

STUDY AND EDUCATION

A lecture given on
13 August 1964

What's the date?

Audience: 13th of August AD 14.

Thirteen Aug. AD 14, Saint Hill Special Briefing Course. We've got another lecture here on study and education.

You probably have realized, going down the line, that we've got this pretty well wrapped up. But we didn't expect some of the bonuses that we got. This was actually quite an astonishing and adventurous thing to do as I've already mentioned and so forth, is all of a sudden pick up an analogous field of practice and study, in order to study that, in order to find something about study, so that you're not interiorized on your own subject, don't you see? So get an exterior view and study this as a lowly neophyte that is tyroing his way up the line. Both of those mean "beginners." And then carry this subject of study out through, not on a dilettante, but on a professional, hammer and tongs basis, you see? There's a great deal of difference between these two types of study.

And what remains undone of that now, of course, is the professional practice of what one has learned. And that will have to be added into it to help you out in that particular field and sphere. That doesn't seem to be too much but here is – the whole subject of education has as its end product the accomplishment of certain doingnesses, the accomplishment of certain ends or aims, and education which doesn't lead toward this, of course, is just sort of doodle-daddle, monkey business, you know, sort of stuff. It's pure dilettantism, by which could be best defined as "one doesn't intend to do anything about it except annoy his friends."

The difference in these two fields of the doodle-daddle type of monkey business sort of and so on – I really wouldn't call it education. I wouldn't dignify it with that particular field. I would say it's acquaintance – it's acquaintancy. It's getting a nodding acquaintance with some data or a field to find out what is in it. In other words, it's just becoming acquainted with it slightly and doing a light skim around its edges and that would not, in my estimation, be education.

Education would be in the direction of accomplishing certain actions professionally. Now, that is my own word introduced into there, "professionally," but if one is educated in a subject, one expects him to be able to accomplish certain things with that subject. I *don't* care

if this is merely a theoretical line of education, one is still expected to come out the other end being a good theoretician.

So education – education I would define as something that is for blood and I would say that many things pass under the heading of education which aren't. I'm not talking if – this is a good English dictionary Definition, you see? Education means learning or knowing or accomplishing the knowingness of a certain subject, you see? Well, let's take that as a flat-out Definition. If one is educated in a subject, then he knows that subject, you see? See, you know, exclamation point, he knows the subject. He's able to accomplish the actions which are taught in that subject, he's able to accomplish the results which are taught in that subject, don't you see? That's education.

Now, to call the modern school system “education,” then, is quite laughable, because this poor little kid gets in there and they – they keep the kid's time occupied. Let's go down to that. Well now, that doesn't seem to me to have to have anything to do with education whatsoever, to keep the child's time occupied. And yet a survey of this field demonstrates that the best reason for formal education of youth and so on is to give their mothers a break. That's the fact. That's the way they look in that direction.

Well, what is this kid being taught to do? And right away, then, you see what your quarrel with young schooling is. He's not being taught to do anything, see? Voilà! So it isn't education. You see, if you just took the word in its pure Definition, with an exclamation point, you know, “educated!” well, this has come to mean a sort of an esoteric fly-around that he – well, what? So you say, “This fellow was educated.” You say, “He was educated at Oxford.” Well, what is it? All right, good, he was educated at Oxford, fine, he's an Oxford man. Good. We expect certain stamps and social reactions and so forth. All right. If he was educated to be a gentleman – good! So he's a pro Gentleman. See? Fine. Fine.

But you can't really disassociate education from an active doingness and a role and a professionalism, you see? It's not possible to disassociate this, to take this over, so we say, “Well, we wanted to give him a good education, not so that he could do anything, but...” Well, that is immediately a contradiction. That's saying, “We must pick up all the white peas by leaving all the white peas on the ground.” You can't do that, you see? You can't just “educate” somebody without any end in view. It – because then he wouldn't be educated, don't you see?

And that is the modern quarrel. We have the largest budget, next to armaments, in the world, is child education. That's a big budget. And I don't care if the teachers all say they're underpaid and everything – which they are. It is, nevertheless, a fabulous piece of money which is spent in this particular direction. When you look at it all the way up the line and when you include under that heading of expense all the training, all the educational actions that are done in this world, you see that there's a terrific investment.

Now, practically everyone in the Western world has had a considerable sum invested in them to become educated. That's a considerable sum. It runs into the thousands of pounds; whichever way you want to look at it. It runs into the many, many thousands of dollars. By the time a young man has gotten through college, for instance, he stands, educationally, at something on the order of the ten-thousand dollar mark, or did ten years ago; that's an old figure. And he probably stands at a higher figure today. That's a lot of money to invest in a man – for maybe no result.

All right, so a lot has been spent upon his education but has he become educated?

Male voice: No.

Yeah, and that's the quarrel. See, there was – a lot is spent on his education but he didn't get educated.

I was rather shocked to find, the other day, that my young'uns couldn't write their name. They're being "educated" (quote) (unquote) at a remarkable rate of speed, but they couldn't sign their name. I wouldn't say that then they were being taught to write. They were not ed – being educated in how to write. No matter what they were doing, no matter how many "traveling ovals" they were making, if it didn't wind up with the end product of being able to sign their names – well, I should think that would be one of the first things that some teacher would think about. They'd say, "Well, you know, a kid should be able to sign his name." Because, frankly, that is almost the basic test of literacy.

The fellow that stumps aboard ship and has to make an 'X' on the articles is instantly and immediately considered to be illiterate. Well, maybe he could write in a flowing, copper-plate hand everything else, but if he couldn't sign his name he'd have a hard time convincing people he wasn't illiterate.

So it would seem to me to be first things first, and when I found this out I caused quite a storm by insisting that they learn how to sign their names. They – even the children got quite upset. It hadn't occurred to them that if they knew how to write they should be able to sign their names. They couldn't do it. So there's a lot of holes left along the line.

Now, you take arithmetic. Well, this is sort of taught as a handy, handy thing that is – you need so that you won't get shortchanged. I think that's just about the wildest short look at any subject I ever had anything to do with. And yet I'm sure that that is the basic reason why it is taught, because I've had children explain to me, patiently, this one point. So this has been taught to them as the reason they were learning arithmetic is so they wouldn't be short-changed. Nobody ever tells them that there's another way not to have to worry about that, is also make enough money. Well, look at it. If you – if you made enough money, you wouldn't have to know arithmetic, because it wouldn't worry you if you were shortchanged. See, there are other ways to get around this. I mean – so therefore, there is some other route on this

business of being shortchanged, although I offer that one as simply a ridiculous one, it's nevertheless quite a factual one. Midas never worried about being shortchanged.

So, what have we got here in terms of arithmetical education? Well, I defy the bulk of the teachers who are teaching arithmetic to give you much of an end product for knowing arithmetic. They'd say, "Well, uh-uh-uh-un – well, of course, he has to have it because it's a fundamental in so many other subjects."

