

## MIRACLES IN DIANETICS

A lecture given on  
27 December 1951

### A Program for Rapid Dissemination

Today there are a couple of new techniques. I have started nearly every speech that way for many months. Fortunately, the situation is under control—under my control, anyway—and I am going to try to put it under your control.

It is with considerable glee that I can announce to you that the number of hours you will be spending sweating over a hot brain has been markedly decreased. It may be decreased, in the average cases, to as little as ten hours. In some cases it may be decreased, as far as you are concerned, to a little indoctrination before and a few hours of auditing after.

It still takes an auditor, though, for several reasons. One of the best reasons is the innate and cursed impersistence of a human being trying to help himself. But we have even got a solution to that.

We left the first echelon of Dianetics behind us about three or four months ago. I don't know the exact moment, but it came with the identification of the life static in a workable form of definition. That was quite a jump. What you have been watching since is the scramble to catch up with that definition.

It can be proven very easily that we are dealing for the first time in mathematical or physical history with what could be called a true static. That is of great interest perhaps to a mathematician and it is certainly of great interest to a nuclear physicist, but it is of much more interest to you.

The identity of life energy and the identity of thought in the descriptive form, with the phenomena which will demonstrate this descriptive form to be the case—that was quite a jump. It made a big difference in things.

We have traveled, at this moment, clear on through the second echelon, and that was simply the application of this “energy,” when identified, to techniques of application for the rehabilitation of human beings.

The third echelon of this is already knocking at the door. Whether that third echelon is caught up with now or two thousand years from now, I don't know at this moment. But I do know this: We wouldn't have to have another confounded thing from here on beyond what we have.

In addition, we have a package in which this is enclosed: Handbook for Preclears. This package, running in short editions and available to you in the field, will pick up the successive small points which may follow or refine out of this. So we are not going to have a disorderly advance.

We have this thing codified into fifteen acts. Parts of those acts may change. Their general sequence probably will not change.

The new points, the new buttons, the new slots in the chart, or maybe a new column on the chart, can be issued. But an overall basic understanding of this subject will make it possible for you to follow through with any preclear. Just by checking every new issue of the book you will find probably a couple of points changed.

For instance, right now this book lacks two things: one is the “approval” button and the other is the column on the chart, and they are really both the same thing. There are several other little minor improvements that have come out—after all, this book was published over ten days ago!

But the point I am trying to make is that part of my struggle was to achieve a codification of the subject to such a degree that merely by changing some minor part of procedure here and there from time to time, it could be kept up-to-date. That means that one of the goals announced in the earliest publications on Dianetics has been achieved: a rendition of technique on a level of simplicity—very easy to understand—and a marked reduction (by about eighty thousand percent) of the amount of time an auditor has to spend on a case.

So, an auditor is actually able to stand by on a case with a minimum of indoctrination and handle, through this book, a very large number of preclears. And an auditor is supplied with some randomness. He is talking to Susie Glutz and Jones and Bill and so forth, and he can generally talk to them on the other end of a telephone or he can give them fifteen minutes in his office and he can straighten this and that out for them. And there are various ways that he can get his money for having done so, if it continues to be the case that auditors have to eat.

We also have something, then, which cuts down restimulation for the auditor. Sometimes an auditor who does a lot of auditing is something like a horse on a treadmill. He gets up the last couple of sessions with the last preclear he had, and he is just barely keeping ahead of himself. His own case does not have a chance to proceed. But if you don’t have to step in there very much, listening to lots of phrases and situations and sob stories and that sort of thing, your own case can get up on top and stay up on top, particularly since you can resolve a case fast enough now so that it doesn’t have a chance to slump.

You could, for instance, tell Mr. Doakes that if he would just go up to a summer resort—Leaky Boat Lake or something—and apply himself for a few days to this book, he could come back and the little wife probably wouldn’t bother him anymore. You can, in other words, do an environmental separation on a relatively short-time basis, according to what I have found, and be able to achieve results with your preclear instead of crawling uphill one inch and having the family throw him back five inches. That still takes a little arranging.

