

5403C26 <1024>

UNIVERSE SERIES: MORALS, LAWS, CODES

And this is March 26, 1954, first lecture of the day. I'd like to cover several little points that are part technique, part answers to questions you get asked by preclears and by the public at large.

The first thing I'd like to cover is the moral values of Scientology. This could be, of course, a very weighty subject. Morals have been sufficiently weighty in the past ages to have, by this time, thoroughly broken the back of Man, and so they have. Moral values are incomprehensibly incomprehensible, mostly because they are based upon a consideration. I refer you to the factors. Consideration - what is beautiful, what is ugly, what is bad, what is good - this is a matter of consideration.

So, we say morals, we are talking actually about some agreed upon consideration as to a way of life or an evolved very mechanical system of living. We could be talking about a set of arbitraries which attempted to control people, we could talk about a number of things but, actually, we know pretty well what we mean by morals. The dictionary has forgotten what morals are in that it defines morals as ethics. Ethics are not definable, and then it turns around and defines ethics as morals, which leaves us exactly nowhere.

Actually it's a philosophic question which was taken up at great length by the early Greeks and which has befuddled the brains of philosophers for a very long time. Of course, it's very easy to befuddle somebody's brain because he doesn't use it to think with. But the main consideration in terms of, of morals, was keeping a society going and keeping the bulk of the populace from going by the boards. That was the main consideration of morals.

In other words, it's a survival mechanism. Life specializes in these survival mechanisms mostly because the MEST universe specializes in survival mechanisms - life echoing the MEST universe, you might say. The first moral codes which came before

Man, of course, were laid down by his leaders, his advisors, his witch doctors, in an effort to pacify control, keep intact and alive and continuing, the individual and tribal organisms.

You'll find that even cats have morals, they have morals very definitely. There's a built-in set that has to do with kittens, what you do with kittens and so on. Very pat, I mean if you were to take a couple of kittens and raise them without any further education from older cats, you would find out that they would, in the majority, make a considerable effort to preserve the kittens which were born. You know, they'd grow up and more kittens would be born and they would sort of preserve the moral line, which is to say, they'd raise those kittens.

Now, when we look at morals from a standpoint of *"let's figure out some better way to get it to survive,"* why, we're closer to an understanding of the problem. But morals are not ethics. Ethics is something else. Ethics are the margin of survival. Morals, that's kind of what we do just to barely get along. See, I mean, that's an arduous sort of an arbitrary, *"this is a code by which we survive, we have to use this code to survive,"* and so forth. Well, you will find that ethics are, exist when you have a much higher plane of existence possible. That is to say, we've got some survival margin now and so we can have ethics. Somebody can be honest just for the sake of being honest, he can be a gentleman because gentlemen are gentlemen, he can keep his word because gentlemen keep their word, and so on. We have then a distinctly different meaning in these two words. They are just a gradient scale but they're definitely different things.

Ethics are what we do, not because we have to do them but because we consider that it is the thing to do to survive. Do you see that? It's a rather light value. Morals are what we do because we've got to do them in order to survive, which means very little survival margin. This is, morals are something, really, which, in the essence in the culture or in the species where they are, morals are something which can't be violated without very destructive consequences. Ethics can be violated without very much destruction in any particular direction.

You might say ethics have some aesthetic to them and morals have ardour to them. Naturally, any organization which is selling hellfire and damnation is going to specialize in morals and is not itself going to have sufficient survival margin to ever deal in ethics. We could say, we could just say that in a clean cut way. This individual has to be moral, he is not ever moral. It's the difference between a court of law and a court of chancery.

In chancery, people and cases are tried on whether or not it's just or unjust, and there's nothing to do with how many laws have been written. People appear before the judge and present their evidence and it is adjudicated, then, on a basis of whether or not justice is being done. A court of law has no, no justice, there is no thought of justice in a court of law. There's a thought of law. They have assumed, you see, that the law was written to enforce a justice and so then they enforce the law. And having made that assumption, reasonable or unreasonable, we get some very strange and peculiar things happening in a court of law. Now, you as a citizen go before a court of

law and you expect justice, more's the fool. You're not going to get justice, you're going to get law. And that is outrageous.

One of the most deteriorating things that can happen in a case is to suffer a great injustice before law, that is on the third dynamic. He goes in and he finds the law is being obeyed, but nothing is done about justice. In other words, his whole woof and warp on the subject of morals and ethics is violated. He's got this enormous package, you see, of the thing, the thing to do, the way to behave, the way to conduct a third dynamic. And that has to do with certain morals, you just have to do those - and ethics, you're a nice guy and you do those. And he has this all arranged as to how to get along with people and he goes into court and somebody is suing him for wearing a collar button on Tuesday. There's nothing to it and they sue him and they recover eighteen thousand six hundred and seventy-four dollars damages. But it said right in the law book that anybody could sue anybody who wore a collar button on Tuesday.

