

ELEMENTARY MATERIAL: KNOW TO MYSTERY SCALE

A lecture given on
7 January 1955

There are some elementary materials of Scientology which we mustn't overlook which have been of fascinating interest to Advanced Clinical Courses for a very long time. The first and foremost of these is the Know to Mystery Scale. I've stated this in various ways, mostly because it was refined in statement. But you get a condensation of knowingness. A condensation of knowingness occurs down to lookingness. One has something to look at.

And then this condenses and we get emotion. And this condenses and we get effort. And this condenses and we get thinkingness – you know, figure-figure. And this condenses and we get symbols. And the symbols condense and we get eating and the eating condenses and we get sex and the sex condenses and we get mystery.

Now, we could go on down south again and say, below mystery we get peering. And below peering, why, we would of course get misemotion. And below misemotion we would get horror of effort. And below horror of effort, why, we would get something on the order of a circuit instead of thinking-ness, you see.

And below this circuit, why, we would get incomprehensible symbols and sciences like psychology. And below, and below this circuitry we would get indigestion. And below indigestion we'd get sterility and impotence. And below this, why, we would get unconsciousness.

And, now, this is a dwindling spiral. This is the picture of the dwindling spiral and this is the scale. We can recognize this scale today as – in various processes. You might think it merely curiosa at times, but you had certainly better know some of the things you are looking at. It helps you out a lot with a preclear to know what you are looking at. A few auditors have been known to get some results because they knew what they were looking at.

Now, we go down scale in scouting preclears pretty darn low. You could say this Know – it's originally called the Know to Sex Scale, but you understand that it goes know to sex, and then mystery to unconsciousness. You get the idea? It could harmonic.

Just as we, in the Philadelphia lectures, demonstrated the fact that the desire-ennforce-inhibit spiral is actually – you could say desire is way up, and then enforce is in the middle of the Tone Scale and is inhibited at the bottom.

Well, we could also draw the same scale this way: desire-enforce-inhibit. And you've only come down one-tenth of a millimeter. Then desire-enforce- inhibit, and you've only come down another tenth of a millimeter, you see? Desire-enforce-inhibit and you've come down another one, so that you could draw the whole Tone Scale as a Know to Mystery Scale. The whole Tone Scale could be drawn in this fashion with one Know to Mystery Scale laid out on it.

Or it could be one Know to Mystery Scale and we've gone down a tenth of a millimeter, and one mystery – Know to Mystery Scale, we've gone down a tenth of a millimeter. You get the idea?

In other words, out of this big section we can take little sections of it and we find out they have all the essential parts of the big section, you see?

In this particular case, in this type of graph, why, we get the part as having all the characteristics of the whole. So we take the band, let us say – this is not meaningful, I mean, I'll just give you an arbitrary area of the Tone Scale – and we would say from 1.8 to 2.0 and right in that area we would have a Know to Mystery Scale complete, see. The part is the same as the whole.

This is not always true. You take a machine apart and you will find out that the cogwheels and the axle are not the same as the whole. But in this particular case, they are the same as the whole because you are dealing essentially with just one thing and that's thought. And these are the component parts of thought in its condensation.

Now, this becomes very curious in the running of Opening Procedure by Duplication because if you were to closely watch your preclear, and if you were to cause him to describe what was happening and to describe what he was doing and to describe the – exactly what you'd told him to describe, you know, “Look at it,” you know. And he looks at it and you say, “What color is it?”

And he says, “Well, it's – uh – it's red.” It's a book, by the way, with eight colors on the jacket, see, and he says, “It's red.”

And you say, “What color is it?”

And he says, “It's well, it's – it's red, with a little green here.”

And you say, “Well, that's – that's fine.” You go on along the line. And the next time you come by this book, this same object which you're repeating on, why, you say, “What color is it?” And he's gotten away with this. He knows the satisfactory answer to you is “It's red with a little bit of green on it.” Didn't look at it at all, see.

And you say, “What color is that?”

“Well, it's – uh – it's – uh – well, it's red with a little bit of green on it. Of course, there's a blue over here.” You get the idea.

Brace him up. Just because he's found the answer to be a satisfactory answer to you is no reason under the sun, no reason under the sun why – demonstrates that he is looking at it. But this sort of thing occurs.

That's beside the point. Just a little bit of an aside here on making him run such a process.

All right. Completely aside from this, as the preclear runs Opening Procedure by Duplication you will find him coming up the Mystery to Know Scale. You know, you'll start to come up the scale. And this is one of the more curious things, because he is so jammed in at the bottom – in other words, the scale itself is condensed down at the bottom – that he is liable to hit sex, effort, know, you see, bing-bing-bing. And then he will hit eatingness.

You understand, he's going over this scale, is so condensed that he's only hitting spots on it. This is perfectly all right. I just want you to know what you are looking at, because this is one of the most curious things. As you make him describe – as you make him describe the color, and that sort of thing, why, he'll tell you “It's good enough to eat,” you see.