Well, all right. Now we're talking about teaching other subjects. Well, we're not interested in other subjects, we are talking about arithmetic. How about this thing called arithmetic? Well, we wonder why people don't know arithmetic. Well, he can't be educated in it because it has no end product. The fellow says, "I don't want to be an accountant. I don't want to be a bookkeeper. I can learn to count on my fingers so I don't get shortchanged." Elementary. Why learn arithmetic?

"Well," you say, "well, you have to have it to learn other su.."

"No, no, no, no. Let's talk about education and arithmetic. Let's not go worrying about other subjects."

"Yeah, well, if you put a restriction like that on the argument," they would say, "of course nobody can argue with you."

And you say, "That's the point. Who wants to be argued with?"

The point I'm making here is that arithmetic, having no finite end in itself – of course, it has – it has finite ends, and it could be described – but having no described, finite end in itself is therefore almost impossible to teach. And you have nearly everybody doing very badly in their grammar schools on arithmetic because it itself is not a subject, so therefore no one can become educated.

It's become more and more – this is very manifest in the university – I'm not talking over your heads here, this is something that's very, very bang! It's very obvious. You get into a university, you're all the time having problems being shoved under your nose in engineering schools that you're supposed to do by algebra; you're always having problems shoved under your nose that you're supposed to do with calculus, any one of which is solvable by sight arithmetic. That's something to think about.

Now, what has happened here? Well, arithmetic, not being a subject in itself, and being a somewhat degraded and degraded subject, has gradually shrunk and is ceasing to be a subject, but is simply an auxiliary subject which moves up into higher mathematics. And if you don't know arithmetic, you can't do higher mathematics. That's the way it's represented, more or less, to the engineer.

Well, I was quite interested in old *McGuffeys Readers* at one time to find out how adept at arithmetic somebody was expected to be in 1888. The problems which they were

expected to solve in arithmetic were the problems, of algebra. And they were expected to solve these with arithmetic. And what do you know? It was a great revelation to me that it was very possible to solve these algebraic problems with their “X’s” and “Ys” and all that sort of thing by common, ordinary, garden-variety arithmetic. And it made a lot better sense – made a lot better sense. I looked at this and I’ve run into some old-timers who could take a column of figures about five figures wide and about ten figures tall and add them up in a peculiar way, which was very peculiar to me, of some kind of a crisscross addition that I would be quite at a loss to explain to you how it was done, but arrive with almost an immediate answer. And you say, “How did they do that?”

“Well,” they say, “it’s very simple. You see, nine added to something gives you itself, so all you do is go down the column and find all the combinations which make nine and forget those, and you add the remainder and you get the total.”

What do you know, you know? Well, of course, that’s just tricky stuff, but all this at one time was part and parcel to arithmetic and it’s not here anymore in arithmetic. Where did it go? Well, you must have a dying subject. Why is it dying. Nobody is delineating its purpose to the student of it. No matter if some – no matter if some purpose does exist in it, that’s beside the point. Yes, you could figure out lots of purposes of it, but all you have to know is, is nobody is delineating, marking out, showing the purpose of that subject to the student so one doesn’t consider that he becomes educated in arithmetic. Arithmetic is just some auxiliary subject that keeps you from being shortchanged.

So that as the purpose of a subject deteriorates in its advertisement or rendition – as the purpose of a subject deteriorates – the subject itself also falls away. Sounds like a very – a very strange sort of a thing to give you, but as the purpose of a subject falls away, why, so does the subject disappear from the ken of man. Manufacture of buggy whips? Go around and try to find somebody today who knows all about the manufacture of buggy whips. There’s probably a couple of boys sitting around in England who know the subject backwards and forwards and who make all the circus whips. See, there are practically no more whips made. Dying, because it has no purpose. Nobody’s got any horses to flip buggy whips over, see? So becoming educated in how to manufacture whips today would sort of be an end – a dead end. It would not be a very productive career.

Now, that doesn’t sound very amplified, but let’s take it in reverse and at once it will make a great deal of sense. Then, a subject for which the purpose is not delineated will die away, not only in the society but in the individual. Both of those two – those statements are true. The first one is so true that it’s almost nonsense. But the other one is not nonsense and it’s not been detected. If the individual to whom you are teaching this subject has not got the purpose of this subject, then that subject will die away in that individual. It might have a tremendous purpose, but if the purpose of the subject is not being taught to the individual, he’s had it. Do you see?

So you can get the difference between a live study and a dead study. A live study is one which has purpose, has a use; and a dead study is one that hasn't any use. And the way you make a live study into a dead study is dual: Its use dies away as in buggy whips or one simply omits it as part of the educational process. And it will make the subject die away, not only in the individual but the society; not only in the society but the individual. Do you see that?

And we have to assume that a person cannot become educated, just by the definition of the word "education" as I have been stressing it here, in a dead subject because it has no end product.

So you find these things become obsessive. Somebody starts to study "miniatures painted in Holland by blind painters." Well now, miniatures painted in Holland, we've got some use for that. But "miniatures painted in Holland by blind painters," well, we would sort of look around for quite a while before we found any use for this particular subject. Oh, you could find uses for it, but don't get yourself all cluttered up on – on introducing your ingenuity to supply the lack in an educational system that – because by being reasonable, you cripple yourself. It's a question of "What is there?" not a question of "What could we dream up to put there?"

Oh, we could dream up some subjects, but let's just say this boy is studying this esoteric study – strange, weird, useless, nowhere. Do you know that he can easily become obsessed with it? He has no purpose for it, no use for it and so, of course, it's impossible for him to become educated in it because he can never display his virtuosity. He can never display its use. Who would listen? He can't even tell his friends. They'd say, "This, *guy* is a ruddy crank! He goes around talking all the time..." Somewhat like your families and so forth have occasionally regarded you on the subject of Scientology. You're over their heads, you see? But much worse than that – much worse than that, we would get it on this sort of a basis, see. Nobody knows what he is talking about and nobody knows why he is studying it and it isn't of any use and it's not of much interest anyway. Well, this poor bloke can never communicate it. He can never communicate it for the best reason that communication becomes difficult: Nobody will listen.

Did you ever think about communication being difficult because nobody listens? Well, just run this into the field of education. If the subject doesn't exist and has no use and has no application and has no this and has no that, well, to that degree their listening ceases because it isn't of any use to them, either. He's studying miniatures painted by blind painters in Holland. People sort of say, "Well, I could understand his studying miniatures painted in Holland... I think he's nuts!" That would be the immediate conclusion, don't you see?

Well, your families look at you sometimes, where you have run into this and collided with this head-on, and people wouldn't listen to you on the subject of Scientology or were

impatient with you for studying it, and that was because you weren't talking to them about the purpose of Scientology. And you didn't talk to them about the purpose of Scientology within the framework of what it could do for them personally.