I'm not just mocking the thing, I mean, law is just as irrational and irresponsible as that because law, in the first place, is made by precedent. They take the past and then they copy what was said in the past and then that's copied again and copied again. Here you have the adjudications of John Marshall being used by the United States Supreme Court in almost all their interpretations of cases which come before them. That was a long time ago.

The United States was a republic. It believed in rugged individualism. It had a great deal of land yet to conquer and it was very arduously moral. And these same adjudications are being used in a country which has gone along the line of socialism, where rugged individualism is being consistently more and more frowned upon and where the moral values, as far as they were understood a hundred years ago, are not detectable in the society.

Now, you can get a microscope and you can find somebody who is being moral. In other words, talk about ethical, that's pretty well gone. You don't have an ethical standard, they've just forgotten this one. But the moral standard itself, this thing that you have to do to survive, that is being tampered with and disobeyed. In the first place, it's been alloyed. I'm not talking of the morals, I'm just talking in the course of the society. It's been flouted so often and so continually that there's hardly anything left which might be considered that, unless one is perhaps a member of a church which is solidly enforcing let us say the ten commandments. I don't know that there are very many people like that left in the United States. They are in the minority, certainly.

You take marriage, blew wide open when divorce walked in and things like this. We're just talking now about what you must do to survive, not whether that is good, but this is just what the society had agreed upon. And they'd agreed to the fact that marriages must remain crunch, just like that, see I mean, no change. And that loosened up and so forth. There's been terrific changes, then, in the social structure, and practically no changes in the legal structure. Well, so how do you get any justice out of this?

Some young fellow, he's eighteen, nineteen, he's educated into believing that this is the conduct of the society and this is justice. And then he goes in and finds out somebody is enforcing a law which was written in 1802 and so he is outraged. Of course,

that means that he's, he just is not, the society is not running on anything vaguely resembling his self-determinism. Therefore, it becomes other-determinism.

Well, not to go off into a long dissertation about this, but a society, to a large degree, accepts things which fit in this frame of reference at the time. Well now, its legal code might be entirely different than the society would be running on if somebody cast a vote. If somebody cast a vote right now and said, "*What is the age of consent?*" why, fellows would sit down and think it over for a couple of minutes and put down twelve or something like that. I mean it wouldn't be, it wouldn't be a pressing matter.

Five hundred years ago there would have been lynching on the thought of reducing an age of consent, see, I mean, people would have been battling and rioting in the streets under the thought of tampering with the sexual morality. And it's not so today. It's just the public to a large degree treats immorality simply as interesting reading in the tabloids. It is not, it's not a vital crushing concern. We've gone through two wars which broke up too many families for it to be.

Nevertheless, the law demands of any activity that it agree, to some degree, with its framework, and the public at the same time argues that any activity or any new thing should, to some degree, agree with its framework. When you have these two frameworks widely different, it becomes rather difficult, to say the least, to forward anything into the society. On the one hand, it would have to agree with statutes, but if these did not necessarily agree with the social structure of the public at large, it wouldn't be acceptable to the public, would it?

Now, if we made it acceptable to the public, why, it wouldn't come within social statutes, I mean, legal statutes. This is a very puzzling thing. Acceptability, it comes under the heading of acceptability. What is the legal and moral acceptability of Scientology? Because they expect Dianetics, Scientology, or witchcraft if it suddenly rose, to have sudden and certain legal, social, moral, ethical aspects. They expect it. And when something doesn't have these things, why, the society at large suspects it.

Well, let's take up and find out whether we have anything that agrees with the society. The society today in the face of all the activity on the part of machines, the abundance and so forth, is quite tolerant. It is not enforcing morals on the second dynamic very hard, there's a considerable freedom of action on the individual, they believe that people should have their own opinion. This might be kind of apathetic, the fact that people ought to have their own opinion but, nevertheless, people sort of believe this. And they also believe that you ought to run like hell when the cops show up or something like that. It's not a terribly high toned society, but yet it is, it at the same time has certain fundamentals.