Or he will tell you “It is awfully heavy this time,” or he will tell you “I don't know I'm kind of bored with this.” That doesn't, by the way, mean he's up in boredom. He's probably in the apathy of boredom when he tells you such a thing.

Every one of the emotional bands has every one of the emotions in it. Now, this is the part being the whole sort of a thing. Well, let's take boredom as an emotion and we find out there's the anger of boredom and there's the grief of boredom and so on.

Let's take apathy. This is one of the most remarkable things. There is a – an apathy of rage. Or a rage of apathy, and so forth. I mean, “Oh, I don't know what I'm going to do, but I could just kill somebody about this,” you know? So we take each one of the emotions and we find out it has each one of the emotions in it.

All right. As he comes up the line, we will discover quite adequately that he is hitting, see, he's hitting, ping-ping-ping, up the line on the Know to Mystery Scale. If he doesn't do this, he isn't moving.

And one of the surest tests in the world – is this boy going on up tone. It is expressed not so much by his voice tone or his emotional context, or something of the sort, but by the actual text of what he is describing. He'll tell you it's a mystery to him. He'll say, “I don't know anything about that bottle now.” You know – mystery.

And then he will tell you “You know, it looks like a perfume bottle.” You know, sex. It – it – “I wonder what this thing contained?” Eating, see? And you will find him sneaking on up the band, you see? And of course if it's heavy or it's – “This is a lot of hard work,” he will tell you suddenly, and something like that; he's scooting on up through effort, and then, as he hits the emotion.

And then he will hit a period there where he stands and stares at it. He stares at the thing, you know. He's not comm lagging. He's just hit the look part of that scale.

Well, the scale is useful. You can discover that somebody who is very afraid of effort will do a lot of figure-figure on the effort. You would be amazed at some of the procedures of yesteryear which simply decided that instead of thinking about it we would simply shove it through.

If you had enough force, you wouldn't do any thinking. You'd do a minimum of figure-figure, if you had enough force. For instance, if this city had no slightest – no dearth whatsoever of machinery in order to clean up everything in sight, and if the machinery was easy to run, didn't require many men to run, there was an enormous supply of power available to it, believe me, it wouldn't do much thinking about how it applied that power. It would simply apply it.

It would say, “Well, let's see now. We need a street through here. Well, street through here.” And they are liable to put one through there, even though the inhabitants are still in the houses.

And you come by afterwards, and you say, “Hey, what was the matter with you? You know, you know that you knocked down about eight houses while you were putting that...”

“Oh, did we? Well, that's too bad. Well, we'll build them another house.” They would. You know, it isn't that they would be mean about it. It's just that, it's just they wouldn't think about it. An enormous amount of force.

Therefore you get societies which are possessed of enormous amounts of force, tremendous quantities of power, and So on, doing very, very little thinking about consequences, which is quite fabulous.

But after, after a few of them have gotten zapped very thoroughly, and so forth, these people will start figuring. They will start thinking. They will begin to write essays, monographs, and tomes on the subject of justice. They have been hit often enough so that they are now below effort and they are worried about justice. You will very often find a preclear who is under the effort band, or just sneaking under the effort band – you know, he can still work as a body – will almost spin if you start to talk to him about justice.

“Justice. Figure-figure-figure-figure. How could I possibly get any justice.” Well, what does he want any justice for? Well, he wants some justice.

All right. As we look over this scale we discover that it describes various manifestations in life in a rather crude fashion, but, nevertheless, in a very useful fashion. It's crude because we haven't got a test meter that instantly tells us how many points south of effort the individual is. We know he is south of effort, though, you understand. There isn't a psychotic in the land north of effort. There is nobody above effort who has anything wrong with him. Get the idea?

If somebody has something wrong with him, he's below effort. This we know. So this leaves us a choice of places for him to be. Figure-figure on south. Symbols on south. Eating on south. Sex on south. Mystery, fixation upon. You see this? So that we get the most curious things occurring.

We get somebody like Freud suddenly picking out a part of this band, and saying, “Well, this is it.” Well, that sure tells you where his particular society was stuck, hm? These boys were below eating.

By the way, sex is a solution to being eaten; the production of another mock-up. And symbols, when they condense very heavily, become forms; live forms. A symbol can very

easily get out of hand and take on a living personality, an identity, and so on, and go ramping about the land and doing an awful lot.

You would say this is impossible. What do you mean, a symbol could do that. What do you think Alexander the Great was but a symbol? He wasn't a – he was hardly a thinking being. His interest in the arts was paying off his old teacher, Aristotle, who probably talked him into some tight spots and probably the only man that had ever bested Alexander at anything.

So of course he sent a lot of specimens home to Aristotle and launched us upon the Dark Age scholasticism under the aegis of the Roman Catholic church.

