

# SCIENTOLOGY DEFINITIONS II

A lecture given on  
6 December 1966

Thank you. Thank you.

Well, we have today what date?

*Audience: 6 December AD 16.*

The what?

*Audience: 6 December AD 16.*

Six December...

*Audience member: AD 16.*

AD 16. What planet?

*Audience: Earth.*

That's very interesting.

This Saint Hill Special Briefing Course lecture... And I have just heard that Scientology is very bad. The minister of health said so in Parliament. But he isn't going to do anything. But we are.

They shouldn't do it. But it's typical of suppressives that they elect executioners. That doesn't mean that any assassination attempt is going to be made upon anybody. It isn't necessary! But you find out that down through the ages that SPs have had a ball. Now, for the first time in known history, there's a thing called ethics. You can't lie in order to do people in; that is the motto of ethics.

Very interesting. Somebody looks at ethics and they say, "That's terrible, you know? Who's selecting out who's a suppressive?" It's perfectly simple – the suppressed. And then they say, "Who's to determine who is suppressive?" Well, I'm afraid the suppressive determines that because if anybody had exact characteristics, it's a suppressive. You've got them in bulletins. But there are no more exact case statistics. It'd be very hard to find out whether or not somebody was sane, but it's very easy to find out who is suppressive: case doesn't change; they speak in nothing but generalities; they take posts like minister of health. It's very positive.

But this universe began to go to pieces and got formed actually on suppression and nothing else but. And all these ages we all been waiting around and ruing the day that we didn't act when we could act. And we're not going to spoil that chance, once you get another chance.

Could be a perfectly good universe. It didn't have to be a suppressive-formed universe. It could be a perfectly happy, good universe.

But ethics would have had to have gone in very early. And because every thetan was an individual acting on his own and suppression was organized, all we have to do is reverse it so that thetans, without foregoing their independence, yet operate on their own and organize the *other* side just a little bit, because actually it's very easy to beat a suppressive organization.

They're being – you see, they're busier because their percentages are out. There's 80 percent who aren't. So that at once gives you numerical superiority. Furthermore, they can't think straight. And you can just go down the list on the number of counts with which they'd win. And I'd put my money any day of the week on the game that is now moving up to knock out the game that wasn't a game – any day of the week – because the majority usually has an advantage over the minority. On that principle you'll find out many fights get resolved very suddenly.

It doesn't matter how good a swordsman is. He maybe handles two swordsmen, three, four, standing in front of him, five maybe, maybe six: He won't handle twenty. He's going to get it, that's for sure.

Now, an organized minority is all that has been making this universe a mess. So why not an organized decent majority? So when they play fast and loose with Scientology, all they're doing is running up their range flag. They think they're running up a battle flag, they're not. They're just running up a range flag. "Our range is 2,600 miles. If hit even faintly with dried peas, we would sink. Code flags flying at the yard."

Now, of course, a suppressive always hits the wrong target. He never can complete a cycle of action. So it wasn't even a well – organized minority. They don't even know who they're fighting. You see, basically a suppressive is stuck somewhere on the track fighting the Martians. And when you walk along, you're a Martian so you have to be suppressed, you see? You automatically are a Martian, even when you come from Venus.

Give you an idea of identification: It doesn't matter how often you tell these Ministry of Health – you'd only have to clip it out of the tape, so I just won't say it – it doesn't matter how often you tell them you're not in the healing business, they're very sure that you are. So they attack our healing activities. Well, we don't have any. That's a very simple battle, isn't it?

So anyway, never forget that you were very lonely on the track for a very, very long time, and the opposition seemed fantastically hard to dent; seemed very, very rough. And it's been a very rough universe, that's for sure. But the weather vane has turned and the wind is blowing in the opposite direction, and the opposition don't like it. They are not sending for whom to find the

bell tolls – they know it's for them! We actually have no overt intentions toward them whatsoever.

I was taught a punch by a judo instructor one time whereby you simply stood there and held your fist out. Need I describe it more? But we are not fighting a revolutionary activity, we're just trying to go about our own business. But we do have a thing called ethics, and ethics happens to be out in this universe. And if you were to go into a mental institution and count noses, you would find only PTSes – one, two or three totally insane suppressives, perhaps, but the vast majority merely their victims.

I think they've had a ball. And it isn't that they're just now caved in enough to take over or handle. That's not true. They've been that caved in all along, only we didn't notice.

So, we at the moment are numerically in the universe, a minority, that is for sure. We are a minority. But we intend to live decent lives and forward decent programs and go ahead along our way as straight as possible without getting knocked out of line by suppressives. And that will eventually result in, I'm afraid, an organized majority.

Now, I didn't get through any words – this is some more dictionary lecture – and I didn't get through any words to amount to anything with you the other day, because all I wanted to do was to give you a basic look at the two big words on the line, which was *OT* and *Clear* And I hope that itself clarified something. Now, there are, however, a great many other words, and they needn't be described that long, and they're probably in this stack of cards that I'm holding in my hand right now of words submitted by students and very nicely printed indeed. When I said legibly it – they interpreted it as gorgeously.

So your cards look very nice. But there are things here possibly that we will encounter, that in an evolving science, something named early before total information on it is present, may leave something a little ragged around the edges. And the first one I'm looking at right now is of that character: Want a definition of the analytical mind as opposed to a thetan. Well, now, that's not asking for a definition; that's asking for a dissertation.

But we could ask for an analytical mind as a definition. And an analytical mind would be anything that a thetan set up; it could even be a computer which collected data and used it to resolve problems. And the basic purpose of the (quote) mind (unquote) is the resolution of problems relating to survival. That's *Original Thesis*. And that's what a mind is. It's something that does this. Now, if a thetan does this, you could say he is a mind.

