

## **FLOWS, PREHAV SCALE, PRIMARY SCALE**

A lecture given on  
2 June 1961

Thank you.

I was just looking at a car outside that's got a hole in its fender. And I tried to audit it, and it didn't respond. So . It's in apathy. (That's what you call line charging one present time problem out of existence.)

Okay. This is what? The 2nd of June, isn't it?

All right. Now I trust you have some good questions today, and what's the first one? Yes?

Male voice: Regard to energies and flows and the Prehav Scale.

Uh-huh? Yeah?

Male voice: Well, sort of a general question. Well, sort of . . . Could you give us some . . . ?

All right. I'll give you some gen on that. That's a very simple question and a good one.

We have this kind of a situation in a mind where we have a phenomenon where an individual has flowed in one direction too long. Whether that is out or in, he has flowed in one direction too long. Let's take something on which I have a fair subjective reality: A writer who has written too much. You know, he's just written-written-written-written-written. It's out-out-out-out-out-out.

All right. Let's take another example. Let's take a shipping clerk, and he ship-ship-ship-ship-ship-ship-ships.

And one fine day he wakes up and he says . . . the writer says, "If I have to write one more book, I've had it. I think I will go off and join the French Foreign Legion." And the shipping clerk says, "Well, I feel very degraded and I'm going to quit." Why?

Because these things have flowed in one direction. Well, it's a phenomenon, an electrical phenomenon really, and we get an awful lot of our material from the field of nuclear physics, or used to, and now we're telling nuclear physics. That is to say, we're in a position now where we know a lot about energy and so forth, that the boys crawling in and out of the woodwork at the atomic-energy-university-grant areas never heard of, and are always quite amazed about. The phenomena of standing waves, of tendencies of flow, sizes of particles, or if there are any, and such things as this, are probably getting better known to us than to other people.

And you get a ridge because, actually, of the inertia of a particle. It's no more complicated than that. There's a little bit of Newton's law of interaction mixed up in all mental activities by people who have gravity and Earth was moving toward me. The point is, here, that for objects of comparable magnitude . . . a push against the E-Meter, you can actually feel it in your hand; there's a slight backpush.

All right. The facsimiles of these backpushes are neglected. Your attention is on the E-Meter, don't you see? Be pushing it. Well, your attention . . . the attention of the writer is on pushing out the words and pages, and the attention of the shipping clerk is putting out books, you see?

All right. So if this is the case, then they utterly neglect and rarely as-is . . . because they're not terribly aware of it . . . this little backpush. Every time you throw a book in the mails, you see, why there was so much effort coming back toward one, and it's neglected.

Similarly, let's say, the colored gentleman who has a good, high-paid job: sticking his head through a canvas and letting people throw baseballs at him. I think that's a well honored profession of one time or another in carnivals and so on. All right. So here he has these baseballs coming in at him all the time . . the visible picture, you see, is made of everything, but his attention goes on the incoming baseball.

Yeah, but as this baseball is coming in, actually there is a contrary reaction that he pays no attention to, because he's interested in the baseball. He's not interested in that contrary reaction. He wishes there were more of it, if anything, you see, to slow that baseball down. And the next thing you know, he will have too many baseballs thrown at him.

Now, he's actually the . . it isn't the injuries of the baseballs or anything; it's just the fact that he's built up a ridge in front of his face that consists of not the incoming baseball, but the resistance going back against the baseball. You got the idea? Well, it's the resistance back against that baseball that sticks there, not the baseballs. So he has too many baseballs thrown at him and all of a sudden gets a horrible feeling of pushing out that way.

Similarly, the fellow mailing too many books gets a horrible feeling of a mysterious, undefinable pushing back against himself. You've got the idea? And he couldn't possibly explain what this pushing back against himself is. He feels like he has pressure on himself.

Why, I had somebody the other day talking about she felt she had pressure on her face, see? Well, it's just this . . it's the reverse push. So therefore it's inexplicable. He knows it can't be books, you see, because books go out, and this pressure he's feeling is coming in.

And the fellow with his head through the canvas: He knows it couldn't be baseballs because baseballs come in, whereas this pressure makes him feel like he's losing everything in front of him. You got the idea?