Now you are coming right on close to home. Your mother might have been interested if she heard what it had done for you personally because she's interested in you. But even your mother would conceive it to be a subject only when a purpose was delineated. Now we'll go a bit – a little bit further: when the purpose that was delineated could be executed to any degree. You know, the purpose you've given it could be executed to any degree. Now, your next stage is, is they don't believe it. See, you could give them the purpose but they don't believe it. In other words, the purpose isn't real to them. So you not only have delineated the purpose but you have delineated it to them in such a way that it is – seems to be an attainable purpose. An attainable or doable purpose.

So we walk up to this bird and we say – we say to this bird, “Your – your interest in this subject should be very great because this subject will make you a Clear.”

He immediately says, “What wall?” because it's not an understandable purpose, see? The purpose ceases to be understandable when the goal does not seem to him to be attainable or valuable. And it can cease to be attainable or valuable merely because it isn't understood.

So for an educational subject to exist and continue to be a subject in which one can become educated, or if you ever expect anybody to ever be educated in the subject – let me put it that way – for it to continue to exist, for it to survive, it has to have a purpose which can be seen to be an attainable action. It has to be attainable. The purpose must be attainable.

Now, the value of a subject – the value of a subject depends, simply and utterly, upon the value of attaining that stated purpose. How valuable is it to attain that particular stated purpose? Is it valuable to be able to accomplish this or is it not valuable to be able to accomplish this? And to that degree a subject appears to be a fringe subject or a vital subject.

So the woof and warp of the culture is made up of educations which are subdivisible – that's the woof and warp of a culture... (Woof and warp: rug term. Try not to put too many words on the line, here. The woof goes that way and the warp goes that way, see?) It's – the make-up of a culture is subdivisible into two general types of education. A culture is held together solely and only by education. Whether that education is accomplished by experience or by teaching, a culture, as a whole, is the summation of its education. And those are two divisions to the educations of a culture, and one of those are the vital ones and the other one is the “nice” ones.

Now, an education achieved is remunerated to the degree that its service is understood to be valuable. An education is remunerated to the degree that its service is understood to be valuable. And it frankly is not remunerated one penny more. Sometimes they falsely remunerate, but not often. And that tells you that there must be some mighty funny, funny things,

because there are some things in the society – because this rule I’ve just given you is true and the society at large then must be misunderstood to some degree because there’s several educations in the subject at large which are remunerated to an enormous extent which are not held by certain educational authorities to be valuable.

Public must like to be fooled. They’re always paying con men of some kind or another. There must be some real value in having hope shot up to the moon in the stock market because those birds are very often paid off heavily. You could reevaluate the society on the basis of what I’ve given you. Yes, you could say, “Well, the society makes mistakes in this direction. Yes, the society is lied to.” Well, I don’t think the society makes mistakes in this direction. That’s a new thought, isn’t it? Do you know that the most valuable prof – single technical profession in the United States is burying people? Hm very highly paid! They’ve managed to convince everybody that the loved one should be in sealed bronze caskets and in concrete and steel vaults outside the caskets so that seepage won’t trouble your loved ones. And they had the whole country absolutely convinced that this was Congressional law, that it was local law. And a recent Congressional investigation disclosed this fact and they found out that there isn’t any statutes in the United States that compels anybody in the United States to be buried even in a board coffin. There are statutes that require them to be buried, but there is not even a statute that requires them to be embalmed. So you roll Aunt Agnes up in a blanket and dump her in a hole. As long as you’ve got a death certificate, man, that’s all you need.

So, this particular profession – this particular profession was selling what? They were sort of selling some weird life after death, weren’t they? They were akin to some religious cult or something like that. And it was obvious that people did buy life after death. And we find out that one of the most expensive things you could do in Egypt was to die. That was a very expensive thing and that’s gotten that way in the United States today. It’s very costly to die. By the time they get through with you, man, well, you’ve got no estate left.

But this is very peculiar. The society remunerates this and rewards it. Well, it’s just about the most educated art you ever had anything to do with in your life. Undertaking is a supereducated art and the society of undertakers themselves – “morticians,” they like to refer to themselves – these birds run their own schools and their own technology and that sort of thing and they really hammer – pound it in. And the final end product is very visible. But these guys are quite sharpies. I know, because back in the days when I was having a ball around New York as a writer, why, the medical examiner – that’s what they’ve begun to call the coroner around New York now – they changed their names, too – the medical examiner of New York was a particular pal of mine. He was the coroner of the city of New York and one of the nicest blokes you ever had anything to do with. He’d embalmed personally, with his own paws, 15,000 corpses.

I got interested in this particular field by being sent in his direction to do a series of stories about undetectable crime and of course I wound up in the lap of the medical examiner

of the city of New York and he started my crime education on the subject. And of course, this was in the field of what they call forensic or legal medicine. And this boy, he had it all at his finger tips and so forth. But the casualness with which he could roll off all of these various things showed a great familiarity with the subject.

This was not an esoteric subject. This had to do with lots of dead bodies which had been strewn all over the place in various states of dishabille, various states of knocked-about. They were untidy at times. This was quite a boy. And oddly enough, he conceived that he was not acceptable socially. And I was very acceptable socially, so he and I formed a very good partnership, because he always liked to – if I was going anyplace and asked him if he'd like to come along and so forth, he was there on a rocket plane, you see? Right away, quick! But there wasn't anything – there wasn't anything that was wrong with this bird. He had perfect manners, he was a perfect gentleman and so forth. But part of his education was that his subject was looked down on and therefore he felt he was socially unacceptable and so forth.

Well, I don't know. A lot of people – lot of people look down on – street sweepers think they're looked down on and so forth, but street sweepers keep the streets swept clean, don't they? Hm? Well, this guy obviously was keeping the streets of New York from being littered with decomposing corpses. And oh, I used to see him every once in a while. When I was president of one of the writing societies there and so forth, why, he used to come over there quite regularly and he'd give detective writers talks if I'd ask him to and so forth. And they would go away from the luncheon or something like that the weirdest shades of green.

But man, here was – here was data. Here was data. And it had a very definite end product, if only in the field of detection. A guy like that could take one look at a corpse and he'd say "Carbon monoxide, been dead about three hours..... Cyanide." "Arsenic." This, that, the other thing. *Brrrrrr*, boom! "Oh, I'd say that was botulinus poisoning, Joe. Yeah, yeah. Well, put him on the slab and we'll run a – we'll run a test on it, do an autopsy. Well, I'm pretty sure that's just botulinus, you know some – eating green beans in the wrong time of the year that had been in the icebox too long. That's – looks like that's what that is to me." Almost always just dead on the button, you see?