I have been looking for a long time for the magic button—the very, very magic button. I came up with twelve buttons.

Effort Processing, Emotional Processing and Thought Processing are evidently the three areas of action that the auditor must address. There evidently are no more, unless somebody stands up and swoops down from Valhalla or somebody brings in a new technique whereby you strike two sparks off the left-hand sword and the preclear grows nine feet tall. But it would be just about as miraculous as that.

An auditor can take this book and hand it to his preclear; he can even run a little evening schoolwork for his preclears. They can come in a couple of times a week or something like that, or he can have several classes. People can come in and study what they are supposed to do or catch up on indoctrination in it, or he can just turn it loose and trust to luck and try to instruct them little by little here and there.

There is a book simpler than this which is going to be written. This book is for the boys who can read and write without moving their lips and everything. The simpler one will be an effort to put these same techniques within the comprehension of an eight- or nine-year-old child. That is going to be quite a little trick; and I imagine you will probably be using it on the bulk of your preclears, so I will try to keep from making examples about little turtles and cute things in it.

But we have in this book fifteen acts. It coordinates with the book Advanced Procedure and Axioms. This is more up-to-date. Advanced Procedure was written some weeks before this book was.

Now, it has been a considerable struggle with you who have been out in the field. With all of the new techniques, we have had to surmount the barrier of how to relay them to you. How could we get them to you? How could we be absolutely sure that you were going to be able to handle these things at the other end of the line? We have found by experience that it is pretty difficult to take a procedure as complex as Effort Processing and put it down in a book or in a few pages and send it to somebody and have him understand the whole thing. Therefore we have a basic technique.

The text on Advanced Procedure is the best one available at this moment. It will be some little time before another text on Advanced Procedure comes out.

A few hours of Effort Processing is worth running a thousand engrams out of a case. It is quite remarkable, since it exhausts the basic action difficulty with a case.

So, I want you to know—and know you know—Effort Processing, Emotional Processing and Thought Processing as delineated. Then, as new techniques develop they can be written up as addenda and special sheets sent you to bring your own books up-to-date, or the books can be changed for each new issue with short issues and an instruction line can be written up to send to you on any small alteration which has taken place.

It would rather astonish you that the general line of operation has now made, really, a complete circle. We are back at 1938 on the word survive. We find out, on my investigation, that there is quite a bit more to be learned about this word survive. There is a tremendous amount to be learned. We are actually taking off from there again, but now we have a bridge built and we have a tremendous amount of phenomena. There are over two hundred new phenomena concerning the human mind which have been uncovered in Dianetics in the short time of twenty years, and that is probably more phenomena than has ever before been uncovered about the human mind in any period.

It all came up on finding one button. The second I found that one “survive” button, the rest of this stuff started to unwind so fast, it was as though it were in a deep vat someplace with a spring cover on it, and the second that I released the safety catch it exploded. It has been there waiting for a long time. If I did anything, it was just to say “Well, that must be the button,” and spring the catch. Out of all of this has proceeded a technique which now is actively capable of producing miracles almost at will.

This, so far, is very general. I will be much more specific about these things later on.

Now, we have had one level we were going out on which was wrong. We can help every case when we get them into communication and so on. We can help every case and we know that. But this is an Achilles’ heel. It is an Achilles’ heel because it denies the auditor the cooperation of the preclear to some degree. The preclear thinks, “Well, if you can do this for me, then I don’t have to work.”

You can even go to the extent now of saying “In most cases this works. In most cases like yours it works. Of course, some intelligence and some persistence is required on the part of the preclear, and then in most cases it works.”

Come off this it-helps-everybody stuff. It hasn’t done us any good from the beginning. Let’s not go back and “fall for the same woman” again. There is no point in it.

The actuality is that the general intelligence of the individual in the world was grossly overestimated—and I mean grossly. Those characters on the radio that write radio scripts and say “Well, we have to aim these at a twelve-year-old intelligence” are probably doing the same thing. Let’s try to shoot Dianetics at two years of age—people who just barely can talk—and I am afraid we will hit the average public level. I notice a lot of people don’t listen to the radio; it is too complicated for them. That is why we have to have a simplified book and so forth.