Well, he'll feel like he's losing everything in front of him up to a point where he can't lose any more in front of him without it becoming painful. See, he's got an outpush. See, the reaction of the mind against this incoming object is this outpush, this outpush, this outpush.

And the next thing you know, he just figures he can't push out one more thing. If he did, it'd kill him. He's sure of this. And at this moment he has a stuck flow. If you ask him to push out one more thing, he says, "That's impossible." The one thing in the world he knows he can't do is push out that one more item, and he goes unconscious. And that is dope-off. It's flowed too long in any one direction. It's not a simple mechanism where just "flow too long in any one direction produces a stuck flow." I've given you the whole gen of it here. It actually produces a reverse flow. Flow too long in any one direction produces a reverse flow to it. You got the idea?

So frankly, at that stage of the game it's a toss up whether he's going to pass out because you throw a baseball at him, or he's going to pass out because he resists something or tries to push something away from him.

Get this exercise: "Now get the idea of a baseball being thrown at you. Now get the idea of throwing away something." That's as far as it's going to run without locking up, you see, because you . . now you've got to say, "Get the idea of a baseball thrown at you. Now get the idea of throwing away something." What are we doing?

In essence, we're running, really, a flow that is all in one direction, but we're running the flow itself and his resistance to it alternately, and it goes flip-flop, flip-flop, apparently.

Now, we say, "Get the idea of a baseball being thrown at you." "Thank you." "Get the idea of a baseball being thrown at you." "Thank you." "Get the idea of a baseball thrown at you." "Thank you." Now, one of two things is going to happen: Either the field or the energy particles in front of his face are all going to go black . . see, that's a symptom of a stuck flow . . or he's all of a sudden going to get an avalanche triggered, and the next thing you know, all the baseballs that have ever been thrown at him, hit him.

That's an avalanche. Brrrrrrrr! . . . they come in, you see? He could just as easily get an avalanche of resistance. But he'd be in awful bad shape to get the avalanche of resistance, you got the idea? Actually, what we mean by an inversion is the avalanche of resistance. You see? The fellow has no longer any effect from it coming in. He's only affected by resisting it.

Now, if you want to see some guy in this kind of a state . . . and they are around, in practically any case you could find this mechanism on them . . . you say to this fellow, "Now get the idea of resisting a baseball," and he gets the baseball in his face. Now you say, "Get the idea of a baseball hitting you," and he feels like he's going to fall over on his face because he feels himself pushing out. You got the idea? These flows have exactly turned around. And that's what we know as an inversion, and that's actually why we call it an inversion. Because it's a flow gone backwards.

Now, postulates follow this kind of a thing, you see, and the fellow will change his mind on the postulate. Instead of interest, he gets a peculiar interest. Well, it follows down the mechanics of this other thing.

Now, why don't we run O/W, O/W, O/W, O/W. Of course, O/W is just dandy because that's out, it's in, it's out, it's in; it's reach, withdraw, reach, withdraw, but only from one person. And let me tell you something about reach and withdraw from one terminal: It doesn't account for all of the motions possible.

Now, as long as the individual is below change, O/W is effective. And he only runs well on O/W from what he caused and what he withheld . . . as long as he's below change. That's the make-break point of O/W. "O/W, A Limited Theory" . . . I call your attention to that bulletin. I give you another datum right on the top of that bulletin right now, and that is that the limited theory of O/W stops at the level of change. There is the point below which O/W is 100 percent effective, and above which it ceases to be effective. Change is the explanation of it all. Why?

Well, I'm sorry. I don't feel as glib today as I did the other day when I explained it to somebody very glibly. But it was sort of interesting. It's a sort of an involved explanation, and there'll probably be a better explanation for it, but I explained it perfectly and then I didn't listen to myself. And . . . but it was . . . it's like this: the outflow and the inflow gets locked up in some particular fashion. And then below this level, the individual is totally individuated: he can no longer change his viewpoint; he can no longer experience change; and the moment he becomes very afraid of a change occurring . . . leaving him on some individuated point of the bracket . . . And as they go crazy, they don't go down from O/W.