But let me give you an idea of what an analytical mind would consist of: One, it cannot exist independently of a thetan. That is not possible. Man has been so caved in on the subject of the *reactive* mind, which was a mind which was working which he knew not what of – see, it was a mind of which he was not aware – that he then discredits the whole idea of a mind. Mustn't be any such thing as a mind at all. I'll just do it all myself! You get it?

Now, the difference between a reactive mind and an analytical mind would have to be discussed to answer this question. A reactive mind is an unknowing, unwanted series of aberrated computations which bring about an effect upon the individual and those around him. In other words, it's got some aberrated computation that "all horses sleep in beds," and therefore, in any attempt to build a stable, equips it with beds. Do you see? But the fellow doesn't know why he this this way. He does not know why he has to do this.

So you would say that the reactive mind is an obsessive strata of unknown, unseen, uninspected data which are forcing solutions unknown and unsuspected on the individual. It's a subawareness activity. And you can see that's very bad if the definition of Operating Thetan is knowing and willing cause over thought, life, matter, energy, space and time – knowing and willing. Well, the analytical mind would be perfectly usable and could exist if it was a knowing and willing mechanism.

For instance, much of Dianetics and Scientology was resolved by the construction – I use that word advisedly since it was diagrammatic and so on, on graphs and things like this – much of it was by what you might call a philosophic machine. Now, a philosophic machine would be something you would draw up which gave some data which you could then combine with some other data and get some sort of an answer. But you're setting down the data and you're aligning it all up, and all you're doing is doing a think which is recorded. In other words, you're doing a recorded think so that you can knowingly observe a relationship of data and get an answer. So an analytical mind would be the knowing and willing resolution of problems related to survival.

Now, thetans sometimes set up things that do this, and that somewhat gets them in trouble because they make these things of lasting duration. And the only time that an analytical mind ever gets in trouble is when it's set up to run forever without inspection or observation. So an analytical mind cannot exist without inspection and observation. See, by definition, a mind which is running *without* observation is reactive; so a mind which is running *with* observation, and so forth, is analytical.

So if you had a big computer – let's get two differences here – you got a big computer and we feed data to this computer – an operator feeds data to the computer and he gets answers out of the computer. He knows where the moon is going to be at such and such an o'clock on such and such a date, and two minutes later he knows where the moon is going to be and two minutes later he knows what... This is typical astronomical calculation; they have computers like this all the time.

Now, he's there feeding the data to the machine, and the machine is simply tallying what it's fed and cross – relating it in such a way that he can inspect it. And then he knows what answers he's getting. If he doesn't know what answers he's getting, he'd shut the machine off. But then he can make these tabulations, and they can turn out a thing called an air almanac or a nautical almanac if – or an astronomical almanac – where the moon is going to be for any given minute during the next twelve months, see. Which is useful to know. And then somebody can

consult this table which has been drawn up by this computer. And he's flying along in an airplane and he hasn't got time to figure out – because he needs his sight right away – he hasn't got time to figure out where the moon is going to be in every minute and where the moon is this minute. Now, if he knew where the moon was this minute, he would know where he was right this minute, and therefore he wouldn't need to do this at all. Do you see? But he has to know the exact position of the moon so that he can get his relationship to the moon, and then he can get his position in relationship to the Earth. Do you follow?

So he is in actual fact using an analytical mind. He is inspecting the moon and then inspecting the table which was drawn up, and then he gets an answer which is his position. Do you see?

All right, now let's take a gobbledygook affair whereby... Oh, this is the superscientist's special, see? Its a machine that, uninspected, picks up the data to resolve problems that had not been suspected and turns out answers uninspected which then, by law, become a total effect upon the population. Do you see? I mean that's silly.

And yet they dream about such machines, and they even write science – fiction stories about such machines as though this would be a great thing.

All right. Now, we take a ship – now, let's take a little air car, see, or something like that, that runs on trolleys or something – we set this thing up to *know* when it's loaded with passengers, *know* when to start, *know* when to stop, when to turn around, when to come back and what course to follow. And we set up this air car to run from A to B, to B to A, to A to B, to B to A, to A to B, to B to A, forevermore.

Now, the question is, is this thing reactive? No, as a matter of fact, it isn't reactive. There isn't a passenger that gets aboard it that doesn't inspect it. And you can just hear the angry catcalls which come from the passengers whenever the machine does not get to B or back to A. It's an inspected machine. Automatic elevators – same way. If you ever want to hear a ruckus in a big office building, the automatic elevator stops halfway between floors.

No, that's inspected. Reason it usually breaks down is it hasn't been inspected lately.

No, people know what that thing is supposed to do, don't you see? They know what its purpose is and what it's supposed to do, and it gets inspected and so forth. So it nevertheless has a sort of a mind. It knows it's supposed to depart every time the weights on it become umpteen kilos, it knows it's supposed to shut its doors and travel to the other end of the track And when it arrives at the other end of the track' by some gimmickry or other it knows ifs supposed to stop.

But it knows. We're not interested in what it knows and what it doesn't know. If it were totally independent of life, of course, the machine could run from A to B, to B to A, to A to B, to B to A, and it could even load things and run them from A to B, to B to A, and back and forth, and there'd be nobody around and no life was served and nobody ever got the product that came

to B, and we have the kind of world that a science – fiction writer very often dreams up as the ideal. There's nobody there at all.

Well, I point out that somebody had to be there to begin with and sooner or later something is going to happen along such a line that this thing will become aberrative.

Supposing you inherited a civilization that you knew nothing about how it worked at all and it was all on automatic. This is another science – fiction dream, see? You walk into this universe – and you walk into this planet and all the doors open and close and the thing's crowded and so forth, but every – thing is just going on. And the machines are there – John W. Campbell special. He's one of these characters. Boy, he loves it.