But in the main, these tenets produce entirely new lines and a plan of advance for Dianetics into the society with a lot less trouble and, I hope, a great deal more effectiveness.

Now, one of these lines is the miracle. What is a miracle? You take a miracle apart and you will find out that a miracle is something which people consider hasn't been done—it is out of the ordinary. But it is more than that. A miracle is “from can't to can.” And if you specialize on only “can't to can” you are all set. By that I mean black and white: he can't see, he can see; he can't walk, he can walk; he can't get out of bed, now he walks; he can't hear, he can hear—black and white, black and white.

And don't try it on any 100 percent. If the fellow is giving you trouble after you have spent ten, twelve, fifteen hours of your time on him, get another one—because you will succeed in saving the fellow only if you desert his case early enough to permit you to go next door or down the block or someplace else and perform a miracle. Then the boy you were having trouble with, of course, recovers.

If you go ahead and slug, slug, slug on the idea that it has got to help every case, you will have everybody walking up to you not only with his jaw out but with you addressed to that postulate. And you won't give up on a case. In other words, you are kept down the tone scale with regard to your preclears. That postulate keeps you down there.

You can take them up on a basis like “Well, we help as many as we can. It helps most—helps quite a few. Oh, work on you? I don't know. I'm working on quite a few cases these days. Well, sure, sure. Well, if you're willing to work hard on it, all right. Here's the book. Good-bye. Call me up on Tuesday.” If he doesn't recover, you say, “Well, so what?”

We took in ten cases of arthritis the first of December—volunteer cases. Two of them dropped out almost immediately. One of them looked at the auditor and found the auditor had dirty fingernails or something of the sort and said, “Well, I don't want to go back to that place,” and the other one just disappeared. (I don't think that Postulate Processing or Effort Processing was used to make the preclear disappear; I think she is actually in existence someplace. )

But seven showed very, very marked improvement; one of them didn't show very much. This was according to the report I had on the tenth of December. I don't know what has happened to these people since. They had had ten days in which they had been in the Foundation, each one of them two or three days or something like that.

One of the eight, however, was an almost instantaneous remission. The girl couldn't walk up and down stairs. Her doctor came down to the Foundation and took a look at this girl. She went up the stairs to the lecture hall like a gazelle (I wondered who the stunned-looking individual was, sitting in the back row) and after the lecture she went down the stairs like a gazelle. I think they gave the doctor oxygen or something; they brought him around. This was a nearly instantaneous remission.

The percentage—including those others who left—on this series of cases was 10 percent. How much work on the part of the auditor? I would say, roughly, probably four, five, maybe six hours. No other work was done—no book, nothing like that. That is very interesting.

On that line you say, “Well, 10 percent of the cases of arthritis—most of these 10 percent could probably be helped.” Then you turn out a miracle: “can't to can.”

Maybe three or four more of the rest of those cases have come through— maybe they have, maybe they haven't.

We are going to try to set up a long series of blind cases, and we might take 10 percent of them and do something for their sight—ten out of a hundred, maybe.

One miracle sight recovery is front-page news in America.

We say, “Well, we do it quite a bit of the time. Help you? Well, I don’t know if we have time, but if you want to work hard . . .”

A little girl came down here from Indiana; she was bedridden, paralyzed from the waist down and so forth. She got nine hours of Effort Processing and nothing but Effort Processing. She is showing quite marked improvement. Her case was cracked.

I don’t know whether this little girl is actually walking yet or not, but I know she is standing. That was the last report I had, several weeks ago. It takes a little while for a number of years of paralysis to go by the boards. Rehabilitation on that might be slow.

But the main point is there are polio cases amongst children, which are badly crippled and in bed. You can go around as an auditor (it doesn’t matter much whether you use just straight Effort Processing or process it on thought or something of the sort) and persuade somebody to sit there and read the child the questions and so on. You just make somebody work with the child for a while. You could actually go around and spot whatever children were in bed from polio in your neighborhood, and even put a little ad in the paper: “Request for volunteers to read to polio cases.” You would get lots of them. You could then pick out some of these people that don’t look to be in too bad a shape and turn a copy of Handbook for Preclears over to them and have them read it to the children and keep in touch with you as the auditor.