This was art, the art of observation, the world of death. But even in the days of Egypt this art was not accorded any social status. The boys who embalmed the bodies down in the deadhouse and so forth were actually never even permitted to leave the deadhouse. They were held in. But here's this terrific, terrific amount of art, terrific amount of detail, terrific amount of technicality, terrific amount of stuff and it's come right straight down through these cultures from the days of ancient Egypt, and it is totally uninterrupted. It's interesting that such a bird as this could sit down and discuss the relative preservation qualities of modern embalming and Egyptian embalming. And he was certain he was doing better these days than the Egyptians were. It's the first time I'd ever heard that, because we've seen these Egyptian mummies in univer – in university museums and that sort of thing, and we've seen these

things around and they're still there, all wrapped up and so forth. But his attitude toward it was the attitude of a true professional: "Well, their features hadn't been preserved and their coloring was bad." That's what he said to me one day, so forth. "Yeah, the next time you're down in the museum, Ron," he said, "if you don't believe it, if you don't believe that we're way ahead of them these days, you just take a look at one of those mummies. Features haven't been preserved and coloring is bad." And I said, "But man! Those guys – those guys have been dead for thousands of years!"

And he said, "Well, in a few thousand years one of mine will have been, too." And he said, "His features won't be bad, and his coloring will be good."

He said, "We can do a better job than" – almost – "we used to do."

Well now, here's a steady – I'm talking to you about a relatively debased profession, but a highly remunerated one. And keeping the bodies off the streets and prettying up the loved ones and so forth is very highly paid. Preservation of memory and so forth is a very highly paid profession. And it has been continuous – it has been continuous for a very long time without its know-how dying away. Wherever there's been a civilization, they seem to have known the data of the last civilization on this, no matter how many wars have swept across the top of it and they deal it off the cuff and so forth. Why, even the ancient tribal rites, they would go find a dry cave that would automatically embalm the corpses of their loved ones.

So here's this – here's this very interesting technical line. That's a technical line, man. What you have to do in order to keep a corpse from going bad and what you have to do to and know about what killed this person and what he died of, so that you won't get all mixed up in your embalming activities and what you have to do in order to straighten all this out, or so forth. And how you're supposed to bury them and exactly how you're supposed to handle the grieving family and exactly how you were supposed to sell them the most for the – for the most, you know? These are technologies, no matter which way you look at it. They are very broad and they are very prec – exact and boy, do they wind up with a finite result! You know? You've got the body, you embalm it, you bury it, you collect your money. Thud! Very easily understood.

So that we would say that the subject is – a subject is not only remunerated to the degree of its need but also to the degree that it is understood by the public at large. It's remunerated to the degree that it is understood.

All right now. How about this longevity? How about this longevity? The continuing need of a purpose can then preserve a subject. The continuing need of the subject can preserve the subject. If the subject continues to be needed, it will be preserved; that's a corollary of what I just gave you a few minutes ago. But the length of time that it gets preserved is entirely dependent upon the need of and the relay of its technology. You see, you must have the tech-

nology continue to be needed and the technology must also be relayed. If it continues to be needed it will be also relayed, which is all very – very fascinating; rather obvious.

But where you get a subject coming on down the line – where you get a subject coming on down the line across the millennia and so forth, it is only because its purpose is carried with it. Its purpose has gone along with it and its purpose is understood. Now, one could destroy that subject by destroying its purpose – no longer needed, you see – or by destroying the relay of its technology in some fashion or another or in being too insistent or too – too forceful in relaying its technology and tacking lots of other things to its technology which didn't belong on it. In other words, “Before you can study engineering, you must have had a grammar school education, a high school education, gone to finishing school and learned how to knit.” I can expect that will be about the next one, see?

You're not going to have any engineers after a while; all the bridges will start to fall down. Well, one of the reasons why you won't have any engineers after a while is very elementary, and it's contained in our own technology, but only in our own technology, the reason for this. And that is, you've given him too much takeoff. He's had too much of a run on takeoff and – and the longer in an – in education – let's get back on education now – the longer it takes to approach the education, the more opportunity there is for tacks on the runway. We could probably state that in a much more easily expressed way, but that's about the way it is. If this character is taking off, taking off, taking off, taking off, he's running on the runway, he's trying to get up speed, everybody is saying, “Well, you mustn't pull back on the stick yet. You must stay there on the runway and keep running on the runway, ready to take off, ready to take off, ready to take off, ready to take off.” Well, by the time he's done this for about forty-five years and finds out he isn't off the ground, he doesn't take off.

The reason for that is, is the number of opportunities to fail are directly proportional to the length of the approach. That's a law: *Number of opportunities to fail are directly proportional to the length of approach*, or length of time that it is going to take to get up to where you're going to study this thing.

Now, that law is balanced by the fact that if you don't study something by gradients, a person can get into a mess by going into too high a gradient as I was talking about the other day. He went too steep, too quick. So there's – somewhere there is a proper length runway for any subject. It's a runway of the right length for the subject.

A runway of the right length for the subject, then, would not be so long that it needlessly multiplies the opportunities for failure and it had better not be so short that a person jumps a gradient and gets himself into a confusion. And what is the right length of a runway for any given subject? How much preparatory action should there be or how long should a course of study be and all of those things, those questions, are answered in this: Well, it

should not be so long that it needlessly oppor – multiplies opportunities for failure and it should not be so short that it takes a person up too steep.

He'll fall off on his nose, like we used to do when I was in flying clubs in college. There's many a sad young man would pull back on the stick too quick. The evolution there was a "whipstall." Called a "whipstall" – technical term, aviation – you come up the line and you – there isn't enough forward speed to sustain the vacuum on the top of the wings, and you have just never seen an aircraft do anything quite as sickeningly funny as it does in a whipstall. It's flying along very, very nicely, and all of a sudden it's flying too slow, there's no longer any vacuum above the wing and it goes "*Whoof!*" It is fast! It's not for nothing it was called a whipstall. And of course, when you're only about 100 feet above the runway or something like that, and the edge of the field and so on, why, it – you don't develop enough speed in the process of falling to then be able to pull back on the stick and pull out of it. What they do is send a notice to your folks and get in touch with my old friend the medical examiner of New York.

Anyway, that's what happens to a student, see? He gets himself into a state of over-confidence or something like this and he pulls back on the stick and he hasn't had a long enough runway, he hasn't developed his speed, don't you see? In other words, he goes into too steep a gradient.

Now, Mary Sue did it the other night. She's studying typewriting, of all things. She typewrites pretty well, but she's decided – started to do touch-typing. And she's going to make the grade on the subject of touch-typing, hammer-pound – bang! And it's quite interesting. I ran an educational process on her for a very, very short period of time on this subject and busted the dam on this. I don't know that she's noticed it and – she isn't here just now; she wound up with lawyers, so – but she probably hadn't noticed that there is a coordination between her sudden interest in learning to touch-type and breaking the barrier on one of the old "too long a runway" propositions and "too short a gradient," too. I broke that with a process and now she's very interested in learning touch-typing and she's spending about an hour a night, with everything else she's got to do, sitting there hammer-pounding on a machine on a touch-typing basis. This is very difficult, because at the same time she uses the typewriter during the remaining hours to hunt and punch out notes, you see? So on the one hand she's busy touch-typing, you see, and the next, why, she's hunting and punching it out, you see, doing her work. And then she'll get back and she'll be touch-typing away.