But Alexander was not a learned man. He was quite able in many lines, but boy, did he want to be Alexander. Which tells you immediately that he must have been in the symbol bracket. And I think if we had asked him to work very hard, that wasn't immediately pepped up to show people how great Alexander was, he would have been in a horrible spot.

He probably would have sweated. Of course, he's made his name infamous right on up to present time in India so that in India today mothers frighten their little babies to sleep by telling them if they do not go to sleep, the Skanda of the Two Horns will get them, and that is Alexander the Great they are talking about.

Now, where we have a fellow who is terrifically fixed on a symbol or where he is being highly symbolical, and so on, we can be pretty sure he will drift off that point immediately. He'll go down scale. He will start worrying about eating. Eating will become a very fixed thing with him.

And now we go down scale further than that and he will worry about sex and get stuck in this particular bracket, and if he doesn't watch it, he'll slide out the bottom on that and be enveloped in mystery.

Now, you understand the Know to Sex Scale only operates after it has become obsessive and compulsive, when it is a behavior factor, a fixed behavior pattern. When you get a fixed behavior pattern on this it isn't by choice.

Now, let's look up scale and find that all of us, sooner or later, sometime or another, hit one or the other of these bands. But we do it knowingly. We do it quite knowingly. We say, "Well, what I need is some exercise." And we go out around, and so on. And we go down to the movies to have a good emotional wingding – not an American movie, that's all effort, by the way. It's the most beautiful picture of effort. Everybody throwing effort in all directions with a minimum of emotion, livingness or anything else condensed in it. Actually, the American people keep looking at these things because they are very pretty, not necessarily because they like them.

Not patting a foreign movie on the back, the foreign movie is technically inept. It has a tendency to go into figure-figure and below this high technical level. But once in a while you will see something that is really a story and has some emotion in it, has some appeal to it and there is somebody alive in the thing. The British movie, by the way, has somebody alive in it.

The hero, the hero, by the way, of the American movie is best described as a criminal. He has every aspect that you could assign to a criminal. He is highly self-centered, he is very

silent, he cares very little about who he shoots, the people around him come to grief and he himself is in bad trouble and catastrophe. This is the – this is a criminal. This isn't any hero.

A hero is somebody who goes out and engages in a game of – this is by German definition – of freeing the chained and slaying the bad baron, and so forth, and refusing any pay for it of any kind. These are the German hero tales. That's where we get the word “hero,” from Germany, and the whole characteristic there.

But the American movie hero today can be found in real life in any penitentiary. He's silent, strong, careless of others, has no thought for anybody else, really, but himself and is involved in lots of trouble of one kind or another. And in addition to that has himself a very, very fine time not. Have you ever noticed one of these heroes enjoying anything? No, he's just kind of woodenly marching forward, like a wound-up automaton.

This is – these are all characteristic of a criminal, by the way. A criminal shares these characteristics. People around him come to grief, and so forth.

But completely aside from an opinion on the line, I'm just talking about the acceptable story. This story is really no longer acceptable. But Hollywood hasn't found it out yet. Their pictures are playing to empty theaters in all directions.

Neither has the American public found foreign movies. They are bad, technically, for one thing. And for another thing they are in a bad – some bad state of communication. You know, they are in a foreign tongue or something like that.

Actually, Italian movies today have a tremendous amount of vitality. The people in them are alive, and if the Italians were real smart – they are once in awhile – they'll – they would dub in all of their pictures. They're pretty – technically they are pretty good, but they would dub in their pictures with English. I have seen several that have been and the English is not, not too hot. But they don't do a bad job. But they don't do a real good one, either. So, therefore, it's really not terribly popular.

By the way, the Italian movie is too smokey. It is too hot for the censor boards to handle. It's – their themes, and so forth, are real – same kind of – if there's an Italian – well, there – I saw an Italian movie one day in Spain that was an interesting movie. It was the picture, it was all in what we call in retrospect. This person was thinking over what had happened.

And this person was sure thinking it over, all right. But it was all dramatized what the person was thinking about. And this girl had run into a guy, and she was a nurse and he was a bum. She was a nurse in the hospital and he was a bum, and they'd gotten all tangled up in various directions and eventually she decided, grimly, to just turn her back on a life of romance and go back to nursing in the hospital. This was its total, total theme.

But that could happen. See, that could happen. It might have happened within the last week up here at the McDowell Hospital – the McDowell Street Hospital, up here. Might have, see. These people breathe. They also have something to say to each other. They don't walk around uttering wooden lines which forward the plot.

Well, this is just differences on the Tone Scale. But at the same time we might be looking in a foreign movie – I'm not talking about movie, I'm talking about Scientology – we

might be looking in a foreign movie at a lower Know to Sex Scale, you see, a little lower down here, whereas the American movie is stuck just below effort, see, on a higher band.

But, look, isn't this interesting that we could take a higher Know to Sex Scale, you see, and we could say it's stuck there in effort. And then we could get another Know to Sex Scale which had a lot more livingness and humanity in it, apparently, and we could say it's stuck lower on the band. Would there be anything wrong with that?