On a lunatic, a real raving lunatic, you'd probably have to find the bracket that was live, and it would be way below O/W. See, it'd be some, oh, I don't know, any one of thirty-two sides of the bracket, you see. It would be what others were doing to others that would be the only side of the bracket that would work. It'd be the others doing it to others or something like that, and then that would be terrible. They have great reality on others doing it to others, and as you shook his mind up about it a little bit, you'd just shift him around on the bracket and he'd say, "Well isn't it terrible how I caused World War II." When you know personally he was . . . he had a body in pawn on Mars at the beginning of it, you know. He'll all of a sudden come up with obsessive cause. Well, actually that's a high point, but it stays in for quite some time. As long as the individual is allergic to change, he individuates, because the change on various flow lines are extremely productive of these ridges.

Let's say the individual is fluid on the subject of change. He doesn't mind change. He can handle change; he can experience change. So therefore, the baseball coming in and hitting the fellow with his head through the canvas . . . well, if he could experience all the changes that were there, he wouldn't resist it.

But if he starts resisting the changes and starts setting up this Newton's law of interaction, the next thing you know, why, he's halfway around the bend on the subject of O/W. He thinks there will be a consequence of everything he does. He just knows he won't be able to breathe without there being a consequence. All he's got to do, therefore, to go through life . . . it's a perfect solution . . . is that every time you pass a sporting goods store, you don't look in the window and see a baseball lying there on

display, you see? That's a good one! That's fine! Now, we know that. That's safe. You know? He knows there's going to be a consequence to what he does . . everything he does.

So he knows better than to walk down blocks that have sporting goods stores in them. And then he knows better than to go downtown where there might be that block. And then he knows better than to go out in the yard, because, you see, he might see the town. And we get the odd phenomenon of somebody being stuck in the house, and then we can't figure out: Why is this man stuck in the house? And we start running houses. No, it's baseballs.

Now there's the goofball reach of this, and it's practically unplumbable. But you can follow it down with an E-Meter and find out why the individual is stuck in the house: He's trying to avoid being hit in the face with baseballs that are no longer being thrown at him, and this is very logical. "All . . all horses sleep in bed" sort of a proposition.

By the way, that's becoming such a stable datum that somebody told me the other day that they were going to start making Simmons beds for horses.

Anyway, here's . . here is your change. So when an individual can no longer tolerate change, he becomes afraid of consequences, because the consequences of change, of course, are change. And he can no longer stand by consequences, so therefore, he's going to have consequences. So the moment that he's worried about consequences, why, he's into the O/W bracket. And that's why everybody on this planet can run O/W so easily at lower stages. But as you go up on SOP Goals, you run out of this.

And I have not burdened your brains, and I have let you waste some auditing time, by making you run all brackets from the beginning on everything, because the Prehav Scale is fairly rapid and it will very shortly catch up with all brackets. You got the idea? The change gets level for a level of the Prehav Scale. In other words, a tolerance comes up. And all of a sudden, instead of it only being effective on himself to others, it becomes effective on other brackets.

Now also in view of the fact that the individual can be stuck on these other brackets and then it'll bring it back onto himself, for a case below average or a case above average, it is safest to run brackets. You got the idea? And for the average case, you waste a little time running brackets. But you had better not tangle your wits up with at what point he ceases to have the O/W mechanism sort of thing function . . cease functioning. At what instant, on what subject does he have this function? Well, I couldn't calculate it myself, so I'm not going to expect you to. So the safe thing to do is run brackets. You got the idea?

So fear of consequence, which is to say fear of change, results, then, in a resistance to change which brings in Newton's law of interaction. The guy must resist changes or motions. So as soon as he has to resist changes or motions, he starts setting up these ridges as I described to you at the first part of that . . this statement, you see. And when these ridges are set up, the only way to take them apart is take them apart on both sides alternately. You take apart the push out, you take apart the push in. Therefore, it doesn't matter whether the individual is stuck on pushing things out or stuck on pulling things in; you're going to take apart both of it anyhow. And then it doesn't matter if he's really spinny on some point or another, as most any mind is, another bracket out here to another. You know, this interchange out here. He's dispersed outside of himself and this is really the one he's running and . . while he's sitting over here and not running it. So it's best to have that bracket functioning too, don't you see? And you save time and you don't bog a case.

Now, what it requires to run the exact number of commands necessary to get the exact flow out of the road is actually beyond your ability to detect at this stage of the game. But running all sides of a bracket evenly takes care of all the flows you will encounter without jamming any. So it's a way out of the rat race.

