

THE ROUTE THROUGH STEP SIX

A lecture given on 7 November 1959

[Start of Lecture]

Thank you.

I heard astonishingly from the seminar leaders that there were some people present that didn't know what a HASI was and didn't know what an HCO was, and so forth. And astonishing as this may seem, I thought I'd better tell you.

Of course, a HASI is the Hubbard Association of Scientologists International that has offices on every continent and has its central office for Australia at 157 Spring Street, Melbourne, and is the Central Organization for Australia. And that's always familiarly referred to as the HASI. It's the Central Organization -- it's the service organization. It does the training, the processing. It handles certification. It does all sorts of odds and ends and bits and pieces.

And HCO is Hubbard Communications Office. And that's a spontaneous combustion, that's HCO, that's -- HCOs spring up; they occur. And it's very, very interesting.

You see, where we stay in agreement with legal we always get into some kind -- by which I mean, corporate law and all this sort of thing. We're all very careful in that field and we always try to stay in it, but things happen that don't necessarily agree with the laws of states.

Now, a corporation is something that is supposed to be formed by a number of individuals, preferably pompous and ponderous, who get together and decide and invest some money, and hold meetings. You see, that's how they happen. Well, that's never how anything has happened in Dianetics and Scientology. There's been a spontaneous formation of some sort, and boom!

And there's an area of interest, we have to do something about it, it busily organizes itself in some way -- we try to help the thing out, and the next thing you know, why,

there's this corporation sitting over there, and we say, „*Well, let's see, we'd better go to the registrar of companies and tell them.*“ And we always do! We are very, very kind and benign people. We don't pick on these poor little governments.

But HCO is a particularly wonderful manifestation of this. I'm liable to wake up any day of a given year and find we have a new HCO office somewhere.

Now, what happens is a Central Organization or an area of an enfranchised area organization gets so much traffic, so much is happening, things start to get so random and they go so far out of communication that their method of getting into communication is to take the brightest girl they've got and tell her she's the HCO Secretary and then they tell the Continental Office that there's an HCO Secretary over here and then they tell me, wherever I am, and then I write her a letter and tell her she's an HCO Secretary. And then she handles the problems of ethics, technology and awards.

In other words, if somebody's -- somebody hasn't been doing the public right, but has just been „*doing*“ the public or something like that, that's the business of the HCO Secretary.

And then there's the problem of technology: What is now currently allowed in terms of research? What is allowed in the way of standard processes? And which processes have been found to be best and how should they be run and who can run them and that sort of thing. She answers those problems.

And she gets routine issues of bulletins and so forth, material and so on, that I write, and makes sure they go out.

And then on awards, people who have certificates -- if they can have a certificate, if they pass their examination, if they are qualified, all that sort of thing, that's all up to the HCO Secretary.

She's actually some pumpkins. Therefore they try to efface themselves and the public seldom hears much about HCO. HCO has as its general purpose the wearing of the hats that I personally wear and they wear them for me here and there. And HCO today is just scattered all over this planet! It's -- it's actually a tremendously effective, very small, very numerous-officed organization. And of course, I'm very proud of these girls. They do a terrific job!

And where you have things straight in an area or where things are straightened out or where problems are being handled one way or the other, why, if those problems have to do with ethics, technology and awards and so forth, why, they're handled by HCO.

But, of course, the HASI is very, very, very important. The HASI is the Central Organization. And if anything's going to get done the doingness is done by the HASI and so on.

Now, I wanted to keep this down to an elementary simplicity so that those people who were brought by trained auditors -- but my worst nature won.

And I'm going to give you a lecture now, with your permission, that has to do with an explanation of social behavior, conduct, government conduct, other things, that is the

package explanation of why things happen the way they happen, and also what happens in cases.

And I talked to you about Step 6, and this has something to do with the route around Step 6 and why Step 6 got deadly on some people. Would you like to hear about that?

Audience: Yes.

All right. I'll just sail out into the blue, and those that don't know all the basic basics, and -- or their own basic-basic -- keep up with me as you can. I think you will find this much more comprehensible than you think.

But let us start right out in full stride and call your attention to the cycle of action. Now, everyone knows there is a cycle of action and everyone knows that this is part and parcel of Scientology and it occurs in the book *Fundamentals of Thought*. And a cycle of action is a very important part of the basic mechanics of Scientology.