Male voice: No.

Well, this is observably true all around us. We can't necessarily say that somebody who is refusing effort is then and therefore on the lowest ebb of the Know to Sex Scale, see. This fellow who – that is the mistake you could make in interpreting this scale.

We know this phenomena, and this is what we get out of this scale. We know that somebody who has been working very hard will sit down and think. We know that if he thinks a while, he'll get lazy and put it into symbols form, see? So he packages his thinking. That's a condensation of thinking.

And we know that if he puts a lot of stuff into label form, he'll have something to do with eating. That's very interesting that the commercial writer writes to eat. He's right there next door to each other, see? Think, symbols, eat.

And only when he gets into thoroughly foul condition will he begin to dedicate a life to sex. But he will slide down these bands. You can expect.

Now, you can predict behavior because unless they're psychotic or neurotic – see, Know to Sex Scales exist in psychosis and neurosis too – unless they are psychotic or neurotic, you can predict the next-door step to anything anybody is doing. This is a curious method of prediction.

I remember a cartoon which occurred in Esquire a great many years ago. It was a scene which was shot across the foot of a bed into a kitchen where their great big icebox was in the kitchen, a stove and so forth, and you could see these things clearly, you see. And you could see the foot of this bed and it was all dark in this bedroom. We were looking in the direction of the kitchen door. And the legend on it is “And now I'm hungry.” You see? These things are right next door to each other.

Now, when you get into psychosis and neurosis, actually they're packed so close together that they short circuit. They don't go through the next step. Get the idea?

And if you could conceive neurosis or psychosis just as a short circuit where identification is taking place so that $A = A = A$, you will see also that it is very easy for the Know to Sex Scale to get in this condition: sex equals emotion, mystery equals effort. See?

You ever hear of anybody talking about, “It would be a hard job figuring it out?” This is idiotic. You mean somebody uses effort to think? Well, that's what it declares. “It would be a hard job figuring that out.” I've had people tell me, “My, you must use up an awful lot of energy, writing and so forth.” I don't know how we'd use up this energy. You generally finish up a novel or something like that, and you say, “Whee. I'm glad to stop sitting still and go out and do something active,” you know?

But this – we don't burn up energy by thinking; this sillier sort of thing. All right. We can, though. You can go down scale and fool around with some of the machines, and you will find out that they are running on energy. They do all their thinking on energy. That is why they are crazy.

All right. Now, if – just as you run Opening Procedure by Duplication on a low-level case and find the individual going up this stuff flip-flip-flip-flip-flip, so do you find societies going in cycles. They go up and down this scale. They have fads of one thing and then another, you know?

But this could be a low-level Know to Sex Scale. Now, you could have actually the Know to Sex Scale in the direct vicinity of somebody who is wearing a very thick pair of glasses. This would be a different one, wouldn't it? It would be heavier and more condensed.

Now, we are pulling this train into the station, so listen real, real carefully here. Condensation is the keynote. Actually, condensation of knowingness is the keynote of all of this. And the Know to Sex Scale is descriptive of the condensation of knowingness, and as we come down scale on the Tone Scale – you see, the Know to Sex Scale is not a fixed scale on the Tone Scale. It is qualities on the Tone Scale; it is the sequence of qualities on the Tone Scale.

Well, as we come down the Tone Scale, we find out we're condensing the Know to Sex Scale. You get that? So that the Know to Sex Scale around 30.0 would be maybe a foot high on a big graph we have up here, but the Know to Sex Scale itself is condensing so that we get down around 2.0, it's maybe only a quarter of an inch, it's all jammed in there, you know? It's getting heavier and heavier and thicker and thicker and all condensed.

Now, actually MEST itself is apparently no more and no less than a totally condensed knowingness. It knows it is solid and fixed. Knows it's got location. That's what it knows.

All right. But theoretically you start to take that stuff apart, it would start to come up the Know to Sex Scale. That's theoretically. I don't. When I take it apart I make perfect duplicates of it, and it isn't there. So we don't have any worry about it coming up a gradient scale. It just goes.

But if you started to take it apart, expand it in other words, you would get a Know to Sex Scale. And when you start taking a preclear apart, you start expanding him just as thoroughly as though you took that wall apart, you see? You start expanding him. And as you expand him on out he gets in pretty good shape. This would not necessarily even be the amount of space. Now, this is what is peculiar. This isn't even necessarily, although I graph it with space, the amount of space in this preclear. That isn't necessarily a case, you see? It's the solidity factor. It's the particles per space.

See, we don't necessarily just put more space into this preclear, you understand, but we could put less particles per the space he has. And this would be a very good way to look at it, particles are disappearing here someplace.

It's all very well for us to say Know to Sex Scale and it's all fine for us to theorize like this and take man and put a pin through his back and pin him there to the card and look at him as a nice specimen. But there wouldn't be any sense in it at all unless it had some practicality

and unless it demonstrated to you the causation of human behavior and permitted you to take a preclear apart simply by knowing this. It would have no value unless you could take an action course with it. Knowingness for its own sake is worthiness.

