

# SUMMARY II: SCIENTOLOGY 0

A lecture given on  
25 September 1963

What's the date?

*Audience: 25th of September.*

Twenty-fifth Sept. AD 13.

All right. Well, the lectures you have listened to from the 24<sup>th</sup> of July forward round up, as I told you yesterday, all phases of Scientology. And you may not quite grasp that at first glimpse because as you look back over this particular period of time it doesn't seem to you, perhaps, that there's too much in that period. I know you look at your notebook and you get a little staggered, but nevertheless, it didn't look like you hit too many subjects or ideas or something since the 24<sup>th</sup> of August—pardon me, July. Since 24<sup>th</sup> of July, just haven't hit too many ideas of types of things and so forth. Since that time you've covered the itsa line, you've covered ARC breaks, the auditing cycle, the versions of R1C. You've had the R2H Tone Scale and so forth. And you've had service facsimile and clearing by R3SC, and you have had the pc's actual goals on a rundown of it.

And now if we add to that Touch Assists and the CCHs, the Tone Scales, various scales, all the particularities of the ARC triangle, the Auditor's Code and Code of a Scientologist—you even had Project 80 in that period which is Scientology I, don't you remember?

And actually you've got the lot. You've got the lot. There's a lot of hellfire and brimstone can be added to some of these points, you see, like: "Oh, my God, if you don't do this—ohhhh!" and you know, that sort of thing. A lot of things can be added along that line.

Undoubtedly there's a lot of new ways to dig into a service facsimile. But you've got a roundup. You've got a roundup. And only two things add to this roundup that round out this series. Well, I just want to lay it before you that you're actually looking at the entire span of body of knowledge of Scientology. And that's quite remarkable. That's quite remarkable. And what I have to tell you now, the first of it is new, which is Scientology 0, and the other is finding goals, which is old R3, and that of course has always been difficult and is much easier now since you can find goals through R3SC, relatively simply.

But these two points are about all that is left out of that entire rundown, and these, I point out to you, are simply particularities.

Now, a lot of work exists which is thrown into this, such as the listing rules, don't you see? We haven't had too much about listing rules, but I've told you a new type of listing which is by TA. And even that has been described. But this is a summary. This is a summary of all of the important points. And this is the data, covered as I have told you just now and since the 24th of July, which is very, very, very important data.

There are about five tapes from 1962, in the autumn, which talk about the theory and Formation of the GPM—the pc's actual GPM. Well, these are interesting. They're background theory material and they're quite interesting. The HCOBs on how you run R3M2, and that sort of thing, are contributive to these things.

Now, the whole body of implant GPMs and this whole body of knowledge has been examined with great particularity. It's a marvelous training area. But the value of an implant GPM is very slight. Aberrative value is very, very slight. I think of it now, those fellows working in the sun and the big moon of Helatrobis—I think of them now, sweating there, the temperature there was seldom below 85, you see. It was real hot and so forth. And there they were, sweating and keeping the poles greased and bringing thetans in and freezing them up and going through all these ramifications—and sweating and miserable about the whole thing, you see. Their consciences rotting away within them, you see, it's a terrific overt. And these between—lives blokes, you know, there they are, they're sweating away, you see, they're keeping that running, you know, and *ahaaa* and implanting, and they've got a trai—they wear out trains and trains and trains, giving those train goals, you know.

And there they are, going on right now, here in present time, and there they are, vast sums of money and so forth. And the amount of aberration which it adds to the case is something like a drop of water into the Atlantic Ocean. It's horrible. Because they would be so upset if they knew. They obviously don't know or they wouldn't keep on sweating at it. It's fantastic. It's all for nothing. It's all for nothing.

All they did was make the universe look more hostile. And they probably color the type of RI which the—or—and even sometimes the type of goal which the pc postulates. They undoubtedly have had an influence in this particular direction, but it's an influence of significance and not an influence of quantitative action at all.

Now, if they disappeared the world would look friendlier and people would have a better chance of destimulating, you see? The present time problem with regard to it wouldn't be so great and they would feel better about it. But this I—point I wish to make: is those blokes aren't doing it to anybody. See, they're just some tiny, small assistance. The thetan is doing it to him self. Which of course a lot of you during this period of this summer, going

through these implant GPMs, and I'm very glad you did because it's a highly educational area, those that were in Y and Z. And if you think you've escaped them totally, why, those coming up now out of X, they're all set and roaring and so forth, and they're going to probably find on their plate some morning, "Run 'to forget' out of a Helatrobos series," before we let them run any aberrative GPMs.

The poor pc will be sweating there and his tone arm won't be moving much and the auditor will be trying to get those rocket reads and they'll be right back in there pitching again, don't you see?

One of the ways of doing it is to find the pc's own GPM and then find out if there is a counterfeit one somewhere on the track, and it'll run like a startled gazelle. Aberrative value 0 but it'll just run fine. By the time you've run 3 or 4 of them—"to be lost" or something like this—by the time you've run 3 or 4 you're not going to get any TA action because you will have restimulated, of course, the pc's own actual GPM to a remarkable degree and have to go ahead and run it. But it's an interesting practice area.

But I think of it now, I think of it now—the administrative agents; the FBI of the big confederation, you see; and the Bureau of Implants, don't you see—and there they are and they're all feeling bad about this and they know that it's all necessary and has to be. Hasn't practically any influence. It speeds up the dwindling spiral and it makes the universe seem hostile to people, but beyond that its aberrative value is nothing. One great, big, crashing RI has more value than the entirety of all of the implant series.

But it's a good thing for you to know what this universe is like. And if you really want to know what it is like, and that sort of thing, this is an exploratory area: what has been done, what people are devoted and dedicated to in keeping other people aberrated, that sort of thing. And it's quite interesting, as a review.

And YOU should consider quite valuable any experience you've had in running an implant GPM because you won't ever have any trouble with an actual GPM. Actual GPMs are far sloppier and nowhere near as neat and they're not preordained at all. And you're off into the blue and you're having to use judgment as you go along the line on these things. And you can make more mistakes in less units of time than in any other field of superhuman endeavor.

Now, that sphere and area is one that cannot be skimped. And we mustn't skimp the technology of how you run an actual GPM; you mustn't skimp that. It looks kind of sloppy so you tend sometimes to do it kind of sloppily. And one mistake in that aberrative stuff is of much greater value than having gone—the pc's having gone through the whole of the Helatrobos Implants. So that's nothing—that's nothing to toss around lightly.

But that technology—that technology all exists and it's in the bulletins on listing and so forth. And the only thing modern of that has been covered since the 24th of July, and that is you list by TA.