I'm going to get him to write a science – fiction story someday: "I Was a Robot." Everybody else writes confessions, why shouldn't he?

But the machines repair the machines, you see, and the machines wait on the machines and the machines, the machines, the machines, the machines. Now, that very thought and that idea that a universe can exist entirely of machines that would be of any benefit of any kind whatsoever is of course complete nonsense, because it'd just be a child's toy. And the one who built it would be the one who built it, and if it broke down eventually, he'd have to come back and fix it up again. Do you follow?

But a population which inherited one of these things and didn't know how it ran and so on would be very mystified along the whole line, and so forth. It's reactive! It's reactive.

The human body falls under the character of a machine which one does not know the directions of. He doesn't know how or why it operates as it operates. And therefore we have the medical doctor. I might go so far as to say, therefore, we tolerate the medical doctor. The body is so unknown that we don't know he doesn't know either.

But you get the difference. Now, you find that a body is fairly aberrative; does unexpected things; gets sick at unexpected moments and so on. It's got somebody there but that somebody can't keep it inspected because it has reactions and effects upon him which he cannot predict. He does not know the construction of it, he really does not know how it got there in the first place, and he doesn't know at what moment the thing is going to stop and have to be buried at vast profit to the undertakers. Do you see?

Now therefore, speaking of machines, that would be an aberrative machine. Now, the body line is apparently running uninspected. It is. It's running uninspected. Nobody inspects it and therefore you get ministers of health and all kinds of aberrative things. That's correct.

Now, if you at this moment were going to mock up a body which you, out of courtesy, were going to display to people and have talk, and you put it on the drawing board and you drew it up, both as to how it should look and how it's to function, I'm sure you would leave more parts out and consider them unnecessary than the body has. I don't think you would put it together this

way at all. You would probably put together a very simple, functional body. You would probably also put together a disposable body in case the paint got scratched.

But you see, then you would be knowing and willing cause. Now, you didn't have to be the one who built it, but let us say that you could buy bodies down at the store. Well, beware of buying bodies which don't include any directions in them. And that's essentially what you've been doing for some time.

And it just shows how idiotic a fellow can get that he picks up a machine with no instruction book. And you think of the trial and error you had to learn how to run the body you're pushing right this minute, it's quite remarkable. The number of chairs you fell into and the number of times you bumped its nose. Well, that's trial and error. You had some familiarity with it, and you somehow or other...

But it was a great surprise to man that the heart beat and circulated the blood – just about 300 years ago he found out that his heart beat and circulated blood. Up to that time he thought he kind of existed by the ocean tides or something: the blood tided out to the extremities of the body and untided back. That was the theory of Galen. And Harvey came along and says it goes pocketa – pocketa – pocketa. And there was a great row over this, because the medical profession thought that it might lead – this piece of knowledge – into not having heart trouble, which constitutes 50 percent of their income. Actually, there are treatments for heart trouble right now which are not being used because heart trouble is 50 percent of medical income. That's a statement made, by the way, by the Shute Institute of Canada.

Now, the difference then between an analytical mind and a reactive mind would be a mind that was running without inspection. It's a – unwilling to have it run. Get it? And you don't know it's there and so on. Now that, when you try to disseminate to people about Scientology, is what you run into. You are talking about the reactive mind and they don't know it's there. You have to actually show them it's there before they sort of understand what you're talking about. And it's very funny to see somebody who is very green sit down and start to run his analytical thoughts and computations when you're trying to get him to run his reactive mind.

I could see there are – more auditing time gets burned up just on that basis only. The fellow is busy supposedly running an engram. Well, the fellow is running an engram and the engram is yesterday when he walked from office A to office B. Now, he knew he was at office A and he knew he arrived at office B. He also knew why he was going there, and so forth, and I'm afraid the whole operation was completely unaberrative. But he will sit there and he will run that with the greatest of enthusiasm and the greatest, greatest thoroughness. But if he's too absorbed in it, you can then realize that any living moment to him is a reactive moment, that it was an engram containing pain and unconsciousness to eat his Wheaties.

And there you would get where the fellow was so overwhelmed he was aware of nothing. Now, the way you handle a reactive mind and attain up to an analytical mind status, the way you handle this, is simply to increase the thetan's awareness.

This is the difference, actually, between Dianetics and Scientology. The reactive mind is handled by increasing the thetan's awareness. Now, by increasing his awareness he becomes aware of this thing, so it's now under inspection. And as he goes along he can then handle this thing and so it is under his control and it ceases then to be reactive no matter what's in it. But you – all you have to do is increase the awareness of a thetan to overcome the reactive mind. By merely destroying the machine, you really don't accomplish much.

You could probably get some kind of a pill called LSD Robinson – you'll have to take that out of the tape because those are not his initials. They are the initials of the fellow who invented all the crazy machinery in England. You know, in America you have Rube Goldberg, you know? The Rube Gold – berg machines. Well, actually, in England, isn't it Keith Robinson? And isn't that the minister of health now? Anyway...

Now therefore, as his awareness increases of what is going on, he can handle it. But if you had a syringe that you shot him in the gluteus maximus, which you're sitting on at the moment... This restimulates my medical degrees. Matter of great shame, I have to confess to the fact on the backtrack that I was contaminated to that degree for a while.

Anyway, if you shot him in the gluteus maximus with some kind of a fluid which simply wrecked the reactive mind, you would find the individual would not get well or anything else. You might find some physical characteristics change, but he wouldn't know they'd changed and he wouldn't know they'd not changed. And once in a blue moon, you can run a heavy engram on a preclear and have the preclear's arthritis or lumbosis or something disappear utterly and the preclear be in this fascinating state: not to have known he had lumbosis or arthritis to begin with and not to know it's gone when you have finished.