So, this fellow memorized the Encyclopaedia Britannica from beginning to end. Ho-hum. So we have categorized and cataloged humanity like Kraepelin. I think it's spelled Kraepelin but it's actually pronounced Kraplin. He categorized psychotic states. This is the most enormous graph you ever saw. I do not think the graph itself has ever been imported into America. I know that the graph which is used in America is a condensed or deleted version of the Kraepelin graph of psychotic states.

But in German this graph occupies a book. And you know what that means in Germany. When you say "book" you mean a broken back, you know? It's big. And when he gets all down to the bottom of it he throws all other classifications into unclassified. And nearly everybody using this scale simply throws all categories into unclassified.

But it's a tremendous amount of something to know, isn't it? Tremendous amount of something to know. But if we just knew this psychotic scale from beginning to end and had many examples and classifications of it, it would be utterly worthless to us, just as it is worthless to psychiatry, just as psychiatry itself is worthless.

That's because they catalog. They're stuck on a low band of symbols, and to them, knowingness is symbols. We have strung out this many words and therefore we know something. Damned if they do. They don't know anything just because they have laid some labels on things.

Just because you know somebody's name is John Jones is no reason why you know John Jones. Look how much there was to know about John Jones. An old pal of mine, Russell Hayes, quite an inventor, holds the basic helicopter patents in America and then the US government went over and got a German Folcke-Wulf helicopter, which had stolen, and perverted several patents, you see. And brought it over and had it copied as the first helicopter we use. We owned the basic helicopter patents. Oh, the government. Anyway, Russell – Russell used to do quite a bit of writing, and so forth. And he and I were good friends. We got into a discussion one day about characterization. And we had it hot and heavy, and we talked this thing over, we talked this thing over for three and a half gallons of beer, just to give you an idea. That was real discussion, what characterization was.

And he finally estimated how long it would take for somebody to actually characterize a hero. How many words would it take to actually characterize somebody if you characterized him all the way. And his estimate on it was about a billion words. In other words, many times the length of Dickens' complete works, just to characterize one character, if we were to do it anywhere near fully.

This is kind of curious. Writers get interested in characterization because editors who wouldn't know a human being if they saw one are prone to say if they don't like you or you didn't buy them a drink or you resented their making a pass at your girlfriend at a party, other good reasons that have to do with your skill as a writer... Your skill as a writer is knowing who to pinch and who not to. All right, a billion words.

Do you realize that everything that has been written in Dianetics and Scientology, right from the word go – every word that has been put on tapes, and so forth – is still the characterization of one man. The difference is, is this man that we are characterizing, this is not a man or a woman, and has no name. This man is not myself. This man is not you. But he is all of us. He is the common denominators.

You can look – have you ever looked in the tape library down at 616? Do you know that it cost about \$5,000 to copy all the tapes down there? And we can buy tapes real cheap. That's four years worth of material. And this isn't characterizing one man – not me, not you – this is simply taking the common denominators to all men so that if we added a few of these combinations together and made some of the eccentricities, and so forth, possible out of this, we probably would go on for several centuries before we had even finished characterizing all the characteristics of one individual.

This would be a real dreary look, wouldn't it? That's why we have little things like the Know to Sex Scale and the Tone Scale, and so forth, is to permit us to work our way through this tremendous morass with the greatest of ease and lightheartedness, instead of lightheadedness.

Well, Russell Hayes decided it would take a billion words, and this is not true. It has taken well in excess of a billion words just to describe the common denominators amongst men. And we haven't ever described one man. So that's quite a trick, isn't it? It must be a long subject.

If all we did was just describe the characteristics in common with one man, this might be an interesting adventure, mightn't it? It certainly wouldn't get us anywhere. Putting a bunch of labels on him, stringing a lot of symbols around him, garlanding him with as's and wherefores, would not get us anywhere. No man would be better off for this having been done. No condition would have changed anywhere for this having been done. Because nobody would have the patience or reason to read it. You got to be able to do something with what you know or it's no good to anybody.

And when you get a piece of information which is nondynamic – I'll tell you something interesting to do to it. Use it for a literary tea. One is hard put upon in literary teas and political meetings, and things like that, to find enough nothingness to talk about. And you have to have a little store of it. So that's a good thing to do with something that you can't do anything with.

And right now I'm inviting you, if there is any part of Scientology that you are not doing anything with, simply throw it away. Just discard it. Throw it away. Because I'm going to tell you something right now which will do a lot of clarification for you. I've done a lot of talking on this subject and I think yesterday giving you the category of first you had to change his mind and then you had to get him to hold a couple of things in an alterable position, then you had to get him into communication, I think this kind of clarifies the goals of processing, doesn't it? Certainly clarifies exteriorization.