Now I want to cover rapidly here, there's actually three subjects, I've got to cover more about handling this—today's lecture and tomorrow's—more about handling these, programing these things and so forth, in actual GPMs. Want to tell you right now—having gotten your goals all restimulated—I want to tell you right now about Scientology 0. And this is just a very brief, brief, brief coverage. We'll have much better coverage on this subject, but the essentials of this are of great interest to you.

Every level of Scientology contains, in vignette, all levels of Scientology. It's a nicely built little schema. Reg was busy pointing this out to me ' he said, "Each one of them contains all the levels." That's right. Level II contains all levels of Scientology. Level III contains all levels of Scientology. What do you mean by all levels of Scientology? Well, levels of Scientology, each one, have its own designation. And these, perhaps, could be better defined and the material could be better released to you, but let me give you just a rapid coverage; and I don't say that these definitions particularly hold good because I'm just talking to you for your understanding, not for your memorization.

And that's simply this: Scientology 0, of course, would be the big question mark. This is the problems and confusions and wrongnesses; zones of chaos of existence—the identification of those zones of chaos.

Now, let's take a 3rd dynamic example. Healing has in it the medical profession. All right. They apparently got it all wrapped up. They're a marvelous solution, aren't they? Now, you've got to identify the chaos. Identify the falsity. Identify the upset. People walking around all over the place and they think mental healing is all solved. They think healing is all solved. They don't know that if you've got lumbosis you haven't got a prayer. See, they don't know any of the true data concerning this. What is the situation?

Now at Scientology 0, you point out this interesting thing: You point out the fact that these are unsolved areas or there are pretensional solutions in them. This is a survey area and a delightful area to work in. In fact, newspapers and so forth work in practically no other area because all you have to do is find falsities and wrongnesses. And that's it.

All right, now how do you use this? A bunch of people come in—PE class —and you're talking to these people, and they're sitting down there and they think something is all wrapped up. Well, at the level of Scientology 0 —and everything always starts at Scientology 0—is, you say, "Well that..." You see—they—it's religion and God, see. Let's say that you unfortunately got into this particular zone and area, and so forth; let me give you a very

flagrant example you would not use, see. And that is the church—let's put it in its crudest form—the church does not have the human spirit all wrapped up.

That's an interesting—an interesting approach, you see? But let's say you have there this bloke, he's sitting there and although he doesn't believe in religion, he believes the spirit is all wrapped up. In other words, man's going to go to heaven or he's going to go to hell and that's it; and the vicar knows best. See, he's got that. That's all packaged, it's all put away, and it's some mad zone of Confusion that would hum out at him like a flock of bumblebees if he ever really lifted the cover on it, don't you see.

Well, the least you can do is warn him that if he lifts the cover on it, he's going to be hit in the face with a lot of bumblebees.

Somebody made a horrible mistake over at the FCDC the other day, by mentioning between lives during the church service and learned immediately that he should have kept his mouth very shut. And was around at a—looking kind of scarlet—faced afterwards, and so forth. Well, he at least knew he had made the mistake.

But in actual fact, how much of a mistake had he made? Well, he had only made this mistake: He had opened up too much Scientology 0 too fast. That's the only mistake he had made, see? So it's a case of degree. It's just a case of degree of what you reveal or point out, and this is something. This is a powerful subject. It's a level of the operation of an aberrated world, an aberrated universe, see. That's the level of spotting.

Well, now if you stand up there and you say to the people, "Oh, everything is all bad. It's all bad over there and it's all bad over there, and it's terrible, and everything is going to pieces. Oh, yeah, and—and everything is bad everyplace and there isn't anybody good anyplace, and there are no—nothing but just false situations and everything else." They'd say he's nuts. See, so this is just a level of degree. He might be making sense! I mean it might be perfectly factual. But that's too much Scientology 0, see. That's something like e tying the cough medicine down somebody's throat, and it's the wrong presentation, see.

Too exaggerated, insufficiently definitive, obviously opinionated, R—factor poor, not a convincing presentation, don't you see? I mean, all of these things are wrong with it.

Now compare it with this—let's take a typically British approach to this situation—"Government might not be the perfect answer." See? That might be a too—little dose.

All right, what you want—what you want here—in Scientology 0, you merely want the people to become aware of the fact of what the problem is. Now this is an interesting level to work in because it doesn't have any tone arm action in it. And that's why you can easily overdo it. The only way you could get any tone arm action in it at all would simply be to talk about false solutions. You might get some tone arm action in it if you talked about some false

solutions. But if you say there's nothing but problems, problems, problems, problems, problems, you've got no tone arm action at all on your audience or anybody else, see.

So you shouldn't infer that there are no solutions and only problems. Now, I'm just trying to give you the fact that people don't try to resolve anything or do anything if they think it's all wrapped up. And you'll find out that the complacency of the world is one of the basic things which keeps it gorgeously aberrated. The complacency is marvelous. The government has got it all wrapped up, but the FDA all of a sudden decreed that everybody had to take two quarts of fire extinguisher fluid a day to wash out the vitamins which poisoned them. They'd say, "Well, yes. Well, they know what they're doing, and so forth," and you see, the fact that a bureau has said it or something like that immediately decrees there must have been some sense to it. This is this terrific reasonability factor that drives us around the bend, you see.

And if they want 95 percent of your pay, don't you see, in tax, well, there must be some good reason for it, don't you see, and so on. And you might say, "The last stable datum that anybody can get in is a toleration of the terrible condition." See, and they say it is reasonable or there must be a reason for it, don't you see, so therefore in some fashion it is all right. And that keeps it off their back as a problem.

But you, being more adventurous characters, are always lifting the lids off of things, you see, and you say, "Well, maybe that isn't quite all right." Don't you see? And you look inside this thing, and you don't only find that it is not all right, don't you see, you find out that there's an awful swindle connected with this thing of some kind or another.

Well, it's all right to discover all that, but Scientology I, is getting off these solutions and falsenesses, see, so you're really not involved in Scientology 0 with running the false solutions, don't you see? You've got a little borderline there, and you put an itsa line in, but remember you're going over toward Scientology I slightly.

Now, it's simply—it's simply the level of existing chaos. And you say —here's a typical Scientology 0 question: "Is your family hard to live with? Do you find your home noisy?" Yeah, typical. "Are you worried about your job? Is there any part of life about which you have anxiety?" See, these are simply —these are simply questions which awake a person to the possibility that his life might be better.

And it all carries with it the possibility that the Condition can be improved. And that is its sole and total therapeutic action: hope. You say there are these problems: bong, bong, bong, bong, bong and maybe something can be done about them. So its entire therapy level is this faint hope. "Maybe we won't always have a government." That's its therapy level and you find out this is quite workable. It's quite workable.