I threw her. I gave her a metronome the other night and she suddenly conceived that her rhythm was off, which it was, and so forth. And she couldn't do anything with that metronome running. She said she had to shut that off right now. It was too high a gradient.

But she went onto the gradient of two rows of keys before she had licked one row of keys. Now, you see what I mean by too tight a gradient? This was too tough, see? And boy,

did she whipstall! She whipstalled right now. And she just went into a total Confusion. But knowing, now – yesteryear she simply would have quit; that would have been that – but knowing, now, the technology that we – that I’ve managed to get together here on the subject of education, she sits back and says, “Now, let’s see, now, what did I do? Oh, yeah. Well, this is just too tough a gradient. I just went up on too high a gradient.” She went back to one row, *patter, ta-patter, ta-patter, ta-patter* and then went over onto two rows and she had it, see? See, she – in other words, she moved up over that gradient smoothly.

So a person knowing this can actually guide his own traffic through very nicely. Nobody had to tell her that, don’t you see?

All right. Then an educational subject is simply that something that winds up in a doingness and is approached by the process of getting educated in it. Now, that’s a hell of a thing to have to say! But you know, hardly anybody really knows this. They don’t really know it. They give it lip service all the time, but they’re always engaging in activities which they do very badly and fail at like crazy and it never occurs to them they’ve never been educated in the subject.

I’ll tell you something used to drive me stark, staring mad, down in Hollywood. Every director, every supervisor and as far as that’s concerned, every actor on the set, they all knew how to be a writer. They knew – knew how to – they knew writing. They could all write stories. The place was just lousy with writers. You want to know why Hollywood never got out of kindergarten on stories; that’s just because of it. They never recognized that it’s a technology; it’s a professional technology which is studied like crazy. It has more ins and outs and ramifications; actually it has quite a terminology. But all these birds knew they knew how to write. It wasn’t anything you ever had to study, so of course if they did get a pro in their midst – and Hollywood developed very few professional writers, in fact it developed no professional writers. They come in from elsewhere and go to pieces. Well, the process is done by everybody there knowing the profession of the fellow who just arrived. See, he’s a writer, he’s a professional, he arrives, everybody else knows his profession.

Well, now, he won’t give the movies the beingness necessary to realize that maybe movie writing has a few tricks of the trade too, so of course he looks a little bit stupid to these people, whereas he’s not stupid at all. He just hasn’t learned that particular specialty of his own subject, which he could learn rather rapidly. And Hollywood, not realizing this, never bothers to teach him how to write for Hollywood. And they have never found out that it’s necessary to be educated to know how to write.

So here’s this wild profession which is sometimes remunerated to a fantastic degree and in which you can very easily starve to death and in which people grant you fantastic quantities of beingness and in which people ignore you utterly. So it is through all kinds of contradictions. What is a professional writer? Well, by test he’s somebody who is successful

and is getting his stuff published or at least read or viewed. But of all the subjects of the arts, this is the wildest one to have anything to do with because nobody grants it the beingness of having any technology.

And yet the boy who succeeds – you would be very interested – the boy who succeeds is not just somebody who wandered in with an idea. You go up to the Screen Writers Guild and you for – you find out that the reason education in writing has gotten a bad name is because it's taught in American universities. They have gone out and hired a bunch of failed writers. And failed writers either become editors or professors. And they dramatize their failure, by the way, and they try to make a writer fail. And I've never seen one do anything else. I beg your pardon, there have been a few that worked like mad, they were tremendously successful, whatever they had to do with succeeded and that sort of thing. But they weren't under the idea that they were writers. All these other birds still had this wild idea that they were kind of writers, but here they were, editing, see? They weren't trained in it or if they had been trained in it, they'd failed at it.

Here's a chance subject. The whole society seems to run, to some degree, on the romances and imaginations and so forth of the writer. But you talk about a hidden piece of technical training. Well, the technical training of this field doesn't exist. If a professional writer wants a good laugh, if he wants just to lie right down in the aisle and laugh and laugh and laugh until his sides are sore, all he needs to do is read the curriculum of the professional writing classes of Princeton, for instance. You just double up in a ball. I mean, you – you can't help it. And I took the – a professional writing class at Harvard one time, and put them into paralysis. And I was told by the professor later, they never did recover.

I made the mistake – I was very young and very brash and of course when you're invited to lecture on your own subject, you see, at some very esoteric institution of this particular character, it rather goes to your head, and you chuck your weight around, you know? Particularly if you're very young and brash and me. And so I stood up in front of this writing class, and I said to them, "I noticed your current subject here is style. Now, no writer really knows whether he has a style or not until he has sat down," and I was being very reasonable, "until he's sat down and written a couple of hundred thousand words. And by the time he's done that, he can probably detect in his work whether or not he has a style." From the professional writer's viewpoint this is the most reasonable statement ever made by anybody, because a pro, even – even Dickens would just think nothing of getting out a hundred thousand words in a month, see? Nothing!

I don't know where all this idea came from that they all write painfully with their blood while twisted in agony, see? They don't. They don't at all. If it took somebody seven years to write a great work, it's because he was drunk six and a half. They write well, they write easily, and they write facilely. For instance, most of Dickens' stuff was written at the rate of 5,000 words a day. At one time I worked it out and handed it over to the press and it

got national press. You saw that story kicking around and so forth. They thought less of his work then, of course, I suppose. But a writer can write. What better Definition do you have for it, see? He can write easily, facilely and rapidly.

Well, all right, I said this to those poor blokes sitting there in their classroom and I noticed there was a sort of a shock went through the classroom. And it was very shortly after that, that I concluded my lecture and I didn't get hardly any applause. They were all sitting there sort of like statues, stunned. They didn't even bother to get up at the end of the bell. And finally one or two of them turned around to one or two of them, they muttered something or other. And the professor, who was a pretty good bloke, he came back and got me off the rostrum and walking out with me and so forth, and he said, "Well, you sure raised hell with that."

And I said, "Why? For pity's sakes, why? What is this all about?"

"Oh," he said, "they – they write 1500 words a semester."

And those people were upset, man! I was back there again, and that whole class, nobody even would speak to me. They were upset! They had thrown me overboard. I couldn't possibly be a pro, you see? But yet my stuff was on the newsstands. But this must be a fluke. Something was wrong, because the data I'd given them must be wrong.