Now, if an individual goes unconscious . . which is to say he can't confront the change . . if he goes unconscious at some point while you're running a good five-way bracket, one of two things is wrong: He's either got a bracket that is so unbalanced that it won't take both sides of it. (So, well, all right. So what. So he goes unconscious. He'll recover.) Or more particularly, he isn't doing one of your

commands. And in view of the fact that this is the only one that can get in your road . . . that he isn't doing one of the commands of the brackets somewhere . . . then when a pc goes unconscious, you should always check if he is having tremendous difficulty with and isn't answering one side of the bracket. And if he isn't, all right! Don't hang him with it. Just check him over, you know?

The way you do that is you ask . . . just once around . . . you ask him the question, "Did you . . .," not "Have you been answering it," but "Did you answer that?" Just once around. "Now, did you answer that to your satisfaction?" And the fellow says, "Well, uuuh, no, I . . . as a matter of fact, I never have been able to answer that leg of the bracket."

In other words, you're . . . you're inadvertently guilty of having given a number of auditing commands without getting an answer, and you must always . . . one of the basic rules of auditing is you always get an answer to your auditing command. One command, one answer. One answer, one command, also.

Although that sometimes gets disobeyed when you run into a very looped up bracket that'll avalanche. You know, you're on some hot subject with the pc, and it goes brrrrr! and you've got a whole bunch of them. And the funniest thing I ever saw was a pc in a staff Clearing Course one time, sitting there, he said, "I can't answer the what have you failed to help, you see, because it just keeps going through my mind. . . ." And he looked very round-eyed at the auditor and he said, "It just keeps going through my mind: 'Who, who, who, who, who, who.' " "You just triggered the automatic side of the bracket. That's all there is to it.

Now, does that answer your question, Ken?

Male voice: Yes it does. Thank you.

All right. We got another question? Okay. Gee, I'm glad you're getting smarter. Yeah, Jan?

Female voice: One came up today which was on just how much, on American meter, the relaxation of the pc's hands while running a process may influence the tone arm position, and whether it's just okay to allow for this. And I checked how much it just was with somebody not being audited, and whether you could just allow for that relaxation of the hands as being indicative of some mass shifting, so you count it as process effect anyway. See what I mean?

Don't worry too much about it.

Female voice: Just don't worry about it.

It's just like I ask a pc, "Now, all right. Now, have you got a withhold?" And he wraps both cans around his head and changes the shape of his feet and . . . and kicks the E-Meter and backs up and coughs a couple of times and so forth. Well, I say it read. It read. I ask him again just to make sure. It always does. Similarly, this is just taken into the gross error of the situation. Trying to eliminate anything like that as an error would be nearly impossible.

Female voice: Yeah. It amounted to practically half a tone on an American meter. . .

Sure.

Female voice: . . . just a relaxation of the hands that wasn't even visible, particularly.

That's right. I wouldn't worry about it too much . . .

Female voice: Yeah. All right.

. . . because they're not going to relax and tighten their hands for the bracket.

Female voice: Yeah.

You know. You've got a meter . . . an inherent error in any meter that has to do with the pc being connected to it. And it's not a very gross error.

You can do some weird things. You can have the pc hold to the tips of the electrodes just with his thumb and finger, and get one of the highest tone arms you ever cared to see . . . nice, heavy, high tone arm with a heavy needle. Yeah, you can just have him hold . . . just hold the tips of the cans, just barely touching both cans, and you get a very tough looking pc. But you can get a workman with calluses and have him hold onto the cans, and you don't get a tough looking pc because of the calluses.

The size of the person's hand might have something to do with it. A lot of factors could enter into it, but actually it's not gross. It's not enough to bother with. The E-Meter tells you most everything you want to know. And in view of the fact that you're adjudicating basically on reaction of the meter over a given period of time, we can assume that the pc over any given period of time . . . if the process is flat . . . is more or less static. So you see, it wouldn't tell you the process was flat or not flat when it wasn't flat or something of this sort. It's not even anything that you should watch for but you should do this with an E-Meter, just like it says in E-Meter Essentials. That it isn't kidding. That's a whole drill.