And as far as what the auditor is trying to do, he is trying to exteriorize somebody and make them stable-exteriorized. Well, that's good clarification there. That's really, how does he do it? Well, the modus operandi is very easily delineated. You gotta get the guy into the

condition so he'll change his mind so he can hold two points stably at a distance, one from the other, and so that he can be in full communication. And don't even have to have him in very full communication.

But you do these things, you got a goal. Your immediate goals of processing are the last three, and your general, broad goal of processing is the first one. If you do these things, some fantastic things occur. This individual starts to know, and he starts to get himself a better look at existence and he can afford to be kind.

Being kind is a luxury. Remember that. If any of you have any philosophic notion, you know, philosophic maunder-maunder pondering whether it isn't really best to be cruel, and whether it isn't really best to be evil or bad, but you're being good but you've seen a lot of people who were cruel or evil or bad, and they seem to be getting along and winning. And if any of you are hung up on this old philosophic seesaw of good and evil, whether you should treat your – the world kindly or viciously, or anything like that, if you are hung up in this direction to any degree just let me point out that being good can be in several parts of the Tone Scale. It can be highly enforced and unwitting, it can be done to set an example for one's fellows or it can be done because you can afford to do it.

But it is the, it is the – in the final analysis – it is the easiest thing to do. And – well once upon a time the skipper I had – I was a supercargo over in the Orient when I was a kid for a while, most anything. I could play an awfully nasty hand of bridge. So the three officers on the ship needed a fourth so they made me a supercargo and I went to Java. Well, anyhow – about the way it worked out. I had a – an interesting time of it. The old skipper told me that – now, it was real hard to stay on the straight and narrow, and it was easy to wander down that primrose path and to get into sin and so forth. And to be lured off of the track of righteousness. He told me this was real easy.

Well, I went ashore one night in a Chinese port, and I was very bored as a youth is prone to be occasionally, very bored with life, had very, very little adventure. Life was dull. We had just gone through a typhoon but that was all over. And I decided that I would stray from the beaten path.

I had more trouble. It was the most difficult thing you ever saw in your life to try to get off the straight and narrow, and I finally did manage to get involved, one way or the other, and I had an awful hangover the next morning and a terrific welt under one eye, and so forth. And he stood there telling me – and he stood there telling me, “Now, you – you should have stayed on the straight and narrow, just, even though it was a difficult path,” and so forth.

And I finally was – I was in enough of a vicious mood, that I said, “You see all the difficulty I'm in?”

And he said, “Yeah, well, I do.”

I said, “Well, all that difficulty, that lies over there on that primrose path that you've been dressing up for me.” And I said, “It's the hardest thing in the world to get into trouble. And the hardest thing in the world to get out of it. This is difficult. Being good, that's easy. That's real easy.”

Well, if you want to get into trouble, why, fall off of the good wagon and you'll be in – you'll have all of the difficulty and the application of effort and everything that you could possibly imagine.

This is hard, sweaty work being evil. And very unsatisfactory sort of thing, in the final analysis, because you never quite find enough energy to go on and finish it up. That's hard work. Hard work.

The only reason anybody is up here in the penitentiary is because he didn't have enough energy to go on and finish being evil. That's a luxury to be good. But it is also real easy.

You have to put up barriers and do all kinds of things in order to get over into a point of where you have games, and then you have to put up a lot more barriers. And then you put up a lot more barriers, and you put up a lot more barriers, and then you put up a lot more barriers and you are getting to a point of where you can be nice and evil.

And man, you have to work at it. You have to work at it. If any young girl is given the impression that the world is sitting out there waiting, just waiting to lead her into snares and traps and so forth, she's mistaken. She's mistaken. She will have to put out a lot of effort, lot of effort.

She could probably drift down all of her years without getting into any trouble at all. But if she wants some excitement and so on, she is liable to have to start putting up barriers of one kind or another, secrets. And we get down to the crux of this matter which is she would have to cut communication in some direction. In other words, she'd refuse – several refusals – she'd refuse to acknowledge or she would refuse to originate or refuse to answer or refuse to receive an originated communication or refuse to receive an answer or refuse to receive an acknowledgment. And if she's got herself in these – any one of these six categories, she's started to make barriers.

Now, she could work at it and there are very involved ways to go about this. But she is working on condensation of the Know to Mystery Scale.

The condensation of the Know to Mystery Scale comes about directly from these particular crimes: refusal to answer, refusal to acknowledge, refusal to originate, refusal to receive an origin, refusal to receive an acknowledgment, refusal to receive an answer. That is not necessarily in order, but those are the six categories.

With two more categories. What are these two categories? You already know them. They're the – both the two categories, one for each cycle of live form. She could refuse to be alive, or she could refuse to admit that somebody else was alive.

Well, that's eight, isn't it? And these eight things, these eight negatives, result in the condensation and behavior patterns and considerations which we know as the Know to Mystery Scale.