Now, what are you handling there? You're handling somebody who had no awareness of any part of the machinery, so the man was very unaware, so therefore everything was reactive.

Now, as an individual disappears down the Awareness Scale, he could get into a position where the whole world was reactive. So when you're talking about analytical or when you're talking about reactive, and so forth, you're actually talking about the Awareness Scale of the individual.

Now, an individual who doesn't occasionally set up an analytical mind – not to run for him and work for him and so forth, but who does not use an analytical mental process – is having a rough time. For instance, I'm fairly good at guessing products of two multiplied numbers. But I would rather multiply them. Do you see? I'd rather multiply them and get an exact answer – particularly when I'm paying my bills. Well now, that operation is an analytical mental operation. The machine in that particular character is the arithmetic tables. That's a sort of a philosophic machine, and the various tables of multiplication and so forth and the rules of addition and subtraction – this is an arithmetic machine. And of course most kids in school consider this a totally reactive mind. So you see the difference between these two things.



Now, there is no analytical mind opposed to the thetan, only the reactive mind is. Because the question of – is what is the analytical mind as opposed to the thetan – the definitions of these two things. Well, the joke in this case is that the reactive mind opposes a thetan, the analytical mind doesn't.

So you – do you see the difference between these two things? And it simply comes when you're asked for a very rapid – fire definition of the thing. An analytical mind would be a mind that is temporarily set up willingly and knowingly by a thetan to assist in the resolution of problems – problems inevitably relate to survival – and anything that he set up to do this which – of which he was aware and which was inspected. And that would be an analytical mind.

A committee set up to get data and coordinate the activities of another area or body – of a factory or something like that – would be the mind of that factory, even though they are thetans doing it. But there would have to be thetans doing it to be analytical.

Now, that's one of the reasons why, for instance, in an organization you should know policy because otherwise the solutions and combinations and so forth, unknown to you, make it have an effect on you because it's somewhat reactive. Do you see? If you don't know about it, and if you're – and then if policy isn't inspected, and if it isn't reformed to meet the conditions – you see, it's very set but it gets reformed to meet the conditions of operation as you go along – if these things don't happen, why, then it too could become a reactive mind. But it would become reactive just to the degree that one wasn't aware of it. Do you see?

So therefore, it's a very, very good thing that if you're operating on a set of data of some kind or another to make them known. Now, Scientology is a somewhat reactive mind to the society, particularly health ministers. In the first place, their awareness level would have to be; it would have to exist somewhere on the Awareness Scale. But if they didn't have an awareness level, you could talk at them and talk at them and talk at them and talk at them and give them data, data, data, data, data. And if they were still not aware, they would simply be acted on the way a reactive mind acts.

If we didn't disseminate and yell so hard, do you know that the societies of the world would never really become aware of our existence at all, any more than they are aware of the existence of a thetan. And if we really had something up our sleeves, we would simply continue to operate in that framework. It would be a totally reactive action as far as the planet was concerned, and it wouldn't be very good for man.

Now, we have a tendency to go out in this particular direction, because as our awareness of individuals come up they fail to be aware of how unaware the populace at large is. And when you get into OT operations, you will find very often that you run across this factor. I wouldn't bother to solve it. If the solution got in the road of it, I wouldn't bother to solve it, because they've already got so many reactive minds that one more area of reactivity to them wouldn't matter much.

Now, when you have to explain all of your motives to somebody you realize that you really shouldn't bother. Because if their – your motives are not visible to them when you don't intend to hide your motives, then an explanation of your motives are not very likely to do very much to them because their level of awareness of you already doesn't exist. Do you see?

It almost comes down to it that he – a thetan could make a hard and fast rule – only he never should make hard and fast rules – but it's a good one to observe, is never explain. Be as obvious as you please and be as plain as you please and as straightforward as you can be. And if the ordinary evidences which lie around then don't justify your actions, and so forth, there's no sense in explaining it to the person who is challenging them, for the good reason that he wouldn't be able to understand them anyway.

So reactivity and analytical are relative to the awareness potential of the individual. Any analytical mind can become a reactive mind and therefore such minds, when they're set up, are just a little bit dangerous. Do you follow?

I don't think there's any reason to define *thetan*. After all, you're sitting there.

Now, *power*: *power* just has a physical definition, and I could give you, I suppose, if I thought hard, the textbook physical definition. It's the amount of work which can be accomplished in a unit of time or the amount of force which can be applied in a unit of time. It contains within it the idea of a potential.

Power is not something which is being exerted, whereas force tends to be. Do you follow? Power has the connotation of being potential. Therefore, a person is *powerful* when he is able to use power, not when he is necessarily not using power or using power He is simply powerful. In other words, it's potential that he could be – he could use force. Do you see? So therefore he is powerful. But you would say he is forceful, you would get the immediate action that he was using force. He's using force right now.

So we use the word *power* because power does not necessarily mean application of it – use or application of it. And the smarter a fellow gets, why, the less – the less force he in actual fact employs in order to accomplish a difference or change of opinion on the part of others.

And the – there's a limit to this when somebody is tearing up your mockups faster than you can put them up, and so forth, why, you can change from being powerful to, for a moment, being forceful. And it was your failure to do this very early on the track which got you in trouble.