But that there was this much still to be known about the cycle of action makes me ashamed of myself. And should -- you should be ashamed of yourself for never having noticed it. But, as usual, I have to notice these things. It's the little cross I bear.

Now, the cycle of action, as you will find in *Fundamentals of Thought*, has to do with state of existence plotted against time for any given form or object.

Now, there you are sitting in a chair. Or what is in that chair? All right, what's in the chair?

Audience: A body.

A body, all right. Now, the body follows this cycle of action. The body follows this cycle of action. Now, what sort of an environment do you have? What are your surroundings right here? Look around. Take a look.

What's there?

Audience: A room.

All right. Those forms follow the cycle of action. Now, who are you? Go on, who are you?

Audience: A thetan.

Yeah. Well, you're about the only thing around that wouldn't follow the cycle of action but you sometimes think you do! A thetan doesn't follow the cycle of action. He observes the cycle of action.

So, we've got a body and we've got a room, and the forms of the body and the room follow this cycle of action. And that's very simple here. I'll just draw a picture of it, a big picture, and then we'll go on with it.

Now, that's all there is to it. This is plotted against time -- create, survive, destroy. And that is the lot of any form at this time in the physical universe. It is created, it survives and is then destroyed. That is the cycle of action.

Now, the first time this was ever noticed was in one of the unwritten Vedic hymns, Lord knows how long ago. I've forgotten when I did write it. Let's see? But it runs like this. They don't have this clean, clear-cut cycle of action. It got a little bit muddled up and complicated.

It's „*Out of the infinite nothingness there arrived a form which in various aggressions and recessions proceeded on through the infinity unto the time it declined, degraded and disappeared.*“

Well, it's written in various ways, some of them much more colorful than that. But the truth of the matter is something got created and that which is created survives and is then destroyed. That's the simplicity of it.

But let us examine this cycle of action as it is examined in Fundamentals of Thought and we'll find out something very interesting. Creation to persist, as in survival, has to be continuously created. So it's create (that was the beginning) and then you get create-create-create-create-create, see, continuous creation. We get the persistence of something if it's continuously created, and then one of two things would happen: It would either be continuously created or not created at all and you'd get absolute destruction. But if the continuous creation changed while it was being continuously created -- you created something on it to change its form or alter it or vary it in some way -- you would get the destruction of the original form. You get the idea?

There is no such thing as an absolute destruction except ceasing to create. And this -- this is one of the most fundamental fundamentals of this universe. And these particular discoveries and so forth take nuclear physicists and leave them with terrible headaches because they're more simple and more fundamental than nuclear physics, because it gives you the character of matter.

And you can go off into complications that have gimmicks and ruddy rods and quantum mechanics and everything else all piled on top of this thing, gah-woof!

What is still being created that everything else is creating an alteration of? Well, that is the fundamental building block of the universe. It's that thing which is still being created that a great many alter-isnesses have been created about.

Right now you almost never see a pure cycle of action. A pure cycle of action would simply be this: A fellow creates something, then he continues to create this thing so that it looks like it's persisting, you see, and then ceases to create it at which moment it disappears. Now, that would be a knowing, meaning, clear-cut cycle of action. That would be in its simplest form, and that's the only kind of real destruction there would be. You'd just cease to create somebody and that would be destruction in an absolute nature.

Now, where -- where do we go astray on destruction and how do things get so mish-mashed and why is everybody so puzzled about it all? Well, it's just that most destruction is not cessation of creation. It's an additional creation on top of the object which is being destroyed. We have a form and we put some dynamite in it and it goes boom! And we say, „*Well, we destroyed that!*“ Oh, did we? What are all those fragments lying all over the place?

So, destruction is actually basically an alter-isness. What people call destruction is an alter-isness. It's never the cessation of anything. So if you wonder if somebody gets in trouble if he goes around destroying things -- well, the more he destroys, the more he doesn't get rid of, because he's got the bits and pieces left forever lying all over the place because he still must be creating whatever he tried to destroy.

See, he's -- take a vase, a potter makes a vase and then he continues to make the vase in order to have a solid form, and you have to help him make the vase continuously, and it survives and it gets over, and everybody decides to destroy this vase. So they break it up. Now, of course, they've got fragments of a vase left there till the end of time because somebody's still creating a vase! Otherwise you couldn't break it up. You can't break up that which isn't being created. It's as stupidly simple as this.