Well, let's take a look at the auditor's code and let's find out that the auditor's code is, that's been with us a long time. And let's look at that and find out that it is, in essence, a moral code. It's not an ethical code, it's a moral code because, if the auditor's code is followed, cases revive and get well. And if the auditor's code is not followed, cases bog. It's just as simple as that, see? So, it is in essence a moral code, it is not an ethical code. It isn't something you do because you're nice, see, it isn't any survival bonus, it's just part of the woof and warp of auditing. You audit somebody, you audit him by the

auditor's code, you get results. So, it actually betokens this. The survival of the science itself is to a large degree dependent upon its following a code. Well, the auditor's code could be called something else, it could be called a code of how to be civilized. It, there's been a lot of statements made which include the word "*civilization*" but darn few have ever been made which would make a clean statement of what civilized conduct would be. Very few have. The auditor's code actually is such a statement if it were used in social concourse. You see, there's, it's a code of how to be civilized.

Well, let's take the legal aspect of this. Do you know that a law, to some degree, lies squarely across the auditor's code? Come as a slight shock to you, wouldn't it? To follow the auditor's code is "*illegal?*" Well, it's illegal to this extent: You're not supposed to help your fellow human being, according to the law. You're not supposed to. It says so. Nobody's going to treat nobody for nothing, but nobody. I mean, it's very clear on that subject because it says only medical doctors can treat. Therefore, if medical doctors cannot handle a certain thing, why then, of course, that had made it against the law that it be treated. Do you see this?

We have gone in, then, to legal structure and we find out that to help your fellow human being by the use of certain skills used exactly in the reference of the auditor's code, this becomes illegal. Oddly enough, the law makes it very legal if you cared to follow an entirely different code than the auditor's code. It makes it perfectly legal if you were to say, the auditor's code were to say, "*At all times the auditor should sympathize with the preclear and caution him against wrong conduct and to detract his attention to nothingness and make him worship nothingness.*" If the auditor's code said that, no statement or session could begin or end without paying tribute to a two thousand year past item, why, it would be legal.

And yet, we know by experience that this crushes people into the ground. You go around and you start sympathizing with the preclear and, "*You poor fellow and life has been so cruel to you,*" and then kind of covertly say, "*Of course, if you don't reform, why, the devil is going to get you. And now look up there and pray to the sky because that's the only place you're going to get any hope or help, the sky. You can't do anything for yourself...*" The auditor's code, you see, permits somebody to have an opinion and god never did.

And so, if the auditor's code said, "*Now, we're going to depend upon the permission of somebody who's been gone from the planet as far as we know for two thousand years in order to heal anybody,*" in other words, that looks back towards the saviour in order to save, you know, he died to save all of your sins and therefore, you must look two thousand years backwards in order to get well, you would be legal.

Now, this poses a very very interesting problem, doesn't it? Here you go, straight out with the society in the frame of reference in which the society is operating, what the society would actually consider an ethical code, which is actually to Scientology a very solid moral code because if it's disobeyed the preclear does not recover, and we find out that the whole practice of anything is straight into the teeth of jurisprudence. It's fantastic. This means, of course, that a great frailty must exist today in the courts. It means that the courts themselves are not running in agreement with the society, so they are not the courts of the people. It's all very well, it doesn't make them any the

less forceful, but they are not the courts of the people. Whatever happens is beside the point.

We are just tracing the matter in terms of historical precedent. When courts have ceased to be the voice and the justice of the people, something has happened. I'm not saying there's going to be a revolution. More likely, it's some kind of a decay because that, in essence, is a sort of a decayed situation. This is not a preachment about revolution, it's not a preachment against anything, it's just trying to point something out to you that you can use and know in handling, you might say, "*propaganda*," to use a real crude word, in your own area.

People come up to you and they say, "*Well now, isn't this Scientology a cult?*" And, "*Yeah,*" you say, "*Not dissimilar to the cult of psychology.*" And they say, "*Well, isn't it awfully immoral, don't you do this and that?*" And you say, "*Well, as a matter of fact, it runs on the most moral code which has been produced in many many years called the auditor's code, and it isn't the limited code of ethics of the medical doctor.*" You can point out that the code of the medical doctor simply says one, that a doctor must not talk about or against other practitioners and two, that he mustn't advertise. I don't even think you could call this an ethical code.

The Hippocratic Oath is it's basic, and the Hippocratic Oath is one thing and the operation of the medical code is quite another. It is terribly immoral, immoral under any standard, to take in a patient and give him any hope of a cure when you have no case history of any kind anywhere that anything has ever been done to this particular ill of permanent nature. That's immoral. To take a man's money, well knowing that you cannot serve him, is stealing. It is simply the action of a knave. Medicine agrees with the code of courts of law but it doesn't agree with the people. That's interesting too, isn't it?

If you doubt that last one, I just invite you to go down the street and ring doorbells, at each doorbell, "*What do you think of doctors?*" Just ask them that question. You can always get into the most interestingly 1.5 conversation around any service station just by saying, "*Well, I've got to go see the doctor this afternoon. I don't know what he's going to do.*" That's all you've got to do and you've got a conversation on your hands.