These birds had never been told that they should have to write! They were all being taught to be writers, but nobody had ever said to them: "Brother, write!" You understand? And I was the first one to announce to that class that were going into their fourth year that a writer should write. I don't know what a writer was supposed to do. He was supposed to discuss or he was supposed to do this or supposed to do that, but they – commercialism has a dirty word connected with it to such people and so forth. Why? It means hard work!

They don't disdain money. Never get those people wrong. They don't disdain anything that goes with it. They don't disdain being commercial or being anything else. It isn't their art they're holding on to. It's hard work to produce, to them. This is just too tough. So they had studied for four years and had not covered their first gradient, which is that you *do it!*

"We are now teaching you about ceramics. In the field of ceramics you make pottery and glass and other such objects. By the end of this course it will be expected that you will facilely and easily be able to make bits and pieces of pottery and tell things that are wrong with pieces of pottery that are not well made and so forth and you will know the technology of making pottery."

Somebody comes along and says, "Well, you're – you're really teaching a polytechnic subject," or something. No, no, man. Writing is simply cutting down trees, running Bulldozers, there's many a man out there digging a ditch that hasn't got the physical energy it takes to

write. That's right. It's just another job. And when approached in that fashion, becomes reasonable and comprehensible and understandable, and you – then you sit down.

A writer isn't somebody who wears a red fez hat and blue slippers and smokes a pipe and gazes out the window. A writer is somebody who sits down to a desk with a pencil and a piece of paper or with a typewriter with some paper in it and he writes. What does he write? He writes what will be published and what will sell and what people will look at, because by Definition a subject has to be accepted by the society in which it exists for it to be a professional subject.

Now, this is awful cold-blooded, hard-eyed looking. That's right down to earth. Now, I don't exaggerate when I say in a university they don't say this. The best professors will stand around and say, "Well now, when you're out in the field some day, and you're looking down that transit, don't blame me if you haven't got it level." No, they don't teach that way. They hand them a transit after class and tell them to go survey something and don't even give them a lecture on what the transit is, because it's some nasty object.

No, the tools of the trade are transits. Engineering: the tools of the trade are levels; the tools of the trade are big pieces of drawing paper and blueprints and bricks and pieces of steel and machines and bulldozers and tough foremen and shady contractors. These are the tools of the trade. They don't teach any course in "How to Keep Your Own Ethics While Working for the Bide-a-Wee Construction Company." They're not real, in other words. They've gone into some other never – never land.

So that was how I shocked the short story course at Harvard. And I never could figure out exactly why and how I had shocked them. It wasn't that I had told them too many words. That I assumed for a long time, but I know now, in studying education, what I had done. What I had done is simply told them that, "If you're studying writing, you write. You're expected to write. You're expected to turn out wordage." And it probably wasn't even in the phrase, "You won't know a style," because my whole talk was devoted to this single idea.

But it was when I finally gave them a quantity, right after what I meant by "words on a piece of paper." I remember standing up there on the rostrum calculating it rather rapidly. I said, "Well, I'll get some low figure that anybody in his right mind would be able to do in a few weeks, you know, and it won't buffalo anybody." So I said: "A couple of hundred thousand words," you know? "*Gaaargh!*" see? Well, that was what they went: "*Gaargh!*" But that isn't what the shock was contained in. The shock was contained in the fact that my whole address to the subject of writing is that you wrote and that a writer writes. And that was what the shock was in.

If you're going to be educated in a subject, you should be able to do it. Now, it's not a dirty word to do things. Now, you don't have to go on obsessively doing this the rest of your life. It is very confusing in this course that I've just taught. I've just been taught. The very

best of these teachers have been thoroughly grounded in theory, and have worked like madmen with lots of doingness and lots of ramifications of it in their own field. Now, when you've got that combination, you've got a fellow, when he said something is so, there was something very believable about it because it was very right. It was very recognizable – he might not even know how to write well, but he could express this because it was his own subject and he knew what he was talking about.

Now you've got somebody who couldn't do it and that would show up – gahhh! Huge lights going up in all directions; the impracticalities of it, don't you see this? This bird – it's not the right emphasis. He doesn't tell you about the right things in the subject. He tells you about something that he thinks might be interesting, but he himself, through experience, doesn't know whether it would ever be useful or not, see? Makes a big thing out of some little thing, don't you see?

I had one the other day – it slips my mind right now, on – in this course. It had something to do with the fact the guy was just tearing – oh, yes! Yes! It was projection. It was the projection of transparencies. And if you had a screen six feet away, why – and a screen twelve feet away, then your light and density of the transparency – your light was, of course, much less on the screen twelve feet away for – not only because the footage was increased, but because it was more distant and therefore the density of the transparency was very important for projection. And transparencies had to be very, very carefully developed and printed and so forth, in their positive form, in order to overcome these differences of – I was – it was one of these boys. He was a little more esoteric than the others. Well boy, he was talking right up a – and Reg, did we have any trouble projecting any old kind of a transparency over there at the circus in the dead black of an open room at an unthinkable distance, up to a size of twelve by twelve?

Well, if you'd listened to this guy very carefully you would have gotten the impression through – he, of course, didn't have the experience; he never had probably given a lantern slide in his life. You know, it's an old technology, lantern slide shows. It is the immediate grandpappy of the cinema, see? But this boy had probably never given one, so he gives this terrific stress of how careful you've got to be to get this point at which – it doesn't matter. It doesn't matter how thick a transparency is, as long as it's a viewable transparency. It doesn't matter how dense it is or how thick it is or how hard it is to look through, if it's too far away, get a brighter light. And the thing has a solution. That's all. Put another lamp in it.

You don't do it in the darkroom, in other words. You do it while you're projecting it, but he didn't know this fact so he makes this big, labored halfpage that you have to sweat through about printing transparencies and making sure that you know beforehand at what distance they're going to be projected, because it makes so much difference between the – oh, no! You get the idea? Now, if this bird had been – had ever done this or had had much to do with this, he wouldn't make a mistake like that. So you – what you do is get wrong emphasis.

So true knowledge will give a correct emphasis and only a theoretical knowledge will give wrong emphasis. And I imagine the universities by this time are absolutely strewn with wrong emphasis. And you can keep moving something farther and further afield with wrong emphasis, up to a point of where the technology practically gets lost. Wrong emphasis, wrong emphasis, wrong emphasis! Maddening!

In other words, “Be very careful, now, about the varnish on your E-Meter. Now, E-Meters are varnished and we’re going to go through, now, the next three weeks of study on the manufacture of varnishes for E-Meters.”

Well, it’s a matter of how unreal can you get? It doesn’t have anything to do with the subject matter at all. Just because there is some varnish in a session – it probably never occurred to you till this moment there was any varnish in a session. Somebody makes a big deal out of this, you see? He says – he figures out, because varnish is shiny, he figures out that light falling on this might possibly influence the preclear into being distracted by the meter. He’s read someplace that something or other, you see? He’s figured out that this must be true, but actually an experienced auditor would tell you that he has never had this complaint from any pc every place, so it’s not a problem, so why solve it?