You should actually get somebody to sit down and go through all the body motions that there possibly could be, and handle the cans in all sorts of weird ways, and lift their fingers and put them back again, and cough and sneeze, and just watch what happens to the needle and tone arm of the meter. And then, that is the best way of sorting out body-motion reactions on a meter, and you can actually get so good at them that you don't... The only one I have to look at is when I'm getting a rock slam, or I start to get a . . . I'll get a momentary rock slam of some kind or another. I will normally look over at the pc's hands to find out if he lifted his finger, because that can be approximated. You can lift your finger and get a rock slam, but it isn't constant enough and you will all of a sudden see that it is the hands or it is the rock slam. You can differentiate there, too. But always make sure that it isn't somebody going . . . playing Morse code on the . . . on the electrodes.

Now there's one more point about this. You can take both cans in one hand, as you do in these "point out things," and you will find out that the left side of the body and the right side of the body, and the right side of the body versus the left side of the body are all different. And this is apparently of great astonishment to many auditors, and it upsets them no end. Well, I don't know. So the . . . you remember the old epicenters? It just means the . . . the guy's epicenters are out, that's all. If you wanted to know if a pc's epicenters were in good shape or not in good shape, have him hold both cans in his right hand, then have him hold both cans in his left hand . . . put Kleenex between them, and both cans in his left hand, both cans in his right hand . . . see if the read is the same. If the read isn't the same, his epicenters are out.

What are you going to do with this today? Nothing. It's one of those little things we cannot live without knowing. You know, it's like reading the almanac. But I've seen . . . I've seen auditors get quite concerned with the fact this happens. It also will read differently if you shove them under the pc's arm-pits. It'll also read differently if you hold him down, take his shoes and socks off, and adhesive-tape the cans to the soles of his feet. It'll read differently, but only in terms of how much resistance it's measuring.

Now I can imagine it one day, if this E-Meter ever gets into the hands of the government, that is about the . . . 50 percent of the populace will probably be getting their E-Meter checks that way. The cops will jump on him and the fellow says, "I won't pick up the cans," and the cops will jump on him and hold him down and adhesive-tape the cans to the soles of his feet and find out if he murdered his grandmother. And because the guy is resenting it... Anybody who would do that probably couldn't read a meter anyhow, and if he was a member of one of these existing governments, why, he'd then, of course, say, "Well, it had a reaction. Ah-ha! Murdered his grandmother. That's good enough for us. Hang him!" Actually, they . . . that wasn't what they were after him for; it was because he hadn't . . . he hadn't not paid taxes. Yeah, it'd be a pretty confused picture.

Was there another question?

Female voice: Well, it was just that today we found out how to produce a perfectly steady, continuous rock slam on a meter with a body reaction . . .

Good.

Female voice: . . . with the cans.

How do you do it?

Female voice: Just take the cans in both hands and keep rotating them like this. And you get a beautiful, steady rock slam that just goes on and on.

Good enough. All right. All right. Take the cans in both hands and twiddle them, and rotate them round . . .

Female voice: Just goes round and round.

. . . and round and round and round and round, and you get a rock slam. That's worth knowing. It's a good way to demonstrate a rock slam. It's worth knowing how to demonstrate any of these phenomena. Very interesting. Okay, is there anything else?

Female voice: Ron.

Yes?

Female voice: I would like to have something on tape with regard to why the various levels are on the Prehav Scale. Because some people come up to me and they say, "Why is this Create here?" You see, and I have to tell them, "Well, this is obsessive create, you see?" And I'd like to have . . .

'Tisn't, you know? It's reactive create.

Female voice: Well, reactive create, yeah.

All right, that's good.

Female voice: All right.

I'll answer that.

Female voice: Yeah.

Why are the levels on the Prehav Scale on the Prehav Scale? That's a pretty broad question. I'm not laughing at Suzie but I just suddenly realized that somebody asking that question, that would be an interesting question to bring up. Holy cats!

Female voice: No, I just wanted the levels gone through, so I can take . . . Yeah, well, that's . . . that's approximately it. That is the same question.

Female voice: Right.