They'll be somewhere around there saying, "*Well, I sent my daughter to the fellow up the street up here and I just guess you have to do it, but I sent her up there. And he operated and he whittled and he chewed and he gave a whole bunch of pills. And nothing happened, nothing happened, nothing happened, nothing happened, and that's the reason I'm driving this old wreck of a car. I just haven't had enough money to do anything about it.*" You get into an interesting conversation. In other words, medicine agrees with law, it doesn't agree with the people.

Now, what happened here? You have a system of healing which is very well in agreement with the people. It's just that people don't hear about Scientology. Auditor's don't communicate on it. We haven't been doing any great campaign of communication on it in this society. But when this subject comes up, ears go up. People listen. They talk about it. They have rather outrageous cross opinions and so forth, but you don't get into any 1.5 situation unless you're talking to a psychologist or a medical doctor. Then you get 1.5 conversation on the subject, but you don't get it with the public at large.

Pick up a girl that's been baby sitting and talk to her for a few minutes about life in general, and she says she has to get home because her own boy has been ill. *"What's the matter with him?" "Well, ever since he was born he's been sickly."* And say, *"Well, you know, there is something called Scientology that possibly might do something for him."* She says, *"Is that so? Well, what's it do?" "Well, they found out that the mind, you know, a body's built out of energy and runs on energy, and they found out the mind can handle that energy and it can change it around, and sometimes the mind can change it around so the body runs better. Yeah, it's actually a problem in nuclear physics and so forth, not a problem in medical."* *"Yes, what do you know,"* somebody who is practically illiterate, they've heard of an atom bomb and, *"Well, what do you know, is that so?"*

Well, they, of course, are not going to put out any outward motion because people are not in a state where they immediately communicate. If you expect the public to communicate, see, broadly, and reach very far, you're going to be mistaken, they're not going to. That's just the same thing as you trying to get a preclear to put some emotion in the walls of the room and you get this preclear, he can put it in the chair but he can't put it in the wall. Or if he can put it in the wall, he can't put it in the building down the street. That's just a matter of not being able to reach.

You'd actually, practically have to drive up the auditor in order to get help, but as far as that's concerned, they would permit the child to be helped. Not only that, they would be very happy about it, ordinarily. Well, you can do that, but if you were to talk to her about medicine, well, this is an actual conversation that we're parroting here, talk to her about medicine, says, *"Well, he won't be operated upon again, they have operated on him four times now. They've taken out half of his left side and they just won't, they're not going to operate on him again. He says he just won't have it and we won't have it, either, because honestly, we were fairly well off before we started these operations, but we don't have any money now. And that's why I have to go out baby sitting."*

See this? We get a perfectly open mind. Now, the odd part of it is, there are many practices they are open minded about. They're kind of apathetic about religion but something new or something that can be done they, they will listen. Well, anything new is liable to get a name for being a cult, it's liable to get a name for being this or that or something of the sort.

You could make a clear-cut statement on the subject of what Scientology is. Scientology is the natural development proceeding from the studies of the mind which began with Freud, a natural development which would have ensued inevitably as soon as more was known about energy. And when more was known about energy, there was more known about the mind. It might not have happened for another five hundred years, but it's a natural result. It would have happened somewhere along this line, you see, it just happened that it happened fast and quick but that doesn't mean it wouldn't have happened. It is a natural consequence, it's as natural as snow falling in Vermont in winter. It's just something that would have happened.

A fellow put up his opinion in 1890, something like that, that something could be done for the mind, that illnesses stem from mental conditions, and worked with that for many many years and nobody did very much about it and obviously it had some-

thing to do with energy or thinkingness or definitions in some line. Sooner or later, somebody who knew something about energy itself, who was a specialist in energy itself, certainly would have crossed terminals with the work of Sigmund Freud, with the work of William James, and with the work of other practitioners. Sooner or later. It's just kind of funny that it happened so quick, because Freud was still alive when I was first interested in the mind.

Now, somebody tries to tell you, you try to sell this on the idea that this is all new and strange. No, you actually, you actually aren't talking about something that's new and strange. Life would have developed it, sooner or later. Well, if you put that across and you say, *"Well, inevitably the work that was done with the mind and psychology and so forth would have culminated very naturally in more information and so on. The body's built out of energy, the mind handles energy, and when you knew more about energy, then you could do something about the body because you handle the mind. Obviously, this sort of a discovery, and the series of work, would have taken place and DID take place and we now have Scientology. Now, what can we do for you?"*

That kind of a relaxed attitude about it will get you a long long way through the society because the society is just sitting there with its arms wide open, because you're talking to something that already knows it. Alright. Now let's take the next thing, the next thing in line.