This is the lowest level of processing, is giving somebody some hope; lowest level there is. And that goes along with the fact that you say there *is a problem*—so let's now summate this level, see—"There *is a problem*" is its strongest statement, and the strongest process that is applied to it is "Maybe something can be done about it." See? It's just that.

A view of Scientology 0 is simply the world as it exists, and if we had no level of Scientology that paid any attention whatsoever to the existence or the isness of existence, you see, that is the conditions and problems which exist in the society, we would have no area to study society just as itself and we would keep on simply trying to resolve society all the time. We wouldn't ever look at society and therefore to that degree we're moved off from society.

So this is the legitimate level of inspection. At this level we can notice, somewhat dispassionately, that the greengrocer, every morning at 9:32 rushes out of his shop and throws rocks at the small boys and rushes back into his shop again. The therapy is, in that particular character, "We hope the rocks didn't hit the small boys, you see, and we hope he isn't too disturbed. And we hope he will be happier about things someday." You got the level? But you still could stand there and watch him rush out and throw rocks at the small boys and watch the small boys, and he goes back into his shop at 9:32 every morning, see.

We don't go around and say to him, "Well, why don't you make friends with them or communicate with them," see—ha—ha—ha—ha—ha—Scientology I. Called 0 because you don't do anything. At this stage there's nothing.

Now, a lot of this goes a long way. We say all the levels of Scientology are contained in each level of Scientology. Do you realize that in order to find a service facsimile, you have to ask the fellow what problems he has, or what he's worried about. This always comes into it slightly, doesn't it? So a little of this goes a long ways. And this is an assessment of problems or something like that. Well, that's the Scientology 0 aspect of the ease. In this particular case, however, we aren't limited on the therapy angle because it appears in another one.

But we still have to have an H—factor in sessions, remember. You know, you can knock your pc in the head. Your tone arm's falling off the pin, see. Your tone arm's going *zing, zing, zing*. It's falling off the pin and so forth. You sit there —you sit there ... and he's going on listing, see. He's going on, and he's listing and he's listing, and he looks at your face, and you ... And he says, "Well, am I getting any place? Is—is the tone arm action—I mean—I mean, is it increasing, or anything is happening, or we still getting a lot of rocket reads?"

"What?"

And he goes, "*Uhhhh.*"

You see, the H—factor is still there at upper levels of Scientology. You say, "You're doing all right," see? "And if you aren't, I'll fix it up so you are." Little hope involved in this

situation, you see. That keeps up his confidence so that he will tackle it. And so even your H—factor's in there.

Now, if you said to everybody on a PE Course, "Everything's bad, all over, everyplace; everything is all bad. In fact, there's no place anybody can find where anything is good," you immediately would have gone wild with your Scientology 0 because, you see, you would have omitted the process. And the process is simply even if you said everything is all bad everyplace, you say, "But maybe it..." The faintest thing you could say, "Well, maybe it'll turn out all right," you see, or "Maybe if everybody got busy they could do something about it," or "Maybe if we studied this thing enough and learned something about it, it wouldn't have to be that way," don't you see? That's the least statement you could make. And even though you're then talking about entheta conditions, you've still got a theta line going along with it, see. You say, "Well, maybe we could even *ease* these things, or get rid of them or something like that."

Now, you'll find that this is very acceptable on a public level if you don't overwhelm them and if you apply just a small amount of hope and don't get too enthusiastic about the amount of hope and don't promise them the moon with a fence around it, because that isn't necessary at all. As a matter of fact, it's not acceptable within their R—factor. You give them something on this order—you give them something on this order: This fellow, he's come in and he's all gimped up one way or the other. He has a pretzel for a spinal chord. There he is and we say, "Well, so—and—so and so—and—so and so—and—so." "Well, your trouble," we could say to him, "your trouble—possibly that you're disturbed about something."

And you let him put in some Scientology 0 on it. So it works the other way too. He says, "Hey, you're damned right I'm disturbed about something. My spine, you know. I'm in pain, agony all the time."

Well, there isn't any sense in selling him up too high, because you'll give him too high a hill to climb on his reality factor. You hear about it; he can't sleep at night and he can't this and he can't that and he can't something or other, don't you see, and all this is impossible and this is agonizing and so forth. And pick out one of these minor, minor, minor, minor, minor things that he is giving you and say, "Well, there's possibly some poss—," because he won't believe you on any of the strong ones. And you say, "Well, maybe we can fix you up so you can sleep better at night."

This becomes very acceptable. Now he's got a goal. He goes ahead—he doesn't expect you to unpretzelize his spine. But he'll move ahead on this and you some degree have slightly bypassed the hidden standard, don't you see? You've given him a new little standard. If he's winning any, he'll sleep a bit better at night, see, something like that. Something you think you might possibly make out of this.



Wrong approach: “Oh, well, we’ll have you walking 6 foot 6, and looking 16 years of age, and all the girls whistling at you as you go down the street.” No, that’s not acceptable. First place, that’s too much. He has already learned to live with it. It’s already part of his service facsimile. It has some method of making people wrong. You try to go head—on with him and take it away from him directly, or say you are going to, he isn’t going to release it, man. All he’s going to do is make you wrong.

So what you’ve got to do as far as that’s concerned, remember, you’re just working at Scientology 0, not at your processing levels, you see, is he tells you this and that and the other thing. Well, you just pick out the tiniest little one that slid in, any way whatsoever, and put some hope in on it. See?

Like, “What are we going to do about the government?” “Well, maybe we could fix it up so there are fewer politicians talk on TV.” Got the idea? And you know somebody would—somebody—they got enough—they can face that, see. It’s a gradient of confront is what you’re working with. This guy could face perhaps giving up enough of his service facsimile, you see, to sleeping a little bit better at night, because he didn’t intend to have his rest disturbed, too. He just wants to get even with people in the daytime.

But, you’re giving him a little bit to confront, and maybe these people on government, you say, “Well maybe we could get the people to—maybe get the politicians to talk less, you see, on TV.” And by George, you know, you could probably organize quite an association, and quite a society. You could probably have people without saying two questions of it, or anything else, or doing anything odd about the association at all, but just going out and working like beavers and writing letters to people and visiting their parliamentary representatives. Well, they’d have a marvelous time, and so forth. And all they want to do is limit the amount of time which a politician can talk on the air.

Now, there’s an adjudication between this, is how much is too little and how much is too much? And that is a piece of judgment that has got to be made. And a person who is working at Scientology 0—and remember, you work at it every time you talk to a pc about what you’re going to do—while you’re working at this, that’s the judgment that you must go: not too much, not too little; acceptable and confrontable by the person. What’s confrontable.