Maybe two of these children in your whole area—New York City—are walking at the end of a month. That is a pretty good percentage! I wouldn’t worry about it. The chances are, maybe 40 or 50 percent of them will be, eventually. The joker is that if you kept at it and if these other children found out that 2 percent or 8 percent or 10 percent were walking, they would start to walk too, so you would eventually get 100 percent. But you don’t get 100 percent in any way, shape or form by telling people you will get 100 percent.

Say, “Well, it does some very interesting things.” Don’t try to give anybody much of a sales talk on it. “It just does some interesting things. On a large number of cases like yours, it helps out.”

Now, if you would go out into the field with this book and a knowledge of Effort Processing and grab yourself ten assorted cases of the “can’t to can” variety and produce a miracle in the community, we would probably be having to hire the Royal Light Horse Infantry to keep people off the backs of our necks. You know that. This circumvents newspapers and the purchase money for news stories. This circumvents directives, if any, from the AMA. This circumvents all these interesting letters that we keep getting from all over the field where some psychiatrist has just spread some entheta about me. It circumvents all of the entheta lines.

Let’s audit old Mr. Jones. He has been sitting on the porch in a wheelchair for many a day now, and people come home from work and see him sitting on the porch in his wheelchair and they know him. They think it is a nice thing to know somebody who is ill like that and to be nice to him (be good and sympathetic and keep him real sick!).

They say, “Well, how are you this evening, Mr. Jones?”

“Well, gettin’ along pretty bad. Arthritis is pretty bad, you know.”

One day they walk home from work and there is Mr. Jones sweeping off the front porch. “What happened to you?”

“Oh, some feller came around here; he said he was an auditor or an editor or somethin’, and I read me a book and I’m well!”

Right away the community tries not to believe in Mr. Jones. But they won't be able to disbelieve him because just disbelieving in somebody doesn't make him disappear. So you can see this would be an interesting line of advance.

We had a blind man over at the Foundation, and the auditor wanted to turn on the fellow's sight. He charged into the case like the light horse brigade and ran the preclear right straight to the incident and the fellow all of a sudden said, "If I run this I'll see again!" And he came up to present time.

It is all right that the auditor didn't turn that fellow's sight on. So what? There are lots of blind men. We aren't going to run out of fodder.

That is a very valuable lesson. It says that when you are turning on sight like that you had certainly better run sympathy, approval and regret—approval for being blind, approval from the person he is carrying the blindness for and regret for what he had done. And the way you get up a grief charge (we can add this as an admonition, having noticed it before with running sympathy, blame and regret) is just to run it until it blows, until a submarine compartment door couldn't keep it back.

Don't pay any attention to the fact that the preclear is going to cry. He looks like he is going to cry—don't get interested in the fact that he is going to cry. Don't get all quivery and say "Oh, boy! Here I get that secondary!" No, just insist he run some more sympathy and some more regret and some more desire for approval and so on, and the next thing you know, the case bears all the signs of Vesuvius about to erupt. You keep on processing the incidental stuff and all of a sudden the case goes bang in your face or suddenly the incident just keys out.

In other words, these techniques are insidious in that they can go in from the bottom of the case and blow it apart without your having to be very challenging about it. Therefore let us take a lesson from these techniques themselves and go at the promulgation and dissemination of Dianetics more or less in the same way. Let's be very insidious.

It would be very interesting if a community suddenly found several sight recoveries on its hands, three or four polio cases snapped to, or four or five arthritis cases recovered. Wouldn't that be interesting? What would people do?

I will tell you one of the things they would do: They would say, "What is the matter with these newspapers that they don't carry stories on this stuff? That's interesting!"

Another thing they would say to themselves is "We have wronged Dianetics."