Boy! How much time we got here? Well, I'll tell you, I've been studying the mind for a number of years and there are various phenomena have been noted. And these phenomena are not necessarily in agreement with a sane and normal society, the way it thinks it operates. And that's why we're winning, because with this sane and normal society that everybody thinks is operating, nobody's winning.

So you see, there would be . . . basically and foremost, we would have had to have recovered some of the broad differences between how people think it ought to be and how it is. Now, if we've recovered this broad difference between how we think it ought to be and how it is, then, of course, we can as-is some of the difficulties and upsets of a human being. But if we stay with how it ought to be, or how we're educated to believe it should be; ah, we're hung with these alter-ises.

Now we've got in the Prehav Scale, pretty close, actually, the way it is, and we haven't got in the scale the way it ought to be at all. So it comes in with a dull crash to find God at the bottom of the Prehav Scale. What? Cause and then Faith.

Oh, I'll give you an idea. I'll give you a perfect substantiation. I don't hang around on . . . on the backs of auditor's chairs ready to stick out my chest like a pouter pigeon and pat myself on the back saying I was right. I merely make a disgusting habit out of being right, and I sort of take it as a matter of course when it works out that way . . . although it's usually very interesting to me that it did work out. It seems curious sometimes.

But it's like this: A pc the other day in an HGC was audited on Faith, and he blew straight out of his head, of course. Where would you think a level was, that the first moment that an individual touched it, he would sort of, kind of disappear out of the body and away and gone and here and there and everywhere else . . . wouldn't you say that was a pretty low level?

And yet that has been the most highly advertised commodity for the last two thousand years that anybody has been trying to sell. You talk about selling blue sky. Everybody has been rushing up and down the streets with a nickel on the drum selling "Faith! Faith! Faith! Faith! You've got to have faith! You've got to have faith!" We've got something here in which you don't have to have any faith to have it work, and that is, of course, the most astonishing thing in Scientology.

So, here comes Faith: I put it on the bottom of the Prehav Scale because it belongs there, because it's a non-observational level. It is the most non-observational level there is. There is no other level that is at least . . . as less observational than Faith. Everybody's got faith. See?

Well, by definition, faith is accepting something without inspection or observation, and no checkup of any kind. Now, that isn't anything wrong with faith. There isn't any . . . there isn't anything wrong with doing this. If you didn't have some confidence in your fellow man and walked around a little bit blindfolded, you'd never get these surprise engrams. But I don't mean to be sarcastic. The thing actually is there. It isn't that Ron put it there. It's where it is. So there it is. All right.

Now let's take up this next thing . . . as long as it's amongst us girls here . . . let's take up this thing called, if you'll excuse me, God. All right. Let's take a one-Akhenaton proposition. See, there's only one and there he is, and he caused everything. Get that now: he caused everything. Do you realize what shape that god would be in right at this moment if he did nothing but make and create things, and you could never reach him and never say anything to him? Now, what do you think would happen?

I'd say that anything . . . if it was just one thetan that was called upon to make all these solids and spaces, what kind of a duress must this fellow be under to have to propitiate the lot of us that much? I think if there's anybody spun in, it must be this god.

You look at all the signs and analyze it anyway you can in running pcs or looking at life, and you'll find out at once that this cause . . . you know, just cause, you know? Like that. "I'm going to hit you with the thunderbolts and you can't hit me." Brother, what that would do to a thetan! So I figure God plowed in a long time ago.

Now, that's an awful comment for me to have to make but that's . . . that happens to be . . . actually happens to be my full belief on the thing. I've looked it all over from every side, and I can't get away from this opinion that if there was one God, man, he's had it!

And I even thought one time of, gee, you know, we could whip together a handy, jim-dandy little religion here in the society for the resurrection of God, see, on the basis that the poor fellow plowed himself in helping us all out, and that we should give him a hand now. I know this all sounds very loopy and very ridiculous, but that is why that level is there. It works there.

Now anybody who is on an obsessive cause is practically nuts. Now, we are talking about, of course, the reactive reactions. This E-Meter tests reactive reactions and that's all it tests. So if we had nothing



but analytical reactions on a scale, then the scale would be of no use to us whatsoever. So we're looking for the deep-seated things. The Prehav Scale is actually the reactive scale, the reactive bank scale.