Now, you’re talking to a PE Course. You’re talking to a PE Course. Now, this is the study of Confusion Now, the practical aspect, if you ever gave anybody a drill on Scientology 0, would—you would have a long sheet of beautiful confusions that have to do with the immediate family or neighborhood or the immediate dynamics of the individual. And you’d simply have him pick out which one of these confusions it was probable that the people he was talking to could confront. See, which one of these confusions could they confront? And you could train him up, see, to this degree. You could have a drill, you see. And you eventually wouldn’t get somebody dashing out saying, “It’s bad all over the place, and we’re

going to shoot everybody tomorrow,” don’t you see, as the immediate indicated confront. “We want you to go and shoot everybody tomorrow,” you see.

Well, even though he has an audience that possibly under different case levels and so forth might have been perfectly willing at one time or another to have shot everybody tomorrow on a problem of the magnitude they are facing today, he is not at that moment talking to an audience that is going to go out and go down to the arms store and get the police permit and shoot everybody tomorrow, see? They’re not going to do it.

All right. But they are going to do something. And this, then you always make as an assumption: that there is always something that you can get to be confronted on any dynamic. Always something you can get to be confronted on any dynamic. It mustn’t be too much and it mustn’t be too little.

Let me give you—this would be an absolute perfect formula for a social worker—going around, and the babies are falling downstairs in the tenement, and everybody’s crying and screaming and there are three fights going on on two landings, and a flatiron comes sailing down through the area way, you see, aimed at the maintenance man or the janitor, you know. And Mrs. O’Leary has an awful lot of problems and her problems she’s firing off at this social worker, and it’s this and it’s that and it’s this and it’s that, and so forth. And if the social worker says—Mrs. O’Leary’s husband gets drunk all the time and never brings home any pay and furniture all gets stolen—it’s always being broken up—and the rent’s behind and so forth, and there’s all these things, see. What’s the social worker trying to do?

Well, the social worker always has to ask himself this question—the auditor always has to ask himself this question—the PE lecturer always has to ask himself this question: What is he trying to do? Well, if he’s trying to make somebody happier in his environment or trying to get some action in some particular direction or something like that, then he uses and adjudicates his actions—he uses these formulas and he adjudicates his action along in these formulas.

He gets something done that can be confronted by the person he is trying to get to do it. This is all so elementary it sounds like you’re talking kindergarten. But actually, there’s a little bit of something interesting here. This is an undercut of such fantastic numbers of problems, that although it sounds very simple and innocuous, it has fantastic workability.

So he says to Mrs. O’Leary, and so forth, the social worker says to Mrs. O’Leary, she says, “And you can’t do, this and you can’t do that and can’t keep the place clean. About the only thing, you know, just can’t keep the place clean at all.” And he notices that Mrs. O’Leary has emptied an ashtray for his cigarette see, as she’s standing there talking to him and so forth, and he says, “I’ll tell you what I would do. I’d start in on this thing a little bit at a time, and I’d get the place cleaned up. Now, why don’t you keep the ashtrays emptied?”

Although she might even fly back in his face, see, at first glance, you look around here, what could she do? He's not processing her because it's sort of a one—command situation. Well, she might be able to keep the ashtrays empty.

You will be surprised. She might even natter at him a little bit. And when he leaves, why, she'll go around and empty the ashtrays. And all of a sudden a fantastic resurgence of hope may occur in that woman. See?

The trick is, there is something to be done about it—that's one level of hope—that *you can do—is* the other level. Naturally, it applies in all processing, too. Pc's in trouble, it's always a marvelous thing to sit back and ask—find out what the pc can tell you about it. You'd be surprised how often this works to pull a pc completely out of the doldrums. Pc can confront doing something. He's climbing too high a hill. Every once in a while a pc says to you, "I'm climbing too high a hill." Well, there's a point where you make him climb that hill anyway. And another point where you don't force him to climb that hill because you'll wind up in trouble if you do.

Particularly in Routine 4 processes, you actually mustn't force the pc forward. You mustn't force the pc forward. The pc's nattering, find out what the ARC break is about before you proceed. And if the pc is actually having a hard time doing, well, just take it easy and see if the pc can't do it anyway. And you'll be surprised, if the pc is not pressed or pushed, how the pc will climb that hill anyhow.

All right. Well, this is a difference here, this is an oddity here, I'm throwing this in as showing you that it does fit at lower—upper levels. We left Mrs. O'Leary emptying the ashtrays. First doggone thing you know, she's liable to be getting highfalutin ideas she can do something about stopping her husband from drinking and coming home. She starts to get the idea something can be done about it.

This isn't the experience of the average social worker, now, to show you how missing this technology is. These people are, (quote) trained in social work (unquote) with an exclamation point on the quotes. Because they only complain to you about one thing, and if you talk to social workers they'll just complain to you about the fact they can't get anybody to do anything about anything. And for lack of this piece of information you get total socialism and total indigence in a society. And that's how big the datum is that sits at the bottom of it. Because nobody ever gives anybody anything they can do.

Nobody ever adjudicates the problems involved in the situation and then does something about those problems that can have something done about them and that somebody can confront to do something about them, see? So as a net result, a social worker goes down scale on a toboggan because he never gives anybody anything they can do.

Now, here and there, there may be some screaming genius of a social worker who is not bound by those rules or who has stumbled onto this data and utilizes it one way or the other. But such a person is, of course, vastly in the minority, because the social worker at large is terribly unsuccessful. Fantastically so. Always giving people: “Now, what you want to do, Mrs. O’Leary, is clean this whole place up; scrub it down from top to bottom, after all, we’ve given you soap. And get your children there and get them cleaned up and put in those nice new pinafores that we have had sent down to you. Now, I’ll have a talk with your husband concerning his drinking.”

And right at that point the social worker has—even if the woman—even if Mrs. O’Leary *would* have cleaned up the whole place, even if she *would* have put the children in the clean clothes, at *this* point she and the social worker part company violently, because the social worker has *told* Mrs. O’Leary something that Mrs. O’Leary *knows* by experience *cannot be done*. Nobody can talk to her husband about his drinking. She couldn’t even conceive the United States Army, with fixed bayonets in a Little Rock charge doing anything about Mr. O’Leary’s drinking. See, she *knows* this. And you’ve just run head—on, you know, *crrrash!* See, into a stable datum.

Now, don’t get peeved, for instance, at the Better Business Bureau, so—called; it’s a swindling organization that uses blackmail to procure contributions for fear that they might say your business is bad. It operates in the United States. It’s quite a racket. Mostly their bureaus are run by people with criminal records. But anyhow—they’re the primary authority on how bad Scientology is in the United States, see. All right, now, these boys—these boys, because they’re fed this by these two jerks at the AMA, see. All right, great. But these two birds up there feed them data and then they put this data out, but they don’t put it out to be mean, they actually put it out because they believe it because they don’t think anything can be done about anything.