So, two nations go to war and the United States and the Allies are going to end Japan! Going to finish off the Japanese empire and so forth. They're going to go to war.

Well, it's a good thing they did. But they -- in destroying it, they made its bits and pieces persist till you hear President Eisenhower recently saying that the United States couldn't do such and such a thing because it would lose face. And it was a good thing they went to war with Germany because the Germans were all out on a -- various line. But what do we find now? We find in the American Army relics of German habits, equipments and names and titles and things the like of which you never heard of. They're scattered all over the US Army.

In the First World War the conquest of Germany wound up with American soldiers wearing, not quite, a German helmet. Did you ever notice that? In the Second World War they wound up with their panzer divisions and all kinds of subdivisions and battle tactics and names and nomenclature and so forth. And you look over the US Army rule book and you wondered, „*Who won?*“

You see, they never destroyed Germany. AH they did was alter-is it. They didn't just cease to create Hitler; they alter-ised all of Hitler's works. So, of course, basically they're persisting. And now people are going mad over in

Germany trying to uneducate the Hitler Youth. You ask -- in a German schoolroom, you ask the boys, „*Well, now, what do you think of Adolf Hitler?*“

„*Well, he's probably a misguided man in that he was a zealot, and he made some beautiful auto-bahns, and he got the German race better known throughout the world and he purified the blood of the Aryan people.*“ And they say, „*No, no, no, no, no. No, no, no. What you're supposed to say is, 'Hitler was a dog and a villain and never should have existed!'*“ And they say, „*Yes, we know we're supposed to say that.*“

Very recently a couple of German girls appeared over in London and were hired organizationally. They were Hitler Youth. Straight -- straight out of it. They were talking about some people had pure Aryan blood and some people didn't and -- and so forth.

The very violence which was pressed up against that mocked-up culture is making that culture persist in some fashion. Even though it has been conquered, it is still

alive. They didn't cease to create it, in other words, they alter-ised it. And so you get very few pure cycles of action.

Nowadays with the embalmer's art being what it is -- and by the way, the medical examiner of the city of New York explained to me one day, he said, *„Well, the Egyptian, well, he might have thought he knew a thing or two. He, you know, buried a lot of mummies in tombs and preserved them. But,*“ he says, *„as far as the embalmer's art is concerned,*“ he says, *„we in modern times do a much better job.*“ He says, *„Our corpses,*“ he said, *„be dug up 10,000 years from now,*“ he said, *„they'd be just as good as the day they were buried.*“ Well, you certainly can't get a very pure cycle of action while an embalmer's around.

A person's born -- a person is born, a person survives and something destroys him. That's generally the way this is thought of. And the destroyed body, you see, is put in a coffin and filled full of formaldehyde and taped up and painted properly, and the coffin is put inside of a concrete vault, and then they bury that in the ground where the seepage won't get to it and it never does finish its cycle of action, you see, for an awful long time. And the cycle of action keeps on going.

This bothers thetans! If you look on the backtrack you'll very often find, though, that what really upsets them is not being up -- it doesn't upset them to be buried. It upsets them to be left around unburied.

If I were really wanting -- wanted to get even with somebody, I would say, *„Well, you know, I'm going to wait until you're dead and then I'm going to dig up your body. I'm going to take it up on a high hill and expose it to the wind and weather, you see. And after it's gone along for a while and is kind of weathered away, I'm going to take the skull and sell it to a carnival with the jaws so fixed as to flap, you see, and with some sort of a speaker unit in back of it that will tell the people some kind of a story. That's what I'm going to do with your skull.*“ Might not be real to them, but they wouldn't realize that their nightmares after that had something to do with what I'd told them, because they're very afraid of just that thing happening.

If they could get an absolute destruction of the body, they'd be all right, but you can -- oh, every once in a while you pick up somebody in processing, you find out that he's still been ... A girl in London -- picked her up, ran it back to a time 1,500 years ago and body, murdered. The Greeks didn't like bodies that had been murdered. And the body had just been thrown into a grove and neglected and just deteriorated gradually. And you know, still part of her consciousness was still there. It wasn't so much of an engram. Part of her was stuck in a grove in Greece, right now in present time, see? And that was why she always kind of felt a little bit absent and not quite here. It wasn't that she was on the backtrack, it was that she was in a grove in Greece still hanging around because of evidently a couple of particles left of this body or something. Couldn't quite make out why.