This is so much the case, this is so much the case that if you were to take any ridge a preclear has or any ridge you have and mock it up as receiving origins, answers, acknowledgments or admitting the presence of a live form – this is a new angle on Communication Processing, isn't it – and make it give forth originated communications,

answers and acknowledgments, and be a live form, and that ridge will disappear, and so will the center of Earth and so will its crust and so will the sun, moon, stars and all the space of this universe.

We have two methods of making nothing out of something. The processing method: All you have to do is make something receive answers, acknowledgments or originated communications or deliver answers, acknowledgments of originated communications or to perceive the existence of a live form or to be a live form and it's gone. That's that.

And this type of processing, if engaged upon by the auditor, does not require the remedy of havingness. Why? Why doesn't it require the remedy of havingness? Well, Burke had an observation on this which was an interesting observation. He said, "I found, during the session, that I was putting up screens in order to receive the communication." There isn't any reason why he has to do this. But he says, "Havingness is a necessity if one is going to receive a communication."

Well now, this might or might not be true because I'll tell you how that mass gets there. It's by receiving – refusing to receive a communication. So havingness comes about directly from a refusal to have a communication. Just the reverse. Comes about from a refusal to have a communication or of somebody else's refusal to have a communication or somebody else's anxiety to deliver a communication or one's own anxiety to deliver a communication; you get havingness.

So havingness will just cut to ribbons on Communication Processing without needing to be remedied, which is one of the more fabulous manifestations.

Now, if your preclear, of course, does start chewing on energy you know what I mean, you're asking him to make a ridge say "hello" or receive a "hello," something like that, you're asking him to do this. He doesn't do this. He rubs one part of the ridge against another part of the ridge and creates heat.

Why, he's lost some havingness by reason of heat, by reason of mechanical things. And when you lose havingness by reason of a mechanical action, it's got to be replaced. Then you have to remedy havingness.

But if you make things talk, if you make things live, if you make things receive messages and livingness, no havingness ever needs to be remedied. In other words, life immediately exceeds – no clearer proof could exist of this – life immediately exceeds any mechanics because it can continue to thrive in the absence of the mechanics if we permit communication to occur. Fantastic, but very true.

All right. There's two methods, then, of making nothing out of things. One is to make a perfect duplicate of it in its own time, in its own place, with its own energy. And you just make a duplicate of it with all those things.

And sometimes people have a little difficulty understanding exactly how to do this because they think they have to put a second duplicate into it or they have to copy it and push two duplicates together or they have to do something in this direction.

This is not true. All they had to do was relax and simply say there is a second one there made out of the same materials and the same space. And that's all, I mean, and

everything falls apart. Except one thing – of course, one other thing falls apart, too. There's one thing wrong with this perfect duplicate, it cuts havingness to pieces as though you were putting it through a meat chopper.

If – you know, we can erase an engram today with the greatest of ease with perfect duplication. All you have to do is have the individual look at the engram, make a perfect duplicate of it, it's gone. Somebody will doubt this, perhaps. And I imagine some old Dianeticist might. I had to alter, by the way, the text of the – of one of the Foundation bulletins. It said we could do this in a few seconds. You could make an engram disappear in a few seconds. But this sounded so unreasonable that I changed it and put an error in there. I said a few minutes. That's not true. It's a few seconds is the proper length.

So there's only one trouble with this, is it doesn't leave any havingness. In other words, you could make a perfect duplicate of anything and make it disappear and discover that the preclear's havingness had been reduced that much.

And if you started to make a perfect duplicate of his whole bank from one end to the other, he would be a very reduced man. Let me assure you, he'd be a very unhappy one, if not a spinning one. Everything would start to go by the boards.

So, we say there's two methods of making nothing out of something. But if one of these methods has a liability, then we wouldn't say that it was a technique method, would we? We'd say it was a method. Well, it wasn't a technique. Get the idea? So that leaves us with actually just one technique to make nothing out of things: Communication Processing.

I've been running some tests – well, I could tell you about them, and so forth – been running some tests on ridges, lines, masses, MEST universe gravities, and so on.

Had a preclear lift an ashtray about three feet off of a desk simply by making all the particles of the ashtray receive the communication of gravity and make Earth receive the communication from all the particles of the ashtray, and gravity disappeared. I didn't say a mock-up of the ashtray. I said the ashtray.

We could put all this down to this: resistance to or anxiety about communication produces mass and condensation, which we graph as the Know to Mystery Scale. See that? Refusal, negation against communication produces the condensation which we know as the Know to Mystery Scale.

Now, you think a lot of other things ought to be in there, but that is not true. Nothing else belongs in that sentence at all.

Well, we could do this. By test we could find out if this is true, and we would get one of the more curious manifestations. I've already told you, I think, about a process, if you have some person that you completely detest, you could work this process on them. If this person is somebody that you mean utterly to destroy, go ahead and work this process on them.