First, one, they don’t know any problems exist, and two, if they did, they didn’t—wouldn’t think anything could be done about them anyway. Now, if you just accept it even at a level of the Better Business Bureau whose questions you see, one—well, their ethics and intentions are probably open to serious question. You probably could even sweep them aside if you used this particular type of approach and this data and kept your head on while you were doing it. Just used this, see? Because the Better Business Bureau says that nothing can be cured. And you could probably sweep this away by getting the Better Business Bureau to agree that people could be made more comfortable. I mean, if you were talking to them and arguing with them.

Your Scientology 0, then, would consist of the fact of there are a lot of people who are uncomfortable; your level of problem that they could confront, see. They couldn’t confront the problem that people are sick and dying and being cut to ribbons on operating tables and

the blood spattering all over the wall, you know, because this is a pretty gaudy picture, see, of what they're supporting. They wouldn't be able to confront any part of it, so they don't consider it's a problem because they don't see it, you see. You've got to snap them out of their service fac just to this degree: To give them a problem they could confront.

Now, "everybody is dishonest everyplace," that just plays right into the hands of their service facsimile, don't you see? No, you could probably get them to agree that there are quite a few people around who are uncomfortable, and by talking to somebody in a friendly fashion could be made more comfortable. Oh, they'd buy that. They'd say you were great. The AMA wouldn't even be able to convince them now that you were doing wrong. Why? They can agree that people are not comfortable. And they could agree that a friendly person visiting them could make them more comfortable. They could agree to this, see.

Well, that would be your Scientology 0 in all levels. There is the study of the problem, discovery—discovery of the general problem from your viewpoint. Then the discovery of the area the problem that can be confronted by the person you are talking to, and then finding some part of that problem, or doingness in that problem, that that person could face up to and execute. And all this is done in an atmosphere of hope. And you have your Scientology 0.

If you could do that uniformly to everybody that walked up to you, you'd have so many pcs you wouldn't know which end you were standing on. Guy comes out here, and he says, "I have an awful lot of trouble with my business. Secretary's always drunk and the workers aren't working and so forth and they came in and they opened the cash drawer and the police are always walking through the place in their muddy boots and—and so forth, so—so—so—so—so . . ." He's just talking—you're just listening to some kind of circuit.

And you say, "All right, now, I heard that. Now, what's really wrong here . . ." "See, you can put the itsa line in just as well as he can. You don't even have to do an assessment of Scientology 0, you see—" "What's wrong here. . ." It doesn't matter whether you put in the problem or you get the problem from him, see, we don't care which. And you'll find out this works in R—in R3SC. It's—you can't give somebody goals, but you can sure tell somebody what his service fac might be bordered upon and run it with considerable tone arm action sometime.

For instance, you've been doing lists, you look over somebody's old lists and you find out that every time he hits the subject of women, you notice that—bad women, good women, and so forth—this gives you tone arm action, see. Just that little period there. You know, you get a little blowdown and tone arm action and so forth. Just say, "Well, we're going to run women." See, you didn't do any assessment. That's a trick some of you characters lost out on last week, by the way. You were busy, busy, busy, busy, busy trying to find something wrong with the pc that you could pin a service facsimile on, and after you had done two or three dozen pages of lists on problems, of course, you didn't have any tone arm action. So

you see, this has a broad application over into that sphere, because you didn't have anything—any business doing that with anybody who was getting no tone arm action anyhow, see. You didn't have any business doing that with somebody. Well, you didn't have any business listening to any problems and cutting his itsa line on listing and all this kind of bunk. This was the time for you to put the small crank in through the temple, and wind it a few times and have the little bell go *whirr—ping*, you see?

And say, “You know, every time this guy has a present time problem,” you know—you've been auditing this pc maybe only a few days—but every time this guy has a present time problem, it actually seems to concern the course. See? That's all, see. Or it concerns the girls around, you see, or it concerns something. Assessment—just use Scientology 0, see. Obviously, obviously this person has problems about it because he can confront them. He can confront the course; he can't confront the world; he can confront the course. You'll be surprised how often you will run somebody's best friend as a service facsimile. Well, he can confront his best friend but he can't confront any of his enemies.

Very often, by the way, somebody's liable to get mad at you. They won't be mad at anybody else in the whole world. They'd be sweet as pie to them. But they'll be mad at you. You're their best friend. They can confront getting mad at you. You get the idea?

They would be in a screaming rage at the rest of the world if they could confront it, but they can't confront that. But they can get mad at you. You should understand that sometimes as an auditor. Because you realize, it's always safe to get mad at your auditor. See, your auditor's bound by a code of ethics not to get mad back. Furthermore—furthermore, your auditor is *a* friend of yours, you see? So that you might not be able to get mad at your bank, but you can get mad at your auditor, don't you see?

In actual fact it doesn't make the auditor less a friend of the pc. But that's the lowest level he can afford to get angry at. That's actually the basic secret of the ARC breaky pc. He's ARC breaky with the world at large and it's safe to get mad at the auditor. That's all.

Now, that's—you recognize then that here is this—maybe this little mouse character, you see. Why, she hasn't whispered on the street anything of the sort. And yet she's got a—gets into a session or gets into a group meeting, or something like this, and she realizes she's amongst friends so she can dare get mad at them. It's quite interesting. Quite a case gain.

I'd never criticize them for it, particularly. I'd just find something else they could get mad at. But what—that isn't a session use. Thing to do is find out the ARC break and keep going. Get tone arm action is the whole answer to that. Find the bypassed charge and get tone arm action and, you'll bring them through anything. These are good, workable, sizable stable data that won't wear out.

But here's your Scientology 0 aspect of existence. And you don't tell people about problems that are completely unreal to them and that they know they can't do anything about and expect them to be in a wild, stampeding enthusiasm to get going in any particular direction at all. Works with the pc, works with a group, works with anybody.

Why, you can have the police shooting down rioters with machine guns right outside the door, you see? You could have rioters burning down every government building. And there'd be a very large portion of the population in the midst of all this mess, and so forth, that'd be—sit there knowing that everybody had it under control who was supposed to have it under control. See? I mean, the visual evidence means nothing to them. That explodes one of probably your favorite stable datum, that if somebody could see it with his own eyes, he would believe it.

See, this has such a limited workability. There was one of the high top aeronautical design scientists flew over here from Holland some years ago. Heard I was in London, had to come up and see me, and talk to me about a theory about something or other. And he talked to me, *brrr—bang*, for a while, and went back and climbed on his airplane and went elsewhere. But he told me a funny story. And that is after he had demonstrated that something was actually hanging in space and suspended, counter—opposed to gravity, the commanding general, in charge of all of the project and so forth, got down on his hands and knees and crawled all underneath the table and all around the room, trying to find the secret magnetic equipment and so forth that was holding this thing aloft.