But there's persistence, you see, still continuing to mock up something that wasn't there, still trying to make something survive that has been destroyed pins the person down to the area.

You see how this would work? The person is -- says, *„I don't want to lose this body. I don't want to lose it. Don't want to lose it. Don't want to lose it. Don't want to lose it. Don't want to lose it.*

it. “ And head goes off, you know, and it gets cut in two and the person says, „*I don't want to lose it. Don't want to lose it.*“ And boy, he's pinned down still protecting -- finally he's protecting an idea.

And there are people here right this moment that have some kind of a mass stuck around here someplace, you know. They're conscious of it occasionally and they're still protecting the mass energy idea of a body they once had. See, it is still being created, and it hasn't been destroyed at all because there's something left of it.

So, absolute destruction is something we see very little of in this universe. Now, in Dianetics, the dynamic principle of existence, as agreed upon by all animals and so forth and beings, was said to be survive. And we know just a little bit more than that. That was observable, and you'll find that in Book One, Dianetics: The Modern Science of Mental Health.

In Scientology we've advanced this just a little further and we know the dynamic principle of existence in Scientology broadens out to create. The dynamic principle of existence is creating. The action of creation is the dynamic principle of existence.

Now, don't please, run this back off into Sigmund Freud. What's the idea of bringing him in? I know he talked about the second dynamic and sex, and it was all sex and if anybody ate a bad dinner and it disagreed with him, well, that was sex. And if you didn't like spaghetti and if you rode horses it was all sex. And if you got fired, well, that was sex. Confidentially, it's been my opinion for a long time that he sort of had it on the brain.

No, create means a great deal more than that. Actually, the second dynamic is simply a body manifestation of sex. Let's see how far just create goes. Well, it goes into the fact that if you've got a job you'll continue to have a job. In other words, your job will survive so long as you create the job. So if you have somebody -- there's a job called governor general of the Mishmash Tool Company, see. And that's a tremendous position, you see. It's been occupied by great men. Has a tremendous salary. We take this little fellow down here and we say, „*You're now appointed governor general of the Mishmash Tool Company.*“ He goes in ... He hasn't got a prayer of creating that job, has he? The job is so much bigger than he is! See, the job's big and he's little and he couldn't create the job -- well, boy, he doesn't survive very long or the Mishmash Tool Company doesn't survive very long either.

And politically, every time you elect to office a man that's smaller than the job, the job doesn't get created and the government doesn't function! And that goes right on -- right on down to janitors. If a guy cannot or is not willing to create the job of janitor he will never do any janitoring. He'll do everything else.

You come in, find the water pipes all busted and the furnace all rinsed and everything going wrong and the roof off. That's what he's been doing. He hasn't been doing janitoring, because he wouldn't create the job of janitor.

I don't care whether the post is some tremendously high post or some very, very low one, one has to continue to create his job! It isn't something that goes on forever

automatically because as soon as it slides over to going on forever, it slides right on down the curve and goes into destruction.

He's creating it less and less and then he decides he doesn't like it, so he'll alter-is it in some fashion in order to destroy his former beingness. Well, he's still being the same beingness and alter-ising the same beingness at the same time he's being it. And he hasn't been -- he hasn't been an executioner for 1,500 years, he hasn't been one. Obviously that cycle of existence disappeared -- altered it. All the overts on it have all disappeared. There's nothing left of his life as an executioner except he can't stand ties! So, there'd be right ways to end things and wrong ways.

And the right way to end things is simply to cease to create them. Ah, but to cease to create anything you have to realize that you were responsible for creating it in the first place.

Now, let's take a reactive bank; there it is. And the person says, *„I don't create it. It's totally other-determined. It just seems like every time I think of spaghetti I get hit in the face. And I have nothing to do with it whatsoever.“*

Well, the reason why he gets hit in the face every time he thinks of spaghetti -- he gets a somatic, you know, every time he thinks of spaghetti or something -- some other ridiculous thing like he hears a typewriter running and gets a cold. Whenever he smells gas fumes he gets a pain in his hip -- never manages to connect the two at all. If his wife looks at him crossly, why, he knows she has put poison in the soup. All of these things that are absolute knowns he seldom connects up with any other factor. And seldom even recognizes them.

