out. He wasn't even supposed to be in charge. It's just that everybody was dead, and... except the senior officer of the ship who stayed in the engine room keeping the engines running while this young fellow up on the bridge, seeing as he had command of the thing, ably fought the ship out of a very, very rough position. It was one of the famous actions of World War II down in the South Pacific.

Well, his pop ran the very best base you ever wanted to see. The old man was really terrific. But don't think... You see, he was perfectly capable of raising a good son and getting his son the responsibility in life. He didn't over-mass this kid so that this kid is always pushing this way and that. No, the kid does his job when he has to do it. If there's something to be done, do it. Don't think the old man was soft either. He wasn't soft.

Every once in a while he'd ride up alongside of some enlisted man that's standing there watching a job to be done with his hands in his pockets and he'd say, "What unit do you belong to, son?" And the kid, you know, new on the base turn around and see this old duffer probably warrant officer or something of the sort riding this scooter, dungarees, no rank, and he'd say, "Oh, I just got in on the late draft," and so forth.

And he'd say, "Well, why don't we lend a hand with this?" And kid would grab on to one end of a girder while the old man grab on to another end of the girder and finish up piling the girders or something like that. Or the kid would say, "Oh, I don't feel like working."

"Well, that's fine. You got ten days bread and water." And the whole thing was real casual.

Well, there is somebody who is somebody. I wonder what the characteristic was of some of the most famous able people in history. There have been lots of famous naval people in naval history, but there's one fellow who seems to outshine all the rest - a fellow by the name of John Paul Jones.

What sort of a character did this man have? Did he have the kind of a character you read of... you are led to think by reading what the US Naval Academy handbooks and so forth write about him? Nope. John Paul, who was the first boy to really lick a first-rate British ship, who put the American Navy on the map, who was the only person to invade the British Isles since practically twelve hundred and something or maybe the Norman Conquest. John Paul Jones you know made a complete invasion of Great Britain, burned a harbor and everything else. Nobody ever did that.

This guy - what sort of a personality did this man have? Well, he certainly wasn't sold on John Paul Jones. This wasn't the only person alive. As a matter of fact, it was very hard to get him to find out there was John Paul Jones there. You'd find him at sea down in the 'tween decks, teaching the midshipmen how to dance properly because the young man ought to be a gentleman, and a gentleman knows how to dance properly. And you would find him up there running a small contest with the steersman showing that he could get the ship closer to the wind than the steersman or the steersman showing him he could get the ship closer to the wind than John Paul. Or he'd be up forward refereeing a game of backgammon or some such game. He was all over the ship. Nobody knew where the hell he'd turn up next. The whole ship was alive, the whole thing from stem to stern was alive. Any ship he ever commanded was alive. The amount of military discipline which he handed out was so slight as to be undetectable beyond one case.

A fellow... While he was a merchant captain, a fellow down in the West Indies charged him and was about to do him in and so forth and he shot the guy. He didn't consult regulations of the merchant marine and say, "Let's see, under these circumstances you're supposed to shoot somebody." No, somebody was going to deal him in so he just shot the guy. This haunted his career for some time because he had many enemies. He was so able that, of course, he was utterly detestable to early American naval officers.

I'm not being sarcastic, I'm just being truthful. He many times lost his seniority on the captains lists, and so on. This upset him because you had to have seniority in order to get to sea to fight the enemy. And he was having a good time fighting the British. I actually don't think he was ever once mad at the British. This fellow didn't care anything about it. We find him ending up his career, by the way, in Paris, perfectly comfortable.

Did you know he was also a vice-admiral in Catherine the Great's navy? He was quite a boy. I mean, he was all over the place, everybody.

This is the sort of an excited being the person who can see any viewpoint, be any viewpoint... By the way, he once challenged the secretary of the navy to a duel. He didn't like what the secretary was doing, so he sent him a challenge. First man to do that. Quite remarkable. Here is certainly a person who is acting individualistically, but he isn't an "individual." Now, do you get the difference between the two things? In other words, he can assume a clear, precise viewpoint anyplace as anything. He can assume this as a clear, precise viewpoint. He keeps a game running, but the great glory and the terrific responsibility of being him always kind of seems to miss him. He never quite catches up with that one.

Well, when we point out a character - you're not trying to tailor make any pre-clear into a particular set of characteristics. Didn't mean to run in on you so much level of personality, but I think it's necessary to this degree: Have there been great men who succeeded, who could be everybody and didn't give a damn for themselves? Yes, there have been. They just happen to be. This is an entirely different thing than the fellow who just can't bear to be with that crowd, and he's got to move back a step, and to a higher rank. And the fellow who can't bear to be that crowd and so he's got to leave a patch on Rome, you know. He's got to get in there and say

“Let’s all do and die for the Romans and particularly me.” And he isn’t the sort of a fellow who just can’t stand being a corporal so he becomes a dictator.

Those guys all fail. Now, let me call this to your attention very sharply. Every one of these boys, regardless of whether their names are Mussolini or Pilchinski [Pilsudski], if they are under a terrible compulsion to relieve themselves upward to where they don’t have to associate with their fellow man, where they can command their fellow man, they fail, inevitably. They do not win; they don’t win their campaigns, they don’t win their goals. They fall down, they become ill, they are very messy people. And there you get your Mussolinis and your Hitlers and your worldwide revolutions.