In view of the fact that there wasn't even any cloth on the table, because there was no way to put anything under the table, this was quite remarkable.

Now, of course, his observation of the situation was simply that his word had been questioned, and he was quite wroth on the subject, so he was also limited in his observation. So he didn't really see how funny this story was. There wasn't anyplace in the room to put any such machinery. Yet the general even invents a table cloth to hide the nonexistent thing that is keeping the designed flying saucer, you see, in suspension, see.

See, he couldn't—he saw it with his own eyes, and he didn't believe it. We know this is chronic, this is customary. If you get to thinking it over, you could think of many instances where people see things with their own eyes and don't believe them. In fact, they're probably more numerous than the reverse.

So, you never count on that as a stable datum. There's not even any particular—particular sense in being terribly good to prove to people you are good. Because if they're saying you are bad to that degree, then they are incapable of the power of observation to determine when you're good. This —parents and fathers and mothers are notorious in this particular line. Sometimes the son gets to be forty years old and his father still has never been

introduced to him. He has a theoretical symbol someplace that he calls a son. And sons behave in a certain way, so therefore this fellow behaves in that way, and he'll even invent a whole false past and a whole series of false adventures to account for this image that he has, but this hasn't anything whatsoever ...

And the child often goes, "*Gluuhhh*," practically spins on the unreality of this sort of thing. There is many a child who is always being challenged for the things they have done, which they haven't done. And they get in a woggy state of mind because they're doing things that they should be challenged for and nobody ever sees these. And it gives them a complete *zzzzz*! You see, it doesn't match up reality.

So this is the type of person, and this is the beingness of individuals when you're dealing in the sphere and zone of aberration, or when you're dealing with guys who are downscale far enough to be doing nothing but wear meat bodies, you know, and be on the economic treadmill. When this kind of thing occurs, you must realize the power of observation is out. And the easiest thing to relay in this particular line is an idea. But the idea must not violate the confront ability or the confront potential of the individuals being brought to. So therefore neither the problem, which is being pointed out in Scientology 0, nor the solution must exceed the reality of the person to whom it is being pointed out.

Now, all right, this colonel goes around the army camp and he wonders how these fellows can be so involved in their company streets and their barracks and that sort of thing and operating in their tiny little spheres. You've probably had the funny feeling yourself occasionally, in going into a shop and wondering how somebody could work at that particular bench all day long and never move out of that zone or area, and it probably is almost giving you the creeps. But in actual fact—in actual fact, that person's confront potential on problems is problems of the zone of that particular little workbench. And his ability to confront solutions are the zone of solutions which he is applying. And therefore we say he's an effective person on the job.

Now, when his ability to confront problems gets up to the full zone and area of the entire camp, and he really is confronting the problems of the camp—not problems he dreams up, because this very easily goes on a lower—scale mockery—and he can confront solutions which are actual and real solutions to these problems or doingnesses in that particular direction, you no longer have somebody who is working at a workbench, you have a colonel. See?

Now, because of the system of labels which is used in this particular society, very often the guy who was commanding general in his last life is a private in the rear rank in this one. May be that his confront potential has not particularly reduced. He'll have quite a coterie in his immediate vicinity whereby he's pointing out the things that are wrong to the immediate troops in his vicinity and pointing out the solutions.



What's interesting is, is these are usually more real than the command decisions. That's quite amusing. And sometimes at a lower level of rank you start filtering around through the lower level of rank and picking up the grapevine on the subject of what are the problems of the camp and what are the solutions to it, and you generally find out those are the answers. But according to the staff, command level, you see, why, the problems are—and it's really, they'll start in this sort of way: "Well, really, it's very involved for an uninformed observer, you see, to realize the tremendous difficulties of coping with this situation, you see. And in actual fact, you see, General Smith here is having a very, very hard time trying to keep his number in the proper rank up, you see, at the Pentagon. And that is really the basic difficulty here, because we've got to make a better show with the —and . . ."

Well, your problem, you thought up to that point, was simply one of morals and drains, don't you see? No, we find out that they're very complicated. And if we listen to this kind of approach for a little while we get absolutely staggered, get completely overwhelmed. We don't know whether we're coming or going. We don't know whether there are any problems in this camp, or just lunatics, don't you see, if we listen to it at this level.

I'm sure—I'm sure that the FDA's opinion of what are the problems of the United States, and so forth, wouldn't stand inspection by a psycho. They wouldn't. I'm sure that if you sat around the press office and the administrative centers and so forth at the White House today and listened to what the problems of the world really were, you would sit there and your eyes would probably start an inch out of your skulls. See? Their Scientology 0 is wildly out. See, wildly out.

It's based on an inability to observe. Well, sometimes these inability to observe are quite real. In other words, you can't go there and look. But that doesn't mean you can't get it trustworthily looked at. That's always something to remember. You can get things trustworthily looked at.

For instance, all too often in Scientology some guy is kicking around and somebody suddenly says, "Well, he's no good and he audited a pc very badly," and all this kind of thing, "and therefore he should be suspended from staff," or something like this, "until he's had 8,000 hours of auditing," or something like this.

Well, there's some kind of a command decision, see. I mean, it's made by an Assoc Sec or somebody of this character. Well, as long as everybody's fate depends on this particular level of action, and as long as that fellow actually isn't observing what really happened or what the circumstances actually are, there is actually no justice or personal security possible. If you get just a freakish flip and "Oh, well, somebody's got to be hanged, so we'll hang this one," you know, that is not a possibility of solution. If you're going to have any justice at all you've got to have the situation looked at. Don't you see? The situation has to be intelligently

looked at. That is as intelligently observed as it can be observed and as unbiasedly observed as it can be unbiasedly observed.

You've got to hear people who've said, "All right, he did a bad job," and so forth, and all right, and these other people say, "Well, yes," and you eventually get down to it and you find out the pc had a hangover that morning, don't you see, and something wild was in the lineup, quite ordinarily, that nobody suspected up to that particular time. There were contributing factors; there were all sorts of things.

Well, a person at command level has neither time, you see, nor the position from which he could observe, in order to settle it. So he'd better settle it with people who do have the time to observe the situation and then abide by what they have observed. That's a solution to the situation, don't you see?

In what wonderful shape you would be in if all during your career in this universe you had only operated, ever, upon the actual facts. See? So we get a branch out of Scientology 0. If a group is going to operate in any cleared level, you've got to take the service facsimile out of it as far as you can. And the characteristic of a service facsimile is: is nonobservation and a generality substituting for judgment. Now, those are the characteristics of a service facsimile.