You are going to develop, if you do that, a national emotional curve on Dianetics—sympathy and contribution. Everybody who has been very mean to it suddenly runs into the bright and smiling face of some little child that is walking who didn't before. This person is going to say, "Was I wrong!" He will come right down to about 1.0 on the tone scale—contribution, sympathy and so forth. Just after we do this, don't let the sympathy kill you!

But you see how this might be possible.

We made another mistake: We have been willing to apply this to everything it would help. A sixteen-inch gun will kill rabbits—it will. We have been killing too many rabbits.

If you use this gun on its proper game, you are going to have remarkable regeneration. As a matter of fact, Dianetics, whether you realize it or not, is undergoing a very active regeneration throughout the country. Any time I can climb on an airplane and have the fellow sitting next to me tell me that he spent all last night talking about some subject called "dynamics" or something of the sort, I know something is going on.

I said, "Was it Dianetics?"

And he said, “Yes!” and he told me all about this and about various things, and he told me “This guy Hubbard, evidently, is a terror!” or something of the sort. He told me all about it.

I broke out my typewriter (I got tired of listening to him after a while; he had a layman’s opinion on the subject) to catch up a little bit on some work. I ran a piece of stationery into the thing and it said “Hubbard Dianetic Foundation” across the top.

He got interested. “Say,” he said, “what kind of a—do you know this fellow Hubbard?”

And I said, “Yes.”

“Well, I know a fellow who knows a girl who used to be Hubbard’s secretary....”

We went on and after a while I reached the signature on the letter. This fellow got a bit upset and confused.

The point is that there is evidently a cycle through which a subject has to go. For instance, it was years before relativity was accepted. Einstein was called every dirty name you could think of, for a while. (I am not comparing myself to him—he produced an atom bomb.) They were awfully mean to him and then the whole field of mathematics went into propitiation with regard to him.

Until about 1932 there were twelve men in the United States who were regarded with some awe—who regarded themselves with some awe—because they understood something about Einstein. It was propitiation, more or less, because I tried to talk to one of these boys once. I wanted to run an article in the college newspaper with regard to Einstein’s theory of relativity as discussed by a certain professor who was one of the twelve men in the United States who knew something about the theory of relativity. He became very angry at the idea that anybody else could know something about the theory of relativity; that anybody could communicate it through a newspaper or say anything about it in any way was very upsetting to him. But he spoke with such sympathy about the whole thing that today, knowing some of these mechanisms, I wonder if he wasn’t among the toughest doubters at the first issuance of that theory.

Some people have been awfully mean to us. Now let’s knock them down the emotional curve. The way you do it is to define a miracle and then turn them out, because you can turn out a certain percentage of miracles. The lame aren’t good enough—you want somebody who can’t walk. The blind are fine, but don’t get people blind in just one eye; you want a seeing-eye-dog type of blindness. And if you follow out that line of advance you will then, as a third-, fifth- or tenth-echelon reaction, help all the others.

The hard way to do it is try to help everybody. The hard way to do it is try to hit every case. The tough way to go about it is try to make people happier and more successful. It is not “can’t to can,” that’s all. I mean, it just isn’t that direct division. So there are people who are happier: there are a lot of people in this world who don’t want people any happier. But the public as a whole is educated into believing that a miracle is a desirable and a strange thing. We can turn them out. Let’s turn them out.

Now, the first time you turn out a miracle you will probably go into it rather doubtfully in spite of the fact it says in the book you must be inexorable in your approach. If you realize that some small percentage of these cases will snap to on a minimal address to the case, you won’t be straining at it and trying to hang yourself up—your whole proposition and your whole life—on whether or not this one person who can’t see sees again, because he is a part of the whole pattern of all blind people.

Let’s take it mathematically: All the blind of the world exist as a set. They exist as individuals and each one is valuable as an individual, but the problem is to take apart this set of blind

people. You take apart this puzzle of blind people. You understand that? You don't do it by taking every blind man, one after the other as they come up the line, and hanging yourself up with the solution of his case. That is not the way you do it, any more than you can make a nation sane by processing every individual in it to sanity. It takes too long. So consider blindness as a set, a puzzle, and figure out how to solve the whole puzzle. And the way you solve the whole puzzle is to just pass through a case without promising the case very much.