So these unrealities simply consist of this, and this is a very precise Definition Unrealities enter when an educational activity teaches solutions to problems which don’t exist or fails to solve problems that do exist. And the mean between those is what should be taken up. And the one thing that gives this is experience.

Some bird has the – he has the activity of carving stone heads out of the mountain: Gutzon Borglum. He – this is it. I imagine you could go up and you could learn more confounded things from a bird like that. I imagine he’s got it down. But he’d expect you to have a whole grounding in the field of the world of arts and sculpting before you even got there. But nevertheless, there’s probably a lot of specialized doodle-daddle that he would tell you all about, like, “You can tell whether that particular piece of rock that you’re going to go into has a crack in it by the fact that there’s discoloration of the pattern of it,” and so forth, and this would all be very good, you see? Well, he’s solving something real. You start to carve a cracked rock and it goes “crack.” And this is very disastrous, particularly when you’ve only got one mountain to cut up. You can’t order another mountain.

So this is probably a very important problem. And you go out there again and you look it over and he’s got a new assistant who has been taught all about how to fix up faces and heads in mountains by somebody who never did. And now, Gutzon Borglum is faced with the fact that he’s got to train this – first he’s got to untrain this assistant and he’s got to train him again, so he’s just got about twice the job on his hands, you see?

This bird’s been taught that it’s very, very bad to smoke at heights because it destroys your aesthetic sense. Has nothing to do with carving faces out of a mountain, see? Carving

faces out of a mountain doesn't require very much aesthetic sense. It requires a lot of leaning on these great big "widow maker" pneumatic drills and blasting powder and it's a very violent activity. There's lots of motion and mass and doingness connected with it, you see?

But somebody that would never do it, he'd teach, "Well, you have to be very careful of your aesthetic sense," and so forth, and *blyehhh!* see? He'd try to extrapolate a subject with which he had no acquaintance and that would be a very difficult thing to try to do, to teach a subject with which you had no acquaintance. And yet, apparently it is not – it is very difficult to do, but it is always being done. And it's given higher education a bad name today in many areas – it's given it a very bad name, because they're always being taught by people who haven't done it.

And I have really learned my lesson in this photography course. Boy, I can see one of these birds coming up in the textbook a mile away now, and *I-ahhhh!* I say, "Ronnie, here we gooooo! Wharoom! We are now going to solve all sorts of problems that don't exist, and we're going to not have any solutions for the problems that do exist, but all of this will be stated in such a way that it's impossible to extract any meaning out of it anyway. But you will have to extract the meaning out of it unless you want to get barriered or blocked on this particular subject." Now, isn't that an interesting problem?

So it makes about seven times the amount of study, just easily seven times the amount of study that should be there. He doesn't know what he's talking about, but you have to know what he's talking about, so you have to read his subject and then sort of dream up one and figure it out for yourself against your practical applications. It's a bum show.

So all subjects, regardless of whether people call them "pure mathematics" or "pure art" or something like that, all subjects wind up in a finite doingness, a very specific doingness; all subjects wind up in a specific doingness if they are educational subjects in which a person can get educated. And if they do not wind up with a specific doingness, a person, no matter how long he studied them, couldn't become educated in them.

Now, this isn't just for the Definition of the word *education*. I haven't given it that meaning. I mean, you could go on and on and on, and feel more and more baffled and more and more baffled by this particular subject and so forth. Well, it is not a subject in which somebody could become educated. Do you follow that? Well, that's your bafflement. You're trying to become educated and it's impossible, because it doesn't wind up in a finite doingness.

So, anything that winds up in a finite, specific doingness – that's a measurable, you know? It has limits and actions. Anything that winds up in a finite doingness is susceptible to being educated. In other words, you can educate it. But if it doesn't wind up that way, a person cannot become educated in it, no matter how hard he studies it because there isn't any way he can ever check out if he ever learned anything. So it becomes a total significance for which the mass is absent; and education in the absence of the mass in which the technology

will be involved is hard on people. Education attempted in the absence of the mass is hard on the student. It's very tough on the student.

It makes him feel – physiologically, it makes him feel squashed; actually, actually makes him feel squashed, makes him feel bent, makes him sort of spinny. It – these are all physiological and mental reactions; makes him feel sort of dead, makes him feel bored, exasperated, makes him feel a lot of different ways. This *isn't* the only way a person can become those, by a long ways, but that is the result of studying the doingness of something in which the mass is absent. The mass of it is absent. Do you understand? You could understand that you were studying nothing, and therefore you would not expect any mass, so that probably wouldn't upset you; but you're studying tractors and you ain't got no tractors; no tractors and you're studying tractors.

Photographs help. Motion pictures would help. They would do pretty good, because they're something of the mass. They're a sort of a promise or a hope of the mass. But the printed page and the spoken word are not a substitute for a tractor! Remember that.

And this isn't the old argument, "Of course, we know that a person has to have something of the stuff they're studying around them." No, no it isn't – it isn't even into the area of your – your practical, and so forth. Don't look for a further explanation for this datum, because you have to understand this datum in its purity. And that is simply that educating a person ii., a mass which they don't have and which isn't available produces physiological reactions. That is what I'm trying to teach you. I'm not even saying it should be done or shouldn't be done. I'm just saying it produces physiological reactions. That's just a fact. You understand?

You're trying to teach this fellow all about tractors and you're not giving him any tractors. Well, he's going to wind up with a face that feels, squashed, he's going to wind up with headaches, he's going to wind up with his stomach feeling funny, he's going to feel dizzy from time to time, his eyes are very often going to hurt and so forth.

Now, have I got this datum across? It's a physiological datum. It has to do with processing and the field of the mind.

So therefore you could expect that you would get the greatest incidence of suicide or illness in that field of education most devoted to studying absent masses. Clever, huh? And therefore I can tell you, knowing that datum, exactly what the French educational system consists of. I don't even believe they would be permitted to have a desk in the room if they were studying desks. I think the teacher's first action would be to have all desks removed from the room and then he would teach them the theory of desks.

Now, one of the ways you get away with it, I talk to you, for instance, in these lectures. You are looking at somebody who does have a mind and you're looking at a body and it's very live, so you've got more mass actually, in a lecture, than you have in a bulletin.

You'd probably much rather be lectured to, live, don't you see, than you would be to a bulletin. All right, your second best is you've got the mass of the tape and the sound and that probably isn't so bad, but it starts reducing on down to a silence and a nowhere-ness, and a – so forth, and about that time you'd start to feel bad. And then if you were studying somebody without ever having them there – have you ever read a bulletin, for instance, and suddenly recognized something about the pc you were auditing? You actually have an impulse to go find him or her. Well, to the degree that you don't do that, you get upset. You've got an applied mass now, but you haven't got the thing there that it directly and immediately applies to, so your tendency is to go find it.