Now, to the degree—you see, you cannot totally remove those on an absolute from all situations everywhere, see, because the very fact of removing them would become so complicated that you would now have new complications to observe. But you can go a long way in this direction. You can go an awful long way in this direction. What is the situation? That's the first question. What part of the situation is potentially confrontable? And what part of that situation will somebody do something about? And of course you've got the whole formula worked out to get observation and action accomplished in this universe.

There's many a—many a king, like Kennedy, swanking around, wants to get everything done tomorrow. I'm sure—I'm sure Kennedy, left to his own devices, I'm sure he would have the Cubans out of Cuba. Isn't that what he's trying to do? I'm sure he'd be able to accomplish this because he's a good, sincere man, basically, at heart, even though he's stone—blind and stupid. Now I'm trying to be fair. So he marshals up the whole United States Army and the whole United States Navy and the whole United States Air Force to solve this situation. And they go out and make fools out of themselves on the high seas for a number of days with tremendous amounts of rocketry, big guns, everything of the sort. They put a blockade all the way around Cuba that anybody can get through. They have an invasion on Cuba and it's carefully planned so that Kennedy, at the last moment, calls off their air support.

The revolutionaries and the people who know Cuba have now been disowned completely; won't have anything to do with them. Shoot them, they're—they're not, after all

germane to the situation because they are out of Cuba already, see. So he accomplished that much. So we don't worry about them. We don't ask for any of their advice. It's starting to look wilder and wilder when you get right down and look at it, you see, and this is just a basis of generality substituting, you see, for actual judgment. And the generality got there in the first place because there was no observation of the situation. I don't think anybody's made a study of the situation at all of any kind of an impartial nature. I think everybody's just riding hobbyhorses and big wild theories and that sort of thing.

Situation couldn't possibly maintain itself the way it is if somebody sat down and made a good, broad, wide survey of all the factual evidence and did all the personal observation that he could on the situation. He'd eventually wind up at the other end with an exact appraisal of the problems and situations as they exist in the vicinity of Cuba. And then, of course, he could pick up something which is confrontable about all this and start moving in on that quarter, and then start moving in on another quarter and the problem called Cuba would go *pssww!* That would be the end of that. Got the idea?

All right, you do with—this with a case all the time. And you ought to know this cold about cases. Very often, any time you've got a failure on a case, you have *not estimated* the state of the case; that is to say, the confusions and problems of the case. These you have not estimated. It's very often a great shock to an auditor after he's been auditing, out of the best possible motives, auditing somebody for two or three weeks to suddenly come up with a gasp and find out something new about this pc that he'd never known before and it completely alters the whole situation and program of which he was operating, you see?

Well, what's at fault there was an uncareful survey of the case. He didn't look this case over before he began in on it, so of course he made mistakes. In other words, he cut out the observational point. Then he, himself, didn't do what could be done, because of course it was based on unreal information. And then we get what is commonly called a case failure. You know, he didn't make good progress; it's that sort of thing.

Well, frankly, all case failures are addressed more or less into this zone and area. Somebody made an improper estimate of the case in the first place based on bad observation of the confusions and difficulties of the case and then didn't handle it on the basis of what the auditor could confront and what the pc could confront and, of course, we have a case failure.

Now the auditor, in looking this pc over, as he's listing these problems and difficulties and solutions is actually listing two different zones, or two different aspects. The problems he can see about this case—problems and difficulties and confusions about this case that he can see—and then, of course, there are problems and confusions and difficulties about the case that the pc can see. And these vary widely. These are two different points of view and they are quite different. And I've told you about the fellow that walks in on the crutches and tells

you that he has a constant pain in his ear. That's what's really wrong with him. All right, he's apparently never noticed that he didn't have a right leg, you see?

This then follows through that there's the auditor's estimation of the pc's problems and difficulties, then there's the pc's estimation of the pc's problems and difficulties. Well, the auditor is too often simply content with his own estimation of the pc's problems and difficulties; he pays no attention to the pc's estimation of his problems and difficulties. This becomes a missing factor, then, in auditing.

Now, there's a certain level of these problems and difficulties that the auditor finds confrontable. He finds confrontable, see, or she finds confrontable. And then, of course, there is the point of the problems and difficulties—and now remember this is not a point of view of what the auditor thinks is wrong, but a point of view of what the pc thinks is wrong which the pc finds confrontable. There's one of these things—now get this—that the pc thinks is wrong that the pc can find confrontable. So therefore there's what the auditor can confront about this case, don't you see, but that's a confrontation of this totality of confusions and difficulties which the auditor sees; and then there's the pc's point of view over here, but that is a point of view of an entirely different group of problems and difficulties. You got that?

Now, the pc has some part of that series of difficulties which the pc can confront. See that? All right, then—then there's a certain point of level which the auditor's experience and so forth has told him that he could do on the problems and difficulties which he has confronted. So that actually is the doingness which the auditor is willing to attack—that's—attack with. That's what the auditor is going to do about the confrontable problem or difficulty out of the total problem and difficulties of the case. You see that?

Ah, but there's another one for the pc. There's the pc's attitude of what he could do about the problems and difficulties which he himself is able to confront out of all the problems and difficulties which he has some awareness that he has.

Now look at these as six factors, six factors, all stacked up on one case. You want to know how you get a misestimate of the situation, well, just draw this for your pc sometime. Just ask your burning question at each level. "What are the Problems and difficulties which I honestly think this case is in?" So—and—so and so—and—so and so—and—so. "All right, what part of these am I willing to confront?" Well, so—and—so, that one's the easiest to confront, that's obvious. "All right, then, what am I willing to do, or know that I can do, with regard to that one I can confront?" That would be the auditor's estimation of the case and its progress. Interesting.

All right, then there's three more. What's the pc's estimation of his states of confusion and difficulties? What one of those problems and confusion does he find potentially confrontable? And what is he himself willing to do about that problem and confusion which

has been found confrontable? In other words, big one, smaller two, smaller three, see. You've got six factors at work here then, in any auditor—pc relationship. This is all Scientology 0, and nothing else.

Now, the funny part of it is, is this isn't that important on a pc level because it's mostly taken care of by the fact that if you can get tone arm motion on the pc on a hunt—and—punch System and a push—about and so forth, why you're all right. But listen, when you *can't* get tone arm action, man, that is important and that becomes important and you haven't done anything about it.

A little serious discussion with the pc on this particular subject would entertain you vastly sometime or another. The pc may be talking about these tremendous things that he has in mind that he would like to have, or something like that. But that isn't the question we just asked. We asked the question of, out of this total sum of his problems and difficulties, which one is potentially confrontable by him and what could he do about that one problem or difficulty?