Say, "Well, in a certain number of cases it happens. If the person works hard, if he cooperates with the auditor, it'll happen. It doesn't require any faith and belief, particularly; we don't care about that. But if the fellow works hard and is cooperative, why, we can do something for him."

Then just start down your cases and don't spend very much time on any one of them. All of a sudden, bang!—you will get one there, one there and one there. They were all ready to blow anyhow. Someone could have come along with last week's techniques and blown them. Undoubtedly, by the way—and all kidding aside—they probably would have blown with last year's techniques. They were all ready to go.

All of a sudden it starts word of mouth all over: "Dianetics is turning on people's sight." Everybody who is blind, who really wants some help and objects to being blind and isn't basing—all the approval of his life upon being blind, will be on the other end of a telephone, as far as you are concerned. His case will blow that much easier. But if his case doesn't blow, you say, "Oh, well, give it a little time; try it again. It works in most of the cases. It isn't a failure in your case, it's just—probably you just didn't work hard enough." Make him cause of his own sight recovery, and keep going.

Take the little children who are sick in bed and handle it the same way.

But you can become very emotionally involved with one individual and say "I'm going to make this guy," not "I'm going to make blind men," but "I'm going to make this guy see again." And you have just cut yourself down that much. When you get through with that case and you have suddenly discovered that you didn't get very far with the case—that he is merely happier or something of the sort and his sight did not recover—don't you then go into a failure cycle. A failure cycle is nothing to be afraid of and in this case it is completely stupid. Why should you go into a failure cycle because you failed to turn on the eyesight of a man? It has been two thousand years since there have been any of these real routine miracles!

Let's set up shop and undo three specific problems. I know you have a lot of preclears that are hanging on your skirts and so forth. Give them the book and tell them to give you a call, and you go to work on blindness, arthritis "can'ts" and children in bed with the aftereffects of polio. Just work on those categories. Don't take children that have been all chewed up by surgery. You can make them better off but they are not spectacular.

You can establish, then, the fact that Dianetics can turn on miracles. And if it can turn on miracles, the miracles exist and you haven't bothered to publicize them. You don't worry about publicizing; they will make their own publicity. The next thing you know, the cases that you wouldn't have been able to crack—merely because the fellow was saying "Oh, I've got to have this," or something of the sort—will start cracking. You will have tackled three problems simultaneously.

Dear old Franklin D. Roosevelt built up a tremendous national sympathy complex on the aftereffects of polio. Actually if the truth be known, numerically, polio is not even serious compared to tuberculosis, heart trouble and any number of other illnesses, because there are not very many of these cases.

If you wanted to help the set called "all children," you would be going in on the basis of straightening out their poor, befuddled little heads on the subject of "Should I obey?" or "Am I myself?" or "Where am I going?" or "What's my name?" and setting them up so that the strong

ones in the society would become strong. That would be the efficient way to take care of the set of children. But we are already taking care of the set called children if we suddenly start getting polio kids on their feet. If we can get a few polio cases on their feet, then somebody is going to pay some attention to Dianetics as far as children are concerned.

And you will have not only resolved the bulk of the cases of polio aftereffects (and believe me, there are plenty of those that are walking; they are around, though they are very unhappy about it) just by specializing in the miracle side of this, but you also will resolve the whole set of children.

“If it does this much for polio... they say it does something in education. I’m having trouble with little Johnny—he tore all the wallpaper off the wall day before yesterday. I’ll take Johnny down to see that man.”

They bring Johnny down to see that man. You say, “Hello, Johnny. How are you? Would you wait outside?” And you turn around and say, “Well, now, let’s find out what’s wrong with you, madam.”

A tremendous hurdle has been overcome, a tremendous hurdle. It would have taken tens of thousands or hundreds of thousands of auditors to have carried the ball.