Let's take the, the again, a moral aspect. And they say, *"Well, what does Scientology believe in?"* Honest, this is the most ridiculous question that anybody could ask. *"What, what does a study of a system of universes, which results in Man and the physical universe, believe in?"* we laughs at, because they like to see symbols around, they like to see something represent something. And you could say, *"Well, it believes in able people being more able."* And that's all the deeper you have to go, *"Believes in able people being more able, it believes that there should be less illness, discomfort and unhappiness in existence but mostly, it believes in able people being more able. We don't much bother with the insane and so forth, we just handle able people and we make them more able."* You know?

You know, it was proven in the Korean War that it was the good pilot not the good plane, because we had bad planes and good pilots and we were faced with good planes and bad pilots, and we won. And it's obvious that, if a pilot's reaction time is one tenth of a second, that he'd be a much better pilot if his reaction time was one twentieth of a second. Well, that's kind of what we do. We just speed you up. We hate to see people driving down the street with a reaction time of one quarter of a second when, with a very little bit of work, we could boost their reaction time in driving a car up to a much more proper sixth or seventh or eighth of a second.

How long does it take them to put on their brakes? Well, if it takes them a quarter of a second to realize the brakes have to go on, they generally crash. So it would mean better drivers. It could mean a lot of better things in better ways. Here, Man is up against the machine, Man now has to get better to survive. And that's what we're trying to do. Any kind of a statement of what we're trying to do to get the thing off what we believe in, what we believe in. Well, a natural consequence to the work is, of course, the auditor's code, and if really hard pressed, what we believe in. Well, that's what we believe in, the auditor's code, and it is, that's what we believe in. And they'd

be very happy for that. Actually, the auditor's code was simply worked out on the basis of experience with preclears. They got well when you did this and they stayed sick when you didn't and it was totally defined in this fashion.

Then the next question is going to come up and it's going to hit you sooner or later, so you might as well stand by for it. And that is, *"What happens when you release the suppressions and inhibitions of an individual? Isn't it true that the pressure and fear of punishment alone keep Man good?"* Now THIS, my god, is one of the biggest philosophic questions that has ever been posed by Man, it continues to be posed by Man all the way through in any science, anything that comes up, somebody will talk about this.

People will say, *"Man is basically good,"* and somebody else will say, even Plato said, *"Man is basically evil, and if you took away the shackles and the chains, you would find there a beast so loathsome that you would very promptly resort to whips and torture to get him into his proper place in the cage."* Now this, this is the big argument, is Man basically good or is he basically bad? Well, how can you argue this when being good and being bad is actually a consideration? But you're not arguing with somebody when you're talking to the public or a judge you're trying to get to give you probation, or to process, or school children, you're trying to talk to a school principal, and you've come up against this fantastic problem. Is Man basically good or is he basically bad? Well, there is an answer for this, almost the kind of an answer that you would say would be a little story that you would counter this with, that would go a lot further than any vast philosophical argument because of one, you'd be putting your big toe immediately into the deepest slough of despond, as far as arguments are concerned, when you get into, *"Will Man be better if he is released of his chains?"* And that, it, oh, you could just go on.

If you ever talk to, if you ever talk to a priest about this, you could just, any logic and wit that you have would be sorely tried because, I swear, there have been thousands of years of men writing for courts and governments that proved conclusively that Man must be a slave. Every time any great conqueror has made nothing out of half of his nation, he has had to justify this by proving to everyone that Man is a beast after all, so therefore, it didn't matter if he killed them. So this justification runs through the society. The best way to answer it, I say, is this sort of a response. You go immediately into the subject of criminality. Don't take any halfway steps. As soon as anybody asks you, the minute anybody asks you, *"Well now, is it good for Man to have these fears and inhibitions and controls released? Would it, is it good for the society to have this happen?"* Just, you just pitch right over into criminality, see, bang. You just start talking about criminality as the example.

This, by the way, is a very graphic dramatic example because always before his eyes in the newspaper, on TV and so forth, is the example of the horribleness of crime and criminality. He is educated to believe that criminality is horrible and loathsome. And it is a problem, by the way, which the society is not solving. But you can talk about criminality. You could say, *"Well, it happens that numerous studies on the subject of criminals has uniformly revealed that criminality comes in when the ability to work goes out. The first step into criminality is the inability to support oneself by legal and peaceful means. And if you were to go through a prison, a penitentiary, and conduct a poll and to ask searchingly, you would find that those*

men committed their crime when confronted by the utter hopelessness of being able to give enough effort to receive their support by legal means. "

Now, that isn't a Les Miserables sort of a fact, it happens to be true, it happens to be true. The criminal has been greatly romanticized. People have exemplified freedom by pointing to the Jesse Jameses of the past track. But these men were not free. These men were slaves beyond the slavery of any working man you ever knew. They were the slaves of fears, phobias, obsessions and compulsions. Criminality has long since been suspected of being, and in psychology is uniformly believed to be, and those police who have studied psychology uniformly believe it to be, a neurosis. And so it is.