Now, of course, the greatest use of that particular survey is not in the field of processing but in the field of auditor advices to the pc; a field which we almost never touch, because we say, we shouldn't evaluate or invalidate for the pc. Nevertheless, it totally exists as a field and exists as such a broad field that not to call it a level of Scientology would be to disown what man is ordinarily doing with man all the time: He's giving him advice. And if you follow the rules which I've just given you here, you'll give some beautiful advice, believe me. It'll be pretty gorgeous. You'll be a very successful adviser.

Funny part of it is you'll actually be in total control of the situation before you know it because all the advices you give will be followed. And what stops people advising? Because the advice they give is never followed. But your advice in this wise would always be followed.

You've got now an estimate of what the person—not pc—but what the person considers problems and difficulties. Good. You've got that estimation. Now you've got what of all these problems and difficulties they would find confrontable. See, we only now wind up with one problem or difficulty, you see. Now what would they be able to face doing about that one problem? And you of course have smoked it right out into the clear, see? And bang, that—they will do something about it. They will then, to that degree win, they will then, to that degree, be able to see more of their own problems and difficulties; they'll be able to confront more of their problems and difficulties and the cycle can be repeated again. So now you will find out that a new review of the general situation finds out that they have an improved idea of what is potentially confrontable amongst their problems.

So you can now find out what they would be comfortable to do about this new problem and they would do that and that would give them another win. Now the only

difficulty is, is they very often go up scale with too great a confidence and, like a little baby who has just learned how to walk, they go tearing across the room at a high run. And I'll call to your attention they usually fall on their face about the third step. They can get much too ambitious.

So you have to take *this* into consideration when you're giving that sort of thing and say, "Well, don't do any more than that at this particular time," you see. That would be giving advice. That would be social working and that sort of thing.

Well now, you have to enter this field as auditors because it is your duty to reduce the present time restimulation of a pc to a point where the session is controllable. So in that particular field you have to study out the situation sometimes and say *zit*, and *zat*, and *dit*, and get done what the pc can do about it. And he's handled some of his present time environment, don't you see?

So this is where this comes in. It comes in at pc—at pc level on advising the pc so as to cut down present time restimulation. It all comes—so comes down to wonder why the pc feels he's losing all the time. Of course he can't do any of this as the pc who eventually, of course, does all these things about his own case.

And then you get the—you get this additional aspect of the PE person—the new person. You get the people who can't audit, who are part of a group. You get these various zones and spheres and you have to talk to these people about things. Well, if you make it your business to rapidly—because you mustn't dwell on it because there's no tone arm action in it, you see—to rapidly get an estimation of what they think is wrong, then find out which one of these points they can confront, and then find out what they're going to do about that point that they think they can do, and then get them to do it. And at that point become terribly militant on the subject of getting that point done. Man! You have agreement with a capital "A." Agreement with a capital "Affinity" every time. How come?

You haven't told them anything that they think is false. And they've got an estimate of the situation. And they know when you're advising them on that estimate of the situation, they know then you speak true. And I'm a bad one to use for a model on this because in the first place in talking to you I'm not talking to the public. I say, "You see that vertical wall? Oh, you've left your fly—shoes home, huh? Well, climb the wall. Just walk straight up. Now keep your back stiff." I know you sometimes feel like that when I hand you something to do. Slightly different relationship is involved.

Now I'm talking about the analysis of a situation in any given zone or area. People don't know what the world is all about. They don't know how to get any further along in life; they know they can't make any improvement in life. They know it's impossible to be any better at all, *yeahhhh*. Well, you could actually sit down and prove to a whole group that it is

possible to get better. You can make them write it on a sheet of paper. I can see Allison down there in Cape Town doing this now in a month—few months. Have them write down on a piece of paper—and see the rest of you, too—”Write down on a piece of paper now, a short list of problems that you think are wrong with your life—the problems you have in your life. Just write this short list down,” and so forth. “All right, which one of those is the easiest for you to confront?” and so forth. “Now write that down, see? All right, now, now, write down what you absolutely know for sure you could do about that last one you have just written down. All right, write that down. Now you see what you’ve written down at the bottom of this page? Do it!”

They say, “My God, this fellow’s reading minds! The guy’s a genius! How’d he know I could do that?” It’s quite fascinating, you see? You could then—and just leadership of a group in PE or a Scientology group or something like that—increase your agreement just enormously with the rawest meat you ever had—rawest meat you ever had anything to do with—and social work and in other ways.

Now, I notice every once in a while a Scientologist winds up as an adviser to some bigwig someplace. This is quite interesting. Every once in a while, once in a blue moon, I’ll get a sudden letter from somebody or another, and it, all of a sudden, it’ll really all be foxed up enormously. More power to them, you see, but there’s—you can see that mahogany desk, you know, just imprinted on that letter, all over. And this will be “Mr. Bushbottom’s Scientology Adviser.” Every now and then it comes through my mail lines. Quite intriguing. And they land in these positions and they very often stay in them for years and years and years. What are they doing? They’re processing this guy, you see, and they process his staff and that sort of thing. They don’t do too much dissemination work and so on.

But that position and post does exist in Scientology and does occur. I’m not making any fun of it, because we make a considerable inroad. It’s quite interesting. It’s just a niche that Scientologists here and there carve out for themselves. If he did—was very careful to do nothing but Scientology 0 on his advisory capacities on that particular post, they would think of him as the greatest screaming genius that ever walked through that front door; particularly if he never pointed out a single problem, he himself never dreamed up a single solution to any of the problems, but just made people continuously estimate the situation and do that which they thought they could do about the situation, see. I’ve given you the perfect formula for this, see.

That is not all of Scientology 0 because it’s a Confrontation of what things are all about. That’s what it is. It’s the problems. It’s the chaoses. It’s other things of that particular nature. There are ways and means of handling these things. I’ve given you the most elementary material there is on it.

Scientology 0 has high applicability to any case level anyplace because it's simply an estimation of the case. And I point out to you that there are two actions always involved in Scientology 0 in all of its problems, and that's your viewpoint and the other fellow's viewpoint. And they are always those two, and they always lead to two different views of the exacting—of the same situation. If you can get the other fellow to estimate the situation, you seldom have to, which is the laziest way to look at it.

Of the two of them, it is slightly more important for the other fellow to estimate the problems and confusions—the potential problem be confronted and so forth, and what he can do about it—slightly more important for that than for you. But you shouldn't lose your gift in this particular wise, because life is successfully lived with Scientology 0 well in. And it's very unsuccessfully lived with it out. And probably the reason you came down scale and figured out all those things to do all that confronting for you in those GPMs and that sort of thing, is because your Scientology 0 was out the whole way.

So I think it's time, after all this time, that we got it in to some slight degree.

Thank you.