Now, when somebody says *implants*, he means an unwilling and unknowing receipt of a "think." The most ordinary example of an implant... Now, there's a difference between an implant and an engram. An engram is simply those perceptions unknowingly contained in the force, duress, pain and unconsciousness, you see, of an incident. Now, a fellow gets hit in the head with an ax – it's – intent is the difference, see. A fellow gets hit in the head with an ax and at that moment there is a mill wheel going and somebody says, "Look out." Now, he'll have the sound of a mill wheel and "look out" and the texture of the ax and the general scenery so

cluttered up and generalized and impressed upon him that he will have – a wog will – a stuck picture. Not only a wog. But he will have a stuck picture of this. He will make a mental image picture.

Now, he makes a mental image picture by reaction of resistance. He goes *wruhh* with energy, see? Out! You know. Stop it! And at that moment he goes unconscious, and he's made a sort of a stuck wave because, of course, he didn't prevent it. And actually, just as you sort of would make an embossed impression of something, he sort of embosses the environment. Do you see how he'd do that? You know.

For instance, if you put your hand up against a brick and pushed it very hard and then looked at your hand, you would, oddly enough, for a split instant you would have almost an exact picture of the brick, and a moment or so later, why, you would have the indentations of the brick, you see? Well, that was because you pushed on the brick. You pushed something at the brick. Well, a thetan is potential – well, he is able to exert energy. He can make and exert energy, so when he tries to fend something off, he rather reactively pushes back against what is pushing against him or he pulls in against what is leaving him.

Now, if he does this, why, then he's left with not just a picture but a series of pictures. But he certainly has got one of those pictures stuck harder than the other pictures, and it was at a moment when he resisted hardest against the force which was influencing upon him or pulled back hardest against the departing force. Do you see? So it sort of automatically took a picture.

Now, let's get the difference between that and an implant. An implant, he is put under duress – he is resisting – and somebody is intentionally giving him fixed perceptions and ideas. It is an intentional wreck of somebody's ability to make pictures, perceive and remember. It's intentional. Now, we could have an implant on the basis: somebody hit Joe over the head with an ax and knowing, now, that Joe was going to resist at this moment, at the moment he does this he also says, "You are a fool, you gibber and drool." Now, that's intentional. That was an intention to aberrate him. And what do you know, it actually will work out that Joe after that will at least be afraid of gibbering and drooling, because it's part of the impression, it overwhelmed him, so therefore the thought is overwhelming.

Now, implants are of very different kinds and types and so forth, but they all contain this in common: They are an intentional installation of fixed ideas, contrasurvival to the thetan. Some people make an impression of it. Psychiatrists. Now, that's not just a dirty statement. They do this today. They will give a – they will pour the whole powerhouse full of juice into somebody's skull and they never bother to tell him that he's going to f – that afterwards that they have told him he's – they're going to take care of him, you're going to feel all right and you're going to want another one of these. And they have never bothered to inform even the public that they do that. But they quite commonly implant and they use implantings.

Now, you could definitely take a shock machine, any shock machine in any psychiatrist's office – by which they tell the person they're going to be better and so forth (they gave him an

implant in other words; make it reactive, fixed idea). You could take an implant machine, you could clamp it on the head of some guy who was pretty loopy and give it the works, and say at the same time, “You are going to go to the state house and get a job as a page. And on such and such a date you are going to take a knife and kill Dr. Vervordt. You will do this, but forget you have ever been told” and turn the shock machine off and he would possibly do it.

Any use of duress against the insane delivers into the hands of those who are legally practicing it or practicing it without legal check the power to accomplish any criminal act in the society. It’s worth knowing, isn’t it?

But if man does not know that there is even such a thing as a reactive mind, if he does not know there is such a thing as a potential implanting – see, I don’t say that is what happened. This is a technical subject, you see? And if man is not aware of anybody having a reactive mind, he’s not aware of implanting or how you can implant a suggestion, if his closest awareness of it is hypnotism and if he considers, at large, hypnotism a fake and if he is also told carefully by all the hypnotists that only some people can be hypnotized, then people think they’ve got hypnotism mixed up with it. Well, actually all hypnotism is, is a restimulation of past implants. Stop that!

Now, our next one is *GPM*. And *GPM* are the initials of *Goals Problem Mass*. And it was named that arbitrarily because when an individual has an intention and something else has another intention or when there are two intentions counter-opposed he has a problem, for the definition of a problem is intention-counter-intention, purpose-counter-purpose, goal-counter-goal, and that is a problem. For instance, our trouble with such dissident elements and suppressives in the society is: we have a goal of making people well; they have a goal of holding people down.

Now, those two things get together and they’re counter-intentions, so therefore they make a problem.

Now, there can be two or more intentions in conflict, and when those two things are in conflict, one with the other, they tend to produce mass. Now, the Russian statement of this is called dialectic materialism – that all ideas are born out of the meeting of two forces. They’ve got it actually backwards. When two ideas oppose they create force. They say two forces create ideas. If you hit a guy hard enough, he’ll think. Funny part of it is, I’ve seen an awful lot of schoolboys taught that way that didn’t actually succeed very well in life.

*Goals Problem Mass*: It’s simply a statement that when you have two opposed ideas, there will be a resulting mass, or a mass is held by two opposed ideas. Now, the reason the mass holds is because a thetan cannot as-is either side. In other words, he can’t see which side is which.

Now, pan-determinism, which we’ll get around to, is the ability to see both sides of something or as-is both sides of something. When one is totally pan-determined, he has no mental mass, because he’s seen both sides of everything. He can see two ideas at once even though they are opposed. Self-determinism is very laudable since it is very rare, but nevertheless is below pan-determinism, because the individual can only determine something from his own viewpoint.

So when you talk to somebody and he justifies what he does, you know immediately that he is self-determined, not pan-determined. That's the quickest test there is. See, that's the quickest test there is. Little boy; you says, "You spat at Johnny." He says, "He hit me."