But not one of these things would he own up to creating! He'd say, *„Wen, that's something I'd never create. Nope. The one thing I would never do -- would create a wife who would put ground glass in the soup.“* And, of course, as soon as he said that he'd never create a wife that would put ground glass in the soup, if he has engrams on the subject of the wife putting ground glass in the soup, then hell always be suspicious of women putting ground glass in soup!

And it'll go much further than that. His alter-is will start to get into a scale of substitutes. Any soup might have ground glass in it. Food has ground glass in it. When you pick up tablecloths you get ground glass in your fingers. All whitish powder is ground glass really. (We get a new scientific discovery by some sane scientist.) Whenever he looks at a white wall (which is the same as a white tablecloth), he gets a funny feeling in his mouth as though the skin's raw. See? Alter-is, alter-is, alter-is, substitute, substitute, substitute.

And what have we got? We've got destroy -- alter-isness and you're not getting destruction at all. You're just getting persistence, persistence, persistence. He is unconsciously and unknowingly continuing to create the thing that kills him. And we get what's wrong with the reactive bank. And people just will not create certain things. They won't! They won't! They won't And that's it. Zrupp! And whatever a person absolutely refuses to create, if it has ever cut his throat, will then continue to cut his throat.

People who are alter-ising continuously, changing something, not just ceasing to create it -- see, the wife says, *„I'm not guilty in this marriage. I'm not the one who's doing any nagging. I've always been sweet and good. And at night when he's come home there I've been tired and worn out, and I've been sweet and good and gotten his dinner and done everything for him and never done a single thing and encouraged him along the way the whole time.“* And the more she thinks like that, you know, the worse her stomach gets and her back and so on -- *„And I've been sweet and good and I've never done anything but be a good wife.“*

And of course this isn't his viewpoint at all. He said, *„I have been a model husband. I've been a model husband. Here I come home, worked hard all day, sweated my fingers to the bone, just taking it from every corner, just to earn the bread of the family. Here I come home, tired, exhausted, just for a little kind word, something of the sort. And what do I get? Yak, yak, yak, yak, yak!“*

Well, to listen to the two. of them, you'll finally form the opinion that life was never like that either way. If there's any trouble between them it's because neither one of them is taking responsibility for creating the existing situation. But somebody must be creating the existing situation! And there are only two people present!

Now, it's all very well to invent devils and gods and say, *„They came along and came in through the bay window and got it in for you because you were blasphemous or didn't put ice cream in the collection plate or something“*

I'm sorry if I've stepped on anybody's Christian principles. If there are any Christian principles present I honor them. I honor them deeply -- if they're Christian principles.

But who's responsible for the situation? And you hear these two people talking and this one says that that one's responsible, and this one says that one's responsible. And both of them insist on other-determinism.

This one says, *„You are creating the whole situation.“* And this one says, *„You are creating the whole situation.“* Neither one of them will admit to creating any part of the situation. And what do we get? The situation exists! And if neither one of them admits to having created it, we get destruction. It just slips -- just like that!

And we get what you might call -- and we could go into this much more technically and at length. Well, we get what you might call carelessly a slip on the cycle of action. The less responsibility there is for creating what is created, the more rapidly the cycle of action goes from create to destroy. Very -- it's very simple.

But it'll slip so fast that if you find what anybody is trying to waste or destroy, you will find the thing he won't create.

This person says, *„Well, I just can't stand insects. Insects, they are just terrible. Everywhere insects, insects. And I just can't stand insects. They just drive me mad! Swoosh-swoosh- swoosh, swoosh-swoosh-swoosh. Swat. Swat. Kill the insects! Kill them off, you know! Kill them off! Kill the insects. Kill the insects. Kill the insects,“* and so forth.

Now, oddly enough, if you ask this person as a preclear, you said, *„Now mock up an insect,“* you'd get a dead insect. It just goes phhsst. *„Mock up an insect.“* Phhsst. And you get a destroyed insect.