All right, one must understand that this phenomenon exists, because there is another series of phenomena that exists which are physiological, which are based on the fact of too steep a gradient. That's another source of physical or physiological study reaction, because too steep a gradient. And this is a sort of a confusion or a reelingness, goes on this and it's probably – a distinct physiological reaction, distinct from the other. Now, I confess to you, I haven't bothered to make a table of which gives which, but I'm just telling you that there is a distinction which could be drawn between these two things.

And then there is the third one of the physiological reaction brought about through – an entirely different one now; an entirely different set of physiological reactions are predicted to exist in this field – a bypassed definition. And the bypassed definition gives you distinctly a blank feeling, a washed-out feeling, a not-there feeling and a sort of a nervous sort of an hysteria will follow in, in back of that. Those are some, of the physiological-mental reactions that follow this definition.

In other words, I'm talking now about the fact that you'd know whether somebody was jamming you in the arm with a pin, or hitting you on the toe with a hammer. Well, these are two different physical reactions, two different physiological reactions, see? Well, I've just given you three sources of physiological reaction to aspects of study and they are three different areas of study and they are three different sets of symptoms. And I haven't bothered to bring it out in a table form, but – I haven't read it or studied it enough to bring it out in a table form, but I recognize the differences which exist.

There might be a fourth and fifth, you understand? I'm not giving you this as the total grouping. These are the three I know, and know exist, and know that are important.

You've got the one, where – this is the least upset, ones of the thing but it produces the most distinctly recognizable actions, and you'll wonder in vain at what is producing this if you didn't know it, and that is, it's just studying something without its mass ever being around or its space ever being around or something. Let's say you're studying a sky and nobody ever lets you look at a sky. You've never got a sky to look at, don't you see? Something like that. You can study a mind because you know that the mind has an invisibility and con-

tains certain amount of masses and that sort of thing but you understand that and you do have minds around and it's quite obvious that you have a mind in front of you when you're auditing the pc, don't you see? But if you were studying this all off in some ivory tower in Austria or in Bellevue Hospital or someplace else where they don't have any minds, you would very soon find yourself experiencing these reactions, see? They'd be "zuuuu!" and so forth.

The manifestation of "blow" stems from the third one of the misunderstood definition, or the not comprehended definition, the undefined word and so forth. That's what produces "blow." A person doesn't necessarily blow on these other two. They're not pronouncedly blow phenomena. They're simply physiological phenomena.

Well, you could therefore make a child feel sick or well in the field of study. Now, that gives you a whole table of what you could do. Little Johnny is having an awful time in school with his arithmetic. Well, obviously, let's get him some apples and give each one of them a number and he's got a number of apples in front of him and there are no longer a theoretical number of apples. Let's give him the mass of what he is studying, see? See? We find out, suddenly, that he had a problem that involved apples and by golly, he never had any apples on his desk to count. You understand? You know, we'll trace it back to an absence of mass, see? Or we could supply the mass, which is – I'm trying to give you the positive remedy – we could supply mass, we could supply an object or a reasonable substitute and we'd find out that first one I gave you there would cure up.

The remedy for the second one is cutting back. Find out when he was not confused on the gradient: what new action he undertook to do. Now, that's a – that's a doingness level, that gradient. Or what action he understood well and let's find the missing point right in what he understood well. Just before he was all confused, what did he understand well? And then we find out that he didn't understand it well. See, it's really – it's really at the tail end of what he understood well, and after that he went over the gradient, see?

All right, but that is most recognizable and most applicable in the field of doingness. The individual is suddenly asked to learn handling his sensitivity control and he has been getting along just dandy watching the needle of the E-Meter swing to the left and right and now he's all confused about the sensitivity control. Well, there is something wrong with the E-Meter's needle swinging back and forth. Don't go over and try to explain the sensitivity control. Because he doesn't misunderstand the sensitivity control. You have hit too steep a gradient. It was too much of a jump, because he didn't understand what he was doing and he jumped to something next and that was too steep and it went too fast and he will assign all of his difficulty to this new thing. So that's true in this gradient, see? That's true of gradients.

Now differentiate, because gradients, here, sounds terribly like definitions. But remember that they are quite distinctly different. Gradients are more pronounced in the field of doingness, but they still hang off in the field of understandingness. But it is the action that we are

interested in, in gradients, where we have a plotted course of forward motion. See, we've got a plotted course, he should go through this, he should go through that and then he's supposed to go through that. And we find out that he was terribly confused on the second one he went through. Well, we must assume that he never got out of the first one. That's the gradient approach. And that is one whole set of phenomena accompanies that and it looks awfully like this other one.

But this other one is so much more important than the gradient approach – which you only run into the intimacies of actually training somebody – this other one is so much more important, the last one, than gradients, that it's the woof and warp and the make-up of human relations, the mind, subjects. It establishes talent, it establishes aptitude, lack of aptitude, it's what the psychologists have been testing for years and it's all of this balderdash. And that's just the definitions of words: the misunderstood word. That's about all it goes back to: the misunderstood word. And that produces such a vast panorama of mental effects, that it itself is the prime factor involved with stupidity, the prime factor involved with many other things. If a person weren't this way, his talent might or might not be present, but his doingness would be present. See, he might not paint a great picture, but he'd be painting pictures.

So, his aptitude in being able to do it would have something to do with his sensitivity, have something to do with a little bit more, you see? You know? We're – we can't say that Joe would paint as well as Bill if both of them were unaberrated on the field of art, see? That's an unreasonable assumption. But we can say that the inability of Joe to paint compared to the ability of Joe to make the motions of painting, is dependent exclusively and only upon definitions. I'll go over that again; *exclusively, only upon definitions*. There is some word in the world of art that the person who is inept didn't define or understand. And that was followed by an inability to act in the field of arts.

That's very important, because it tells you what happens to doingness. And the restoration of doingness depends only upon the restoration of the misunderstood word; the misunderstood definition.

This is very fast processing, it's a very swift, wide, big result is obtainable in this. It has a technology which is a very simple technology. It enters in at the lower levels, because it has to. It'll probably be discussed at Level I, and it will be memorized and done at Level II. And it will be followed on up the line, but because it is low grade does not mean it is unimportant. It means it has to be at the entrance gates of Scientology, that's all it means. But it is a sweepingly fantastic discovery in the field of education. And don't neglect it.

You can trace back the subject he is dumb in or any allied subject he's got mixed up with it and you'll find out why the psychologist cannot understand Scientology. There is nothing wrong with Scientology, there was everything wrong with psychology. He never understood a word in psychology, so he doesn't ever move over into Scientology.

Got the idea?

Audience: Yes.

Well, that opens the gate to education, so although I've given it last along that line, that is the most important one.

Okay?

Audience: Yes.

Thank you.