Well, the reason he's in trouble with you is because he's self-determined. Well, he didn't determine you, did he? He didn't handle the other little boy from his point of view so the other little boy wouldn't hit him, so therefore he had to react to the other little boy's having hit him. Well, you always get into conflicts one with the other way in life – they're sort of inevitable. Life is a sort of a conflict of some kind or another. But it needn't be a total conflict and it doesn't mean that one opposes every idea that comes along.

Now, you take somebody who's totally reactive: He will inevitably oppose any idea put to him. We normally call such a person a conservative or a reactionary or a Tory or something – it's sort of that. He's "agin it," see. And it's very funny handling such people, to start putting his own ideas to him, because his first impulse is to be "agin 'em," because you're putting them to him. And this foxes him up most horribly. And normally that is such a horrible trick that it's usually looked on as fight talk. "You think you're pretty good, don't you?" Now, that makes the guy resist his own idea. "You think you're right but you are wrong," you see? That foxes him up, see, because although it's a low scale thing, it's the low scale mockery of pan-determinism – take both sides of the argument.

And sometimes you can see one of these low scale mockeries of somebody taking both sides of the argument. They're just rattling on at a mad rate. When they're giving all of the questions, all of the challenges and all of the answers, and the other person is saying absolutely nothing. And this is one of the wildest things to watch which you've ever watched, and I'm sure you have seen it. Somebody is standing there with the whole dialogue!

"Now, you've got it all figured out that..." You know? Starts that sort of thing. "And now you're going to say, 'But...' " "But the other fellow hasn't said anything. And that's sort of a lower-scale harmonic.

There is no ability of a thetan, in actual fact, which does not have a lower-scale mockery or a lower-scale exaggeration, you know? If you can see, up on the upper scale, if you can see, then, somewhere down on the lower scale below blindness, the individual sees things. See, that's the lower-scale harmonic. He sees things that aren't there, of course, but still that's an exaggeration, do you see, of the upper-scale ability.

And so do all abilities. A person begins to single out only one ability out of all of his abilities and then this becomes exaggerated – becomes aberrated and then exaggerated, and then this is all he can do, but he does that far too well. See, you could see a dragon if it walked in. But he doesn't have to have one walk in. He can become so bad off that he sees a Scientologist under every chair. (The guy is right. We are after him. We're after him.) The guy who believes that you're a Martian – he's seeing, but he's seeing in a very aberrated way, don't you see?

So anyhow, a Coals Problem Mass is simply the problem created by two or more opposing ideas which, being opposed, balanced and unresolved, makes a mass. So it's a peculiar kind of a mass. It's a mental – energy mass but actually can exist in the physical universe. If you have tractor A being driven north and tractor B being driven south, they cease to be tractors and merely become mass.

Now here's one: The difference between – it should be amongst because there are three things, you see; you can't have two things – you have three things with a *between – the* difference amongst affinity, emotion and intention.

Well, I should think anybody should know that. An emotion: An emotion is a response by wavelength affecting an individual or another, which produces a sensation and a state of mind. And an intention is something that one wishes to do. He intends to do it. It's an impulse toward something. It's an idea that one is going to accomplish something. It's intentional, which means he meant to do it, he means to do it. And affinity has nothing to do with the other two at all – has nothing to do with the other two. Because affinity is the ability to occupy the space of or be like or similar to, or to express a willingness to *be* something. You say, "I like you," you're immediately saying, "Well, I'd just as soon be you." Do you see?

"I like you," would also say, "I'd just as soon occupy your space." And affinity carried forward in ne plus ultra, I suppose, between two thetans, you could mock up the conversation of "Let's occupy the same space!"

Now, when two individuals – there is a scale of affinity which doesn't just include "like" – but when two individuals do not like each other, it means they won't occupy each other's space, they won't occupy each other's viewpoint, they *don't* want to be like the other person and so forth. The dissimilarity must exist. If one wears blue, the other has got to wear green. It's expressed dissimilarities. And when this becomes sufficiently strong, then they enforcedly become like the other fellow, which is an overwhelm.

Now, when you say *home universe* you've asked... Here is a question, what is a *home universe*? Well, it's the universe a thetan made for himself.

And here is the *Rock*. And the Rock was something which we audited for and assessed out – meaning a shape of something which we could then run a process on – and we at that time were running on the theory that it was the first object that the fellow had made on the track. And that's what we were researching for. And when we found that, we could run Help on that in a 5-way bracket, and you can make a very, very stable, fast release with the process. It produced, I don't know, some large percentage of Releases – we called them Clears in those days – of a very high order in one ACC. It doesn't take long to find it and research it, but now that we have actual clearing, there is no point in doing it.

*Religion*: Now, that is something that has had many definitions, but it means basically the search for truth.

DED-DEDEX: The DED-DEDEX sequence. Now, I've forgotten exactly what those two words exactly mean, but it's a deduced something – or – other But what it is, it's a very necessary phrase. It's a very necessary title. And it's almost impossible to get a decent word for it, but it means that the overt-motivator sequence went backwards. So a DED-DEDEX is an overt-motivator sequence that is the wrong way to. So that you hit Joe and – you hit Joe and then he hits you. Well, that's really a DED-DEDEX. In other words, that is the straight line of it.

Now, the actual, original connotation was, although it went this way you had it figured out that he must have hit you first, so you invented something that he did to you to motivate your hitting him. And that's a DED-DEDEX. It's a phony. It's a phony overt-motivator sequence, do you see?

Now, theoretically, a thetan would say, "I was hit in the chops, so I hit him in the chops." Now, that's just totally reactive, you see? And that's a perfectly ordinary, easy – to – understand overt-motivator sequence, see? He ran into you, you ran into him, see? Well, the reason why you ran into him is perfectly well explained – he ran into you.