When an individual is at length able to have, he doesn't have to have a bank. So of course, the bank disappears at the point Have. So there wouldn't be anything to measure of any kind whatsoever if we measured it on the analytical scale. But there isn't anybody in this corner of the universe that I know about right now that knows what that analytical scale really is except our Axioms 1 and 2. That's the best description of it.

So the analytical Have scale . . . above Have, the analytical scale would simply be Axioms 1 and 2. Those are the only basic truths there are. Those are fundamental truths. If anything is true, then they're true. All other truths are the result of postulates, considerations and agreements. So as a result, it would just depend on what a bunch of thetans got together and agreed would be on that scale. That's . . . that's the whole thing. And they'd say, " Well, this is the scale and we're going to have saucepans at this level and we're going to have chimney pots at that level and we're going to have singing 'Dixie' at this level and that's our scale." And in view of the fact that they were analytical and could change their minds and weren't very serious about it anyhow, of course, that would be the scale.

No, we're talking about the fixed, driven-into-concrete, now-I'm-supposed-to, this-is-it, can't-be-violated, this-is-why-we're-here scale and that's the Prehav Scale. And this is the order of the value of postulates which are fixed postulates and which are not usually changeable and have never been changeable in the absence of Scientology. And that's what that scale is all about. But as far as that's concerned, I think it's a quite remarkable scale.

Now, at some time in the past, at the beginning of track sometime, this scale must have been dreamed up just about like that. Now, to recover the scale again is quite a trick. Now, I'm not trying to tell anybody that all levels that are on the present Prehav Primary Scale that should be there are there. There might be some levels that aren't there. I could think of a dozen to put in offhand, but how much time have auditors got to assess the Primary Scale? And they're all on the Secondary Scale anyhow now.

Now, there are also some repeating levels on that scale. For instance, at Cause, you might not get a fall at Cause and you would get a fall on Blame and Blame was on the original scale, you see. So you have to watch that Primary Scale rather alertly. But there's harmonics. So you'll get more drops on the new Primary Scale with its sixty-six . . . sixty-five levels . . . you'll get more drops going up and down it, than you would get on the old scale, because there are some action words in it, rather than conditions.

There's another use to this scale that I haven't burdened anybody's wits with yet . . . by the way, just in passing I'll comment on it . . . and that is a combination inside the Primary Scale. And man, that can get so involved that it is marvelous. Let's supposing you assess No Motion . . . this is the most flagrant example. Let's supposing you assess No Motion and as you're assessing you found out Agree fell and . . . falls and No Motion falls. Now you go into the Secondary for No Motion and then into the Secondary for Agree, and you find which two falls on that, and you'll get some of the most remarkable combinations of commands you ever heard of. You just try it sometime. You won't believe some of them.

You can't run No Motion all by itself. The pc is just liable to run into a brick wall. So you can combine it with almost anything that is on the scale, but it's usually Like, Dislike, Agree or Disagree. But remember you could combine it with anything on the Like, Dislike, Agree, Disagree Secondary Scales, which gets pretty remarkable. And then No Motion could be assessed all the way out onto its Secondary Scale, and you'd get some word for No Motion. And you just look it up when you see these scales and you'll howl with laughter because it makes some of the most fantastic combinations. But listen, it's going to make sense to somebody.

All right. Well, now, I hope . . . I didn't mean to slight your question in any way because it should be stated. I haven't given any lectures, done any talking about this Prehav Scale. It's just sort of grown and the only lecture I know of about it . . . or, the only lectures I know of about it . . . are in the Johannesburg Congress tapes and it's advanced so far now beyond those that there's hardly any recognizing it.

Its levels may not be all exact. They might not be the exact level wherein, but they don't have to be. There's no stress on this. Now, if I ever find one of them out, I'll put it right and tell you about it. But it usually is pretty good. The top of the scale is the top of the scale and the bottom of the scale is sure the bottom of the scale. And individuals will start to get a rise as you go up that scale at certain levels just like they did on the original Prehav. So all is pretty well with it. I'm very happy with it.

Does that answer the question?

Female voice: Mm.

Anything else about it?

Female voice: Mm-mm.

You sure?

Female voice: Mm-hm.

All right. Okay. Is there anything else?

All right. Thank you. Thank you very much. And have a very, very good weekend, will you?

Audience: Thank you.