But it is just this kind of a neurosis, and you as an auditor can understand this rapidly, if you ask the neurotics you know, and the psychotics you run into, questions which test their ability to make effort, to use effort, you will find out that the common denominator of neurosis and psychosis is the inability to exert effort. Now, why is this? Let's look at it very mechanically because this is true, as true a mechanical fact as there is anywhere on the track.

When an individual is no longer able to handle effort and when he begins to escape from effort, his engram bank, his facsimiles move in on him and exert themselves and their force and power against him. It's just as easy, it's as simple a mechanical thing as though, as though you had a stick up here, you had a stick up here which you were holding the ceiling up with. And this stick is just so much force, power, rigidity. It's holding the ceiling up there. And now, let's say that this stick starts to waste away in some fashion and it begins to wobble a little bit and it wastes away a little bit more and it, at length, becomes a mere thread. At the moment when it becomes a thread, the ceiling's going to collapse, and a person doesn't go into heavy restimulation until the ceiling collapses.

Now this is, this is a matter of effort, it's how much effort can an individual handle. When he's chosen out force particles as his randomness, when he has begun to eschew any contact with energy or force, it, of course, can handle and effect him. When he refuses any longer to be cause on a force line, of course, he becomes an effect on a force line because he's surrounded by it. Oh, this is a grim horrible fact. If we didn't have easy methods of solution of this, it would be too terrible to release. But when an individual becomes weak, the walls fall in on him, just literally that.

Now, let's just look at a sick person. He's no longer strong. In the moment of his weakness, anything said to him can affect him deeply. Worse than that, he gets sick, he then begins to worry and have fears and so forth. In a moment of weakness, he recognizes this and the world has a tendency to just move right in on him. Why? He no longer has the strength and force to hold it away from him. Now, that's clinical. I don't advise you to give that story particularly to people, but I'm telling you that so that you will have a grasp of the actual mechanic behind this "*can't work.*" That is the actual mechanic. When an individual can't work, he can't handle effort. When he can't handle effort, he can't work. You could achieve a considerable affect upon workmen, just at large and in general throughout the country, if you were to go around and re-

move from them the fear that, sooner or later, there would be no work for them to perform.

They're actually dealing with a large fear. Men who are producing, men who are running machines, men who are handling the workaday world, are each one of them, to greater or lesser degrees, looking at or trying not to look at a time when they will no longer be able to work, or when the society will no longer furnish them work to perform.

It is enough for somebody to come up and say, "*We are in the middle of a depression. There is no employment,*" to take all of the ambition, strength and energy out of the working class of a country, so that within a dozen years, less than that, within twelve years certainly, but it showed up really within four years to such a degree that the youth of the country which had been fairly healthy, in World War I when recruited for that war, was found in World War II to be so largely, in terms of percentage, unable to pass a basic Army physical that the standards of physicals had to be lowered. And the Army and the government itself began an active campaign to furnish food to people who would be feeding a future soldier. That, in the United States. It's an unthinkable step for a democracy to take.

Well here, here, you see, men, men were faced with unemployment and the mere fact they were faced with unemployment brought them down in weakness. They then didn't get ambition, they then quit, they said, "*What's the use of handling anything?*" Apathy. They hit it and they hit it quick. Well, the incidence of crime went up on a steep climbing curve, which finally led the United States to take police measures which it had never before contemplated in history. And those police measures took a small body of men who, heretofore, had never been armed, who mainly looked after evidence in cases where the United States was being sued, that was their total purpose, they took this small body of men, they armed them and trained them like commandos. They put in the biggest central file system that has ever been known on Earth on the subject of criminals. They passed laws, laws, laws, all of them in the teeth of growing crime - and that was the FBI.

Do you know that there were no federal police before unemployment came about in the early thirties? You know, we did not have a federal police force. Those that we did have in the Federal Bureau of Investigation, simply furnished evidence, no more no less, they furnished evidence for the people, or against people who were trying to sue the government. They paid for themselves continually because they found out many of these suits were... and so forth. And these were slopped over to the biggest national police machine there exists, besides Russia, but this one is really efficient. The FBI headquarters within a few blocks of here is equipped with tear gas, riot guns, it's equipped with all the machinery and skills necessary to stop a fair-sized riot and stop it fast. And the boys who are there are trained to look and judge and shoot, if necessary. Now, this is something the United States never knew before, and it came up in this wave of unemployment. Crime has always climbed in moments of unemployment.