In other words, he can't mock up an insect. He's got to mock up an insect plus an alter-is. He gets a slip. When he tries to create it he gets destruction. Got the idea?

So, you'll find anything that a person is trying to destroy one way or the other -- you ask them to create it, they get the destruction of it. Very simple.

Sounds incredible. But the living truth of the matter is there are other phenomena connected with this, but there are people around that always get destruction on anything they try to create. That's right. You ask them to create anything and they'll get it in a destroyed form. Anything created becomes a destroyed form, just like that -- bang!

In other words, you say, „*Now create a pretty girl*“ to this person, and this person gets a dead girl eaten up with maggots. Just like that -- bang! -- automaticity.

You say, „*Create a little child.*“ Bang! Under the car wheels, you see, dead.

Now when that gets too bad, they just never get pictures at all; it's just all destroyed. They never really create anything but the destroyed faction of it, therefore they think of nothing but the destruction when they start to create something. You got the idea? It's just an automatic slip.

You say, „*Create*“ they say, „*Destroy.*“ Just like that -- bing!

This is so much the case that an artist takes his life in his hands practically when he goes into the public with art. Critics are people with this slip. There are people who can write and there are critics. There are people that can paint and there are critics.

Now, if you were to ask a critic who was a professional critic to paint a picture, the high probability is he would simply tell you, „*Destroy, destroy, destroy, destroy.*“ Just the thought of painting a picture causes him to think of destroying a picture. Well, he wouldn't be able to do that because, you see, the colors wouldn't come out right and it'd all be streaked with this and that. But the thought of anybody else creating anything drives him mad! So, he's got to be a critic.

„*Well, there was an exhibit today down at the town hall of some paintings. We don't know why our city fathers permit such things to be displayed. Compared to Rubens -- ha!*“ You know, chop-chop- chop.

And some of them are overtly destructive and some of them are covertly destructive and so forth, but these are people with a slip. And the poor artist, you see, who can create a picture runs into people who instantly skid on the cycle of action at the thought of a picture having been created! So the fact that he's painted a picture touches the button which makes them have to destroy the picture, and if he continues to paint pictures, obviously they have to destroy him.

You get then, in an aberrated world, any overtly creative action being met in many quarters by destruction! It's just one-two. And these two things come together so that we get the interplay of people whereas one person starts to create, another person's got to destroy it. Or two people start creating something and then destroy each other. Or those things which are created have to be destroyed. Or people who insist on cre-

ating in spite of the fact that everybody's going to destroy them -- We get all sorts of variation,; and we get

an interplay between these two things and we get the interweavings of life. And if you think it over for a little while -- look it over, I think you will find that most of the violent reactions, most of the inexplicable reactions which you have observed in the past had something to do with the destruction of a creation.

The belief that something has been created is enough for some people to insist that it must be destroyed so that you get -- a whole society of some kind or another will do an incredible thing. They've been formed to help epileptic children, let's say. You come along and you say, *„Well, all right, we're going to help epileptic children. We could do something for epilepsy.“* They immediately say, *„Shoot him!“* And then the next thing you know they say, *„Anybody who says he can do anything for epileptic children is a quack. This society was formed to help epileptic children. There is no cure for epilepsy.“*

This goes into an additional stage. The Society for the Prevention of Epilepsy and the Help of Epileptic Children becomes the Society for the Punishment and Vivisection of Epileptic Children. They destroy, then.

So, your mental health societies, they -- they just think of doing something for mental health or about mental health, in other words, creating a better situation, and they instantly start killing people who need mental help. Just automatic reaction. Say -- they think, *„Well, I think I will help all these poor insane..“*

„Kill them!“ See? It just goes just like that.

If people say, *„Well, I will certainly help the people if I am put in charge of its government. What we will do is create a fine, good and noble government where everybody will be happy!“* So, everybody puts this fellow in charge. And he takes the various departments of the government and cuts them to pieces and changes them all over and stands people up against the wall and shoots them down with machine guns and so forth. Well, that would just be a very aberrated choice.

Hitler was making great promises for the German people and how he was going to help the German Reich, and where's the German Reich today.? Hasn't been heard of for some time, except in its guise in the American Army. In other words, this man was so unbalanced that trying to create a good German state made him destroy the German state. Do you follow that?