Stalin had every opportunity to go on governing Russia with three companions, and he murdered three of them in cold blood because he couldn’t stand the competition. This fellow murdered about ten million ruzhiks, this Stalin. Murdered. He’s thinking about it, you know, occasionally, he says, “Well, maybe it didn’t have to be that many, but it probably did have to be,” and so forth. Here’s a leader, for instance, who has actually put his country in a terribly interesting political position. Of course, he hasn’t made it any worse, it couldn’t get worse, really, at any time. He apparently has done so much, but at the same time he has destroyed tremendous quantities of liberty for other people.

So there are your slave masters of the world. They are the people who cannot tolerate other viewpoints. And if they can’t tolerate other viewpoints, they have to control other viewpoints. So we have two types of personality, one which is upscale and one which is definitely downscale. One which wins and the other which definitely fails. One which brings greater peace, harmony and happiness to man, and one which brings him only misery and degradation. Those are the two distinct personalities.

That man who can be a great man and at the same time assume every other viewpoint there is, is really a great man. And that man who assumes other viewpoints simply because time after time he finds his position untenable is not a great man; he’s a failure. He has compulsively become something because there was no other choice. He couldn’t have any space occupying the strata of a common, ordinary, run-of-the-mill human being; he couldn’t win that way so he had to figure out some other way, so that he goes on up the line.

Now, there’s your two different levels of operation. They’re very distinct. Well, observe these in your preclear, please. The preclear that is having a rough time with his case is finding his current position untenable after having found many other positions untenable. The dwindling spiral of his case was this - and this is true of every human being alive even though he’s a great personality he still has found that this is the case: somewhere or other down the track he has learned that one human being after another or one being after another had a viewpoint which he himself couldn’t tolerate. He has run into viewpoints which were detestable to him - “It’s very bad over that way” kind of viewpoints. He’s gotten viewpoint after viewpoint that he has been unwilling to have, and so has cut himself off viewpoint after viewpoint after viewpoint after viewpoint to a point where he can’t look at anything anymore. And anybody who’s having trouble with looking in any way, shape or form, has occlusions or anything of the sort, just has too many viewpoints which he can’t bear the thought of becoming. Can’t bear the thought of being those viewpoints.

There’s your diagnosis on a case. If you’re going to diagnose a case, any way, shape or form... Many mechanical ways to do it. You can say numerical positions on the Tone Scale, you can say this, you can say that about cases, you can go on and on about cases, but you can’t better really this one, and that is his viewpoint.

There are two tests actually, but one test is certainly not testable by his fellow man. Viewpoints is testable. We can find out how many viewpoints can this individual tolerate. And not compulsively but by his own choice. And we look over and find out that it’s a very great many.

But there is another one, is what he knows. What he's willing to know is another test. But that's not a usable test because it doesn't exist within space, it doesn't exist within energy and therefore does not exist within data. So we can't make up a whole bunch of data and say to somebody, "Now, what of these data are you willing to know about?" and get any kind of a conclusive test out of it at all. We wouldn't be able to do that. We're just giving a bunch of artificials and so forth, and you'd find that cases would be very ragged. If anybody ever tries to set this up, he'll find out that it could be made to look very good and is really poor. That is the test of comparable knowingness. How much does a person know or how much is he willing to know, and that in itself is a test of tone, greatness, other things, you know, strength.

Now, over here, however, is the reliable one: How many viewpoints can this individual tolerate? And that's the one you're interested in. And if you're real smart, you'll just start in on your preclear every once in a while - as you run him, you'll ask him, "Okay, think of a detestable viewpoint. Okay, get the idea of being it." Watch his reaction, watch the meter; pretty soon as he gets better and better he has less and less objection. Well, this doesn't mean that you're pounding him down into apathy about it. That's what he's liable to diagnose if he were to have this explained to him. He'd say, "Look, he's getting me so apathetic that I'm deserting my own personality and he's making me forcibly tolerate, gee, the viewpoint of horrible people like, oh, I don't know, prostitutes and doctors and, and, and... jugglers. Oh, this person... look how this auditor is forcing me down." You never give him a chance to even say that because he doesn't analyze what you're doing. He doesn't really think about it too much, as a preclear. You've got this boy capable and willing of assuming... I said capable and willing to assume any viewpoint in the universe, and brother, you've got him capable. Because that's about the most capability there is.

I'm not trying to teach you now how to be a chameleon. I'm not trying to give you the philosophy of turn your coat when you find it unhandy to wear it the other way over. That's not the same thing at all. You know, every once in a while somebody's come along to you and said, "Well, you have to be able to see the other fellow's side of things." Anybody ever tell you that? Well, they were enforcing a viewpoint on you. They just... you've just got through with this guy and he said, "Well, I think your throat ought to be cut," and you're kind of fond of your throat. And your mother came along and said, "Well, everybody's entitled to their viewpoint, and you should take this other viewpoint." She didn't even know what they were talking about, you see. You're having it forced on you that you ought to assume other people's viewpoints. And so you negate against it, and there we go down spiral, negating against other viewpoints. We don't want them.

Truth of the matter is, all control really consists of; the most superlative control there is, is being able to assume any viewpoint. Somebody's having trouble with his liver, ask him to assume the viewpoint of his liver. If he's willing to have the viewpoint of his liver, his liver will get well. If he's unwilling to have the viewpoint of his liver, it will stay ill or get sicker. That's the final test. It will even work on psychosomatic ills.

Okay.

(end of lecture)