"Well," you say, "*The fellow has to eat so he turns to crime, he normally wouldn't.*" But that doesn't take care of the average criminal, the habitual criminal, the criminal type, the criminal mind. The criminal type, the criminal mind, is all in the neurotic bracket and the common denominator of neurosis is "*can't handle effort.*" When they can't work, they turn to crime. And look at this now, let's turn this around. What happens then, if an individual or a society or a strata of the people are reduced to the straights of neurosis? What would you expect from them? You'd expect that they would no longer perform their work and you would expect that they would indulge in larger and greater waves of crime. This is what you would normally expect. And that's a very reasonable expectancy, isn't it? The employment level of the country falls by some economic stress or other, not controllable by the working man, and the working man responds in terms of thinning his ranks out. Men are depressed into crime, it isn't just the factual problem of "*they have to eat.*" It's the problem that suddenly they are weak enough to steal. Man is essentially a social animal and he keeps his society running pretty well. The criminal is in a neurotic bracket where an obsession, a terrible obsession has begun to take place.

Now, I want to show you this communication graph right here, again, you know this graph. Thetan to the body to another body to another thetan. Well, this thetan here at A is nothing. In order to get a good duplication, in order to get a good communication, he's got to have a duplication, hasn't he? Well, he has become obsessed at length, he's become utterly obsessed that he must have a nothing at B. He has to have a nothing at B, there must be a nothing at B. You see that? And he, a nothing, basically, in order to communicate at all, must make a nothing everywhere.

Now, that kicks in lightly, well above the neurotic strata and way up as we've gone over here many times, here of course the thetan can make nothing or something pretty well at will. But he doesn't get obsessed with the idea of destruction - of murder, rape, robbery, this is all destruction - until he is on an obsessed "*got to make nothing out of it.*" And when he's on that obsessed line, you have a criminal. Obsessed, it really has to be obsessed. Do you see that? He gets on that strata, you've got a criminal. He has no choice anymore, he has only an obsession. A being, a spirit, in good condition, can make something or nothing out of things at will. He is actually more interested in the combinations of pattern and form, nothingnesses and somethingnesses, as an un-serious sort of a curioso. See, he doesn't get terribly serious about it. It's only when it becomes terribly serious, it's only when all the forms there are are confronting him and accusing him in some fashion or another, and it's only when he can no longer hold them off of him, that he goes on an obsessed line of "*I've got to make nothing out of it because if I don't make nothing out of it, it will swamp me,*" and other combinations like that. Well, that is neurosis and that is also quite, quite sharply as a single part of the neurotic pattern, that is also criminality. Criminality just happens to fall in the band of neurosis. When they can't work, when they can't handle effort, they turn to crime.

Now, what does this answer in terms of, "*If you take off a man's chains, what will his behavior be, what will his morality be?*" What's that answer? Well, the answer's this. An individual, on a self-determined basis, will lead a fairly well-organized rational pattern of existence, and an individual who is obsessed, who is being pushed at every side from en-

ergy masses he cannot handle, when he is everywhere receiving pressure, isn't thinking anymore. He isn't choosing anymore. He is drifting down toward the classification of a mad dog. It might be any kind of a stimulus which might set off the response of death and destruction. He no longer chooses his own course.

You mean to tell me that that Man is safe in this society? No, he's not. The truth of the matter is, an individual is as safe as he can handle effort, he's as safe to have around as he can handle force and effort and no safer, not a bit safer, because he's liable to go off at a tangent, he's likely to do something queer, strange, peculiar. No telling exactly what would set him off because he could have any quantity of this, of responses to any quantity of stimuli, or if there's no telling, why, then he's not safe, then the society itself isn't safe.

So therefore, you get down to have to having a policeman on every corner. What's he there for? Well, it's because somebody walking down the street may, at any moment, pick out a kitchen knife. You know, you can't make knives illegal, you can't make weapons illegal in a society. You wouldn't be able to cut sausage if you did that. Anybody walking down the street might suddenly pull a knife and begin to cut everybody up.