Now, we must be pretty good people in Scientology because almost never do we have very flagrant examples of this. In psychoanalysis, old-time nineteenth-century practices, psychiatry, all these old-hat sort of things, they're legion -- the examples -- that they -- a practitioner starts to help somebody and instantly kills him.

Now, you think once in a blue moon that this is what the auditor's doing to you. But, I have great faith in auditors in Scientology and I have found everywhere I have looked that whatever an auditor was doing, even though it looked a little bit miscolored or something of the sort, he was earnestly, honestly and sincerely trying to help the preclear.

I've followed an awful lot of squawks and beefs and yaps, to be very colloquial, down of auditors' misconduct and all this sort of thing, and amongst trained Scientologists they just didn't have any real basis in fact at all. The fact that somebody was trying to create a new state of beingness for the person made that aberrated person want to destroy the practitioner.

This is the automaticity which one runs into when he takes a very aberrated person, tries to do anything for him. Then all that person can do is cut him to ribbons! This is typically a psychotic reaction. You try to help a psychotic, oh boy, wow! They're all over you, they're tearing you to bits. And if they can't get at you physically, they'll get at your reputation, try anything they can think of to cut you to ribbons. Why? Your total crime was you tried to create a better state of beingness for them.

So, until you can hand out processing institutionally, where an institution is taking care of the psychotic, and where he can't tear everything up just because you're trying to help him -- see, because he does an automatic slip. The fact that you're trying to make him survive causes him to destroy. That's the most horrible crime you can pull on a psychotic is try to make them survive! And you just go „*survive*“ to a psychotic and he goes „*destroy*“ instantly -- bing! bing! It isn't even create-destroy, it's survive-destroy.

He knows what survival is; it's lying down on railroad tracks being run over by trains. That's -- that's survival.

And until you can put a psychotic in an institution where you've got -- got padded cells and attendants and they can't hurt the practitioner and they can't hurt each other and they can't hurt themselves and so forth -- can't do anything for them. Because the violence of this skid is so great that they're just left out in the society. Trying to do something for them causes them to practically explode in everybody's face! And of course, you're not going to have control of institutions as long as you have nothing but avowed killers in institutions running them. I don't mean to use a strong expression and say everybody in charge of all the institutions for psychotics in the world are murderers and killers and bums and so forth. I'll shorten it and merely say they're psychiatrists.

But Scientology can do as much as it has facilities for in that direction because of this phenomenon.

But where you see people trying to do something for people and you see that effort going wrong, look it over and I think you'll see clearly what you're looking at. I think you'll see that this fits, that you can see this explanation in action.

Somebody's trying to help somebody and this other person is trying to do this. And you see somebody trying to get along and create a job and you see other people in the organization, very low-scale people, something like that, cutting this person to pieces. Oh, they're a terrible person, and so forth, and this person is really the person trying to do a job.

You'll see this -- instances of this all the time. And as you look at these instances, it gives you an opportunity to evaluate conduct against sanity. In other words, there are

sane actions and there are insane actions. And you can evaluate the value of this on the basis of how fast the person skids between create and destroy. The fact that anybody's trying to create anything, does that make this person try to destroy that thing.?

You look this over. And I don't ask you to assimilate it all srrp, and I certainly don't ask you to buy it 100 percent, but just look it over as an automatic reaction that some people are so close to this destroy...

You get, by the way -- your Tone Scale goes down and your cycle of action follows the Tone Scale down. As you get low on the Tone Scale you get more and more destructive reaction toward creation until you get no reaction at all.

And you look over the general behavior of man, and I invite you to inspect these principles of creation and -- versus destruction as the reactions of different personalities toward different subjects.

All of us are agreed that certain things need to be destroyed. There should be certain things destroyed. Well, we also know how to destroy them and that's to cease to create them. In some fashion we'll get whoever is creating them and whoever's helping create them to cease to create them and they'll be destroyed.

Also we can understand what's going on amongst men to the degree that creative efforts or helpful efforts and so forth are met with destruction. And I just ask you to apply the cycle of action and see if it works and if it isn't a useful yardstick to you in understanding men.

Well, this is the last lecture of this afternoon, and I will see you again at one o'clock tomorrow.

And you have been very pleasant and I am very glad to be here. And thank you for having me.

[End of Lecture]