But how about when *you* are the fellow who did the first running into? Now, you can't say, "He ran into me because I ran into him." That's too honest and makes you wrong. So, therefore, the common human error is when you've run into Joe and then he's run into you, or regardless of whether he ran into you or not, but when you'd committed the first action all out of your own – off your own bat, and so forth, is to invent what he did to you that made you run into him.

And it's sometimes very hard to do. Sometimes you've never met the chap before. And that was a DED-DEDEX. And what it means, actual fact, is the overt act explained. The *ex*, I remember is "explained." It's "the action is explained" – the reason why you did it and so forth. But it's simply explained, and it really doesn't carry in its title enough connotation of "explained phonily."

Now, you'll get more data on this if you look up in the book where it occurs and so on. But that is the original idea: is how did you explain your having hit first without provocation? And that explanation and hitting him is, both in combination, called a DED-DEDEX.

The *somatic mind* was something that was added to the first book by Mr. uh..... I've forgotten the name of the publisher And I remember discussing all this and then I found it in the glossary. So there it is. It's the mind that runs the body, independent of. It would be a physical-coordination switchboard system that ran the human body. In view of the fact we don't really know how the human body runs, we've really got no business declaring a mind we don't know where it exists. Do you see?

So there were diagrams put in about this somatic mind and so forth. You get the idea that I didn't write all that book. Well, actually, I wrote all that book except *its* – *Dianetics: Modern Science of Mental Health* – except its introduction. I wrote the basic introduction, but the real early introduction

that describes the book and says what kind of a book it is, and the wheel and the arch and all that sort of thing, was actually originally written by – the first lines of it were written by Walter Winchell, who was very excited about the subject. And then the rest of it was written by the publisher And then there were some addenda which were written by some other people.

Now, somebody wants to know what *battered all over the universe* means, and it probably is more technical than most of you realize. When you set an individual who is very badly disoriented and dispersed, you can get a type of case that is very dispersed. They don't know whether they're here or in Christmas, see? And when you get them to spot spots in space as to where they are – where they *are*, not where they are not, which is the proper process – but when you get them to point around in space as to where they are, they will point all over the universe. If you run that auditing question on them, they will do that. And it is the reaction of this very dispersed case in response to the question that gives us this colloquialism or this technical term 'tattered all over the universe.' Well, they are. They think they're everywhere. They don't know anyplace. And the last place they look...

Now, the person who tells you – when you exteriorize them or they're exteriorized or something like that – "I'm over there," that's great, you know. They say, "*I am over there.*" Now, how could *I* be over *there*? You see, that's impossible. That person might be, also, battered all over the universe. They think they're everywhere at once.

I don't know how they get this way. I suppose it's leaving anchor points all over the universe and appearing in one anchor point and another anchor point and doing that sort of thing. Anchor point would be something he put out to make space. So that's an old – time process – about 1954, I think it was.

*Tiger Drill:* That's one of the drills which are run and is adequately covered in a bulletin. And it's simply a drill that has to do with the fact that we use the word *tiger* in it to keep from using a reactive word, because I'm sure that nobody has had ever anything to do with tigers.

*Somatic mind* again.

*Computation:* There's supposed to be a comp – well, I – there's another connotation to this in Dianetics and Scientology. There's such a thing as a computing psychotic and a dramatizing psychotic. There are two types of psychosis: a psychotic who, from his reactivity, figure-figures, so his – he's inconstant in his conduct. He's computeive. In other words, he figures it all out. He's got explanations, rat-a-tat-tat-a-tat-tat-a-tat-tat. And his psychosis is derived because these are crazy explanations. And these are all crazy and they have nothing to do with where he is or what he's doing or showing a result or anything else.

And the other type of insanity is dramatizing, so that the individual has one pattern action which is insane. He might do that continuously, but it is just one pattern action. And it's like playing off the same strip of film over and over and over It's like he runs through the same thing. He sits down in the chair, pulls his hair out, gets up, runs over to the window and breaks the glass



and jumps outside and, actually, when he's not doing that particular one, is remarkably sane. Now, that would be a dramatizing. In other words, he goes through a drama.

And a computing psychotic would be one whose variations of the situation are fabulously weird. The reason why you have just spilled tea all over him are... And the only thing wrong with the statement is, you haven't spilled tea, you haven't given him any tea and the subject had nothing to do with tea. And a few minutes later he will figure it all out on some other basis – and that is, he's obsessively solving a problem which does not exist.

As far as *computation* is concerned, it means to figure out. A computation in its purest sense is two times two equals four.

*Arbitrary*: It means something which is introduced into the situation without regard to the data of the situation. It means it is arbitrary. *Arbitrary* means “stand alone,” and I suppose comes from a tree which sits on a hill or something like that, in Skeat's. But it's something which is introduced into the situation without regard to the data of the situation.

You know, you've probably had a nursemaid or somebody in your raising that gave you consistent arbitrary situations, you know? You had drunk your milk and you were ordered to drink your milk. Well, that's the introduction of an arbitrary into the situation because it didn't have anything to do with the data, see? But similarly, somebody says in so many words that such and such is the case, or such and such – it doesn't have to be an order – such and such must be done, or such and such is true. If that's introduced without observation and arbitrarily or without any refutation into a formula, a situation, administrative action or line, will begin to cause a ripple around it. And this ripple has now got to be solved, so somebody else will give an arbitrary solution to the introduced arbitrary.

For instance, if you had a law that two had to be introduced to every mathematical situa – equation, you had to say “times two” arbitrarily by the arithmetic book and what they had told you to do, without any sense and it doesn't have anything to do with the problem, but you're supposed to at this moment add a “times two,” – so you would have a “two times two,” and now you've got to multiply it by two. So that would give you eight equals four. Two times sixteen – but now, of course, by arbitrary, we have to introduce “times two” – two times sixteen equals sixty – four.