Now, you think I'm just using my imagination. I'm not using my imagination, that is the degraded state of an entire society of neurotics in Asia. They call it a condition known as "*amok*." All of a sudden, why, somebody will be set off by something, no telling what, he will pick up a kris and he will start out on a straight line and he'll kill everybody in his path until he himself is killed. And this society is so debased that it just sort of accepts this. The cop has a hard time out there, he has a real rough time. That's an accepted social custom and the state in which that occurs is a nation composed of the greatest, by reputation, robbers of the Pacific, chief of the Malays. The Malay has a terrifically unsavoury reputation in terms of murder, robbery, inhospitality, so forth. He's a sad character to be ... with. He rushes around trying to make nothing out of himself and his method of really surviving is to go out and carve up somebody's village, so he can pick up the coconuts and go home. That was his reputation before we civilized him with a ... Now the, the problem then, I'm not talking now against Malays, I'm just pointing out this is a strange and unusual coincidence, isn't it? A nation of robbers where you find the custom of amok.

In other words, if you reduce a man to too great a weakness, if you push him down too far, if you make it too impossible for him to handle effort, energy, if you make it too hard for him to work, if you let his mental structure get so bad off that he can no longer tolerate the idea of work, that's what occurs, you will have accomplished a nation of criminals which will require a policeman on every corner in order to have, even vaguely, peace. The ideal police state is one where they have a cop whose total weapon is a badge, who sits someplace and hears an occasional complaint that comes in. No crime. In such an area, you would also expect to find a tremendous amount of effort, enthusiasm, industry, color, play, a liking of life instead of a horror of it.

A fellow like Hitler is the arch-criminal type. Hitler can't tolerate getting his own hands dirty. He has to be worked for. He can't work himself. And he gets so obsessed

with this eventually that he recruits the riff-raf, the criminals who were made, tailor-made by the conditions succeeding World War I in Germany, tailor-made by inflation, unemployment, and he takes this strata of criminals and he welds them together into a political party, so called. And he forces a disarmed and degraded state into the most criminal state in the area of Europe and succeeds in causing the death of thirty million human beings.

There's nothing wrong with death, you see, but there's a lot wrong with dying without having given your consent. The German worked during that war under the leadership of such a man as Hitler to accomplish a nothingness everywhere he trod. He made a mistake every time he turned around. We are supposed to be over-awed by this great war, but this war machine was obsessed with making nothingness out of everything, including itself. And it did. I think if he'd just been let run, he would have destroyed himself. Without fortifying Europe, without consolidating his gains, without training or including into the German state any of the peoples around his borders, the man declares war on Russia. Imagine it. He hasn't done anything, I mean, every single line that he had anywhere was loose, uncemented. His political parties were in chaos, his leadership and leaders were very definitely in question, decay was already walking in his footsteps, and he turns around and declares war on a nation which was fully prepared to declare war on him. In other words, without even starting up anything. Then he goes on and he fights here, there. The stories of troops, for instance, the Africa corps, such a magnificent body of men as the Africa corps, it was the best certainly that the Germans had knocked together. Well, Hitler wouldn't even send down any transports to bring them home. He just had them turned over to the people who were taking prisoners in that area after the Africa corps had done its job. He just didn't ever send a transport for them.

We get, we get the fellow who was, I think, the Grauf Von Scheich, the modern battleship, he was fighting three much lighter ships and so forth, his orders are to sink it and blow it up. He does commit suicide. All they do when they, when they were captured at sea was just to sink the ship or sink their own ship, they messed up during the war just everything they could lay their hands on. Just nothingness, nothingness, nothingness, nothingness. Well, they didn't succeed on a long drawn survival state. Right now, half of them captives of a very unfriendly enemy, Russia, and the others under the very unhappy circumstance of being governed by utter foreigners.

Well, it was all right, I mean, if you could have made a fell swoop nothing out of the whole universe at a crack, maybe yeah, something like that. Let's just mess it up, make everybody unhappy, and cause a lot of pain and misery, just because of what? Because they themselves couldn't handle any effort. You see, Germany, by it's chemical industry, had the entire war won long before they armed their first soldier. They had it armed by the brains of German science which handled and controlled nearly all of chemistry in the world. How would you like to be in a position where you had a monopoly on the world's chemistry?

Well, to get back straight to this, an inability to move, an inability to handle effort, an inability to handle one's own life, an inability to be free within one's own frame of reference, results in a stimulus-response condition where no one is free. And criminality

is down scale from the average citizen, not up scale, and you bring the average citizen up scale and he goes into less and less an obsession to make nothing out of everything, and more and more into a comfortable frame of reference which is of interest to him and to the benefit of those around him.

Now, I think you could answer that question very well of "*What does Scientology do to the morals of an individual?*" You could say, rather snidely, that it created a moral structure from the one which has observably just decayed. The society at large is not under any slightest compulsion to be helped, but if it isn't helped, we're not going to be living in a very nice civilization.

[End of tape]