Scientology has moved up into a bracket of where one of its processes can process in reverse, right down to death or insanity just as fast as it can go the other way. This is not a frightening fact, but it happens to be a true one. A Scientologist can handle life. Well, if he can handle life he can certainly handle death. All right. Now, what would this process be? Be the one of the more interesting processes because it would sound to the preclear like you were

running the most reasonable process under the sun. Because this is what he is doing and therefore this reasonable process would be acceptable by him and he would run it.

Somebody who had never heard me talk about this process, who had never heard it from anybody out in the field right now would very happily run this process for you. “Give me some things you do not have to be in ARC with.”

And they – they're just sure that there will be an end to this somewhere. There will be a stop to this somewhere. And somewhere on down the line, why, all of a sudden the ridges they're accumulating and this horrible mass they're getting into and this terrific anger they're going down into or this grief they're going down into will suddenly alleviate. They'll think this will be a very good thing, you see. “Look at all the charge I am – I am building up here and I'm going to spill.” They never spill it. It just gets more and more and worse and worse. They go down the Tone Scale.

Now, you must know that the Tone Scale is simply a description of the emotional band of the Know to Sex Scale. The Know to Sex Scale is a much bigger scale of which we have the Tone Scale as a livingness manifestation of condensation.

See, you put the whole Tone Scale, fits right in on the Know to Sex Scale at emotion. And that's a fact, it fits right in there. Now, as we go below apathy, you see, we run into effort. And as we go on down the line we run into the other minus Tone Scale manifestations.

But the Tone Scale, as it was originally produced in – well, Science of Survival and discussed a little earlier in some other lectures and books and so on, actually just belongs to that emotional scale, doesn't it?

So he'll go right straight on down the line and all of a sudden he will find himself hard-packed into effort, and if you kept up this thing he'd start to figure-figure his way out of this. And if you kept him up with this he would get into an anxiety about the symbols, the exact meaning of the words you were using. And if you kept this up, he would begin to get hungry or worry about being eaten. And if you kept this up he would go right on down into sex and he would begin to get sexually excited, and so forth. And he would drop on down through there and he would tell you it was all a mystery to him. Believe me, it would be.

You can create with this process a black five in two hours, out of a thetan exterior. The process, again, is simply this. “Give me some things you wouldn't have to go into ARC with.”

Now, the process also runs this way – it's a process, it is a death process, the first one I've ever really come up and described. I have described PDH to you, and so forth. But this is real – a real death process. This is much worse than PDH. “Give me some things you don't have to go into communication with” produces the same result. “Give me some things you don't have to agree with” does not produce the same result. “Give me some things you don't have to like” does not produce the same result. So “Give me some things you don't have to communicate with” does produce the result. And that was the isolation of that corner, as a triangle, as the only important thing in that triangle.

All right. Therefore you have a death process which produces this condensation known as the Know to Mystery Scale. And this process is a very, very deadly process. But it demonstrates to us that as we decide to go out of communication with things we decide to die.

It was a very funny thing, running this process, to discover that there is another side to the communication process. Have all of the molecules in a pack of cigarettes or a ridge or in the center of Earth decide to receive a bunch of hellos. And then kind of throw them some hellos to receive, you know. But that is all simultaneous action. Have all these – all these particles decide to receive some originated communications. They decide to receive “hellos.” They decide to receive “okays.” And you will find black and white phenomena turning on. The old Black and White Processing? It goes black and white, black and white.

Too much origin? You know, and it will all go black. So we have them receive some okays. Decide to receive some okays, it will go white. Have them decide to receive some hellos, go black, see. I mean, it will go white, black, white, black, white, black, white, black. Get the idea?

But if we have them decide to receive some communications or decide to receive the – or perceive that a live form is around, we get a disintegration of the mass without any liability to the mass itself. It simply evaporates into a livingness.

Well, this is red hot phenomena. The discoveries which I have been talking to you about are make and break discoveries as far as Scientology is concerned, as far as Dianetics, Scientology is concerned. With these discoveries the problem of life might have a lot of ramifications, might have a lot of developments, might have a lot of conditions but it certainly doesn't have any problem.

Now, I have asked you to run Inventing of Wrongness. Interesting process, isn't it? Fascinating process. Now we are going to run Communication Processing, straight out. And you will find all of these other things running off automatically.

The need to have a wrongness would be the need to break communication, would be the need to have a game. But wrongness and havingness are infinitely connected. If a thing is wrong you don't want it and after a while if you can't have something you only have wrongnesses and so forth. All these involvements take place.

But if wrongness and havingness are intimately connected then, assuredly, we would find communication and wrongness intimately connected, wouldn't we. So it is. So actually the need for wrongnesses resolves on Communication Processing.

These discoveries, as I say – not necessarily the Know to Sex Scale, that simply describes the phenomena – but these discoveries concerning communication actually make nothing out of the problem of the human mind. There is no problem with the human mind. Just a problem of how many auditors can we train. That is about all there is to it.

Thank you.

(End of lecture)