Now, if you had an adding machine which had a piece of stuck solder in it, or something like that, that always added five into anything, you'd get four times five equals twenty – five; two times six equals seventeen. When you introduce arbitraries, you get wrong answers. You have to be careful about introducing an arbitrary.

Now, an order which is given which seeks to remedy a situation which may be quite urgent, might also be an arbitrary order. That's our new system of urgent directives, to get around arbitraries, so that any Exec Sec or any member of an Advisory Council, by getting a majority of signatures, can very quickly issue an urgent directive to remedy some kind of a situation. Very

pervasive – it doesn't much matter what it's about, *but* it stays in force only until data can be collected on it.

There are various ways in which you get rid of the urgent directive, but the urgent directive must be gotten rid of. It must be replaced by something which is based on observed fact – just on the off – chance that an arbitrary might be introduced into the situation.

An arbitrary would be an education that the boy never understood. It's arbitrary – he has to be educated. That's a very arbitrary statements by the way. "He has to be educated" – not in what or anything like that or "so he can" or something like that.

*Harmonics*: Harmonics is the fact that the musical scale – and any wavelength action – it means that if you struck the note of vibration one hundred, even though you only struck one hundred, you will also get two hundred and four hundred to some tiny degree. It is very hard to take any scale, particularly a vibrational scale, and not get reverberations up and down by doubles or halves. That's where the word comes from. Actually, in the field of art, it means agreement with. But what we mean by harmonics – it means – in Scientology it's possibly slightly different – it means the upper harmonics or the lower harmonics we use in relationship to well – off cases – upper harmonics and lower harmonics – bad – off cases. And when we say that the thing is a lower harmonic, we mean that it is a lower similarity which is nutty, which is actually based on something like it higher on the scale which isn't.

But it is all the tendency of a wavelength to repeat itself. And insanity: the lower you go in terms of awareness, why, the more weird the repetition is. But in music, if you strike one note in music, why, that note unstruck in the piano which is double and the note unstruck which is half will also both hum. So it means a co – action or similar action, and so on.

So we just take the word *similar*. We say this fellow is going along fine, this fellow is going along fine and he's able to figure out a mathematical table and so forth. Then somehow or another somebody can get a lower harmonic of this ability to figure out the mathematical table, and he doodles. Do you see? It's a similar action, but which would be less aware. So *harmonic* actually applies to the Awareness Scale. I don't mean it to be too arbitrary, because it actually is not much in use and is not very valuable. What you really use in a term like this, you say "a lower – scale mockery." And that expresses it, doesn't it?

So some fellow dresses in a very good way, and a comedian comes out on the stage and dresses overdone with the same characteristics. That would be a lower – scale mockery of a person dressing well. And you very often – the only reason the word is important to you is you very often can be made to feel somewhat foolish in the presence of this sort of thing. You could be made to feel somewhat foolish by having, yourself, some intention and then having a spinner tell you you've got that as an intention. And it makes you kind of think like you're maybe nuts to have this intention, see?

I'll give you an example. One day as a mental exercise, and so on, I was trying to figure out... You see it's necessary when you're running organizations such as ours, and so forth, to

figure out what to do with the locations of organization or future planning or prediction – for instance, of whether or not money exchanges are going to remain the same and so forth. Well, I was trying to figure out what England would do by trying to figure out what she should do, politically, in order to straighten things out, to find out which way this was going to go, so I could predict a curve whether or not to expand the organization, you see, or whether or not to enter dollars into the country or hold them at the border. Do you understand?

So I had been spending some little time sitting there trying to figure out “What should England do now? And what she could do...” And I was going on like this, and I ran into a fellow just outside the door, and he told me he was Disraeli and he was – had been Disraeli and he was going to help England and I had to therefore clear him so that he could save England. See?

Well, now the fact that I had been thinking about what England should do or would do, you see, sort of put me on the same level as this, you know. But made me feel so weird, you know? This guy telling me, you know, “And they should get the Brooklyn Bridge rebuilt,” you know, and... He did have one good idea: to throw Westminster in the Thames. But I had to fix him up “Because England had met her hour of peril and unless he was in the saddle, why, it was all going to go to hell.” I agree – whether he was in the saddle or not, he was right.

But it made me feel very, very peculiar because I had just been having some similar, some similar thoughts – what England should do and what England is doing. Do you get the idea? That was to get some kind of an idea, a framework in which we were operating. Which way is this cat going to jump? You see, it was way back. We weren't sure about how – what recovery measures were going to be taken. And some guy comes along and gives you, a few seconds later, few minutes later, he gives you, gives you all of these solutions about what they should do, except they've got a mad glaring eye and are completely nuts.

And you walk up the street saying to yourself, “Am I nuts?” You see? You've had this happen to you, I'm sure. You felt then that the ideas you had must have been very, very daffy indeed if Joe Blow had them. You're supposed to react this way to a comedian who comes out and mimics your accent, and so forth, in a disdainful or contemptuous way. Lower – scale mockery. Ridicule is all based on lower – scale mockery.

Anyway, there is the – now, I'm going to vary the situation and – vary the situation and try to give you just a few more lectures on this particular lineup, and the people that are here are going to be introduced at the next lecture. I see I was giving them a bad time here – giving Alan a bad time last time about not having all these things written up, and so forth, so he did a beautiful job. Actually, before, probably copied them painstakingly so I could read them. Now he's got them on beautiful cards. So I'll give them to my aide to make sure that we get them at the very next one and bid you this afternoon, a very good afternoon.

Thank you.