We need more auditors. We haven’t got anywhere near enough. But by golly, for the first time, this handful of us can knock an impact into the society that will be too rough for the society to try to throw anything back on. Anybody trying to stop Dianetics from expanding on a miracle line would have an interesting time of it. They would have to go around and see all the neighbors of every person who had had a miracle recovery and say, “Now, you know this isn’t true. Mr. Jones doesn’t exist.” That can’t be done, can it?

I am not saying that everybody is against Dianetics. That is a very paranoid reaction and it doesn’t happen to be true. One girl went up to the hospital the other day to get herself a shot of penicillin. The doctor asked her name, occupation and so forth, so she gave it and it immediately connected her with Dianetics. He said, “You know, that’s an interesting thing. I’ve been keeping an eye on that. We’ve had a lot of fights up here in the staff meetings at the hospital. Several of us have come to the conclusion there must be definitely something in it.”

If people attack something hard enough, there is almost always an automatic response in another part of the people to defend it.

For instance, my family—maybe forty or fifty people—are scattered all over the United States. There are aunts and uncles and all of this sort of thing besides my parents—a lot of people. I was the baby of the family—I always was—and when I first came out with Dianetics they were very tolerant: “Well, that’s interesting, Ronald. Very interesting, Ronald.” Since the newspaper publicity has hit, these people are pulling 100 percent for me with no further information.

I don’t know what percentage of the society is for an underdog, but there is that reaction and we can take advantage of it.

So, the method of dissemination of Dianetics—how we go about the handling of this book in relation to preclears—is also the question of how we get preclears, and for those of us who are still low enough on the tone scale to have to eat, how we get money for processing. There are three possible answers; actually there are many more, possibly and probably, but there are three which have come up which make it rather easy to do this. I want to tell you about these three methods and I want you to think them over, and I definitely want your opinion with regard to them.

You people from the field have been out there fighting the battle, not in the front-line trench—that is the Foundation—but way out in those lonely bastions which are way off on the horizon, and in the observation posts and so forth that are, many of them, far behind the enemy lines.

So, we have, then, a certain amount of advance to talk to you about. And I have some very definite additions to give you with regard to Dianetics in general, and I want some very definite opinions from you.

One of the things that is going to monitor this book is your reaction in the field, which you will collect from your preclears. When you find that you are constantly explaining one point—not your opinion of it, but when you explain one point over and over and over again and you say, “I’ve explained this for the last time!”—you put that on a good, standard, brief report back to the Foundation: “I have explained this point about Dianetics too many times.” You say what the point is, give what your general explanation is that has been found acceptable on that and shoot it in. This way we will be able to keep the book highly informative for your preclears.

Don’t expect this book to be perfect. It was tested on written sheets—handwritten, some of them—to individuals. It needs a very thorough mauling. But oddly enough I have already seen this book, as it is, turn off one chronic somatic—sinusitis—by the time the person reached the end of the Second Act.

Another case I just heard about had lost another somatic, and had evidently gotten along beautifully. This person knew nothing about Dianetics; he had read the book up to about Act Three and suddenly snapped to.

Since the book has been issued, a few copies of it have been handed out in various places. I have seen one person to whom this book was given and for whom I knew former techniques and processes didn’t do anything, and this person is way up the tone scale.

In other words, the printed copy is living up to the expectations contained in the handwritten copy. That does not say—and I am not trying to sell you the idea—that this book is perfection. But I am giving you the idea that it can be handed out just as it is to your preclears and it will work just as it is.

As the book works better for your preclears, it will require from you less work. And that is the ratio we are adjusting. We are adjusting how much time—time being money when you are investing in lots of cases—you as an auditor have to invest in the case. And right now it balances out; the equation is balanced. You as the auditor with what you know, together with this book in the hands of the preclear, make one hundred. What you know of Advanced Procedure, and this book in the hands of the preclear, with you working as an auditor on the preclear, is one hundred.

What we are trying to do from here on out is save minutes or hours of your time as an auditor by improving the book. We can then run up the number of cases which you as an individual can handle. Maybe with this book, at the beginning, you might only be able to handle five or ten cases, depending on your own speed of operation. We will build it up to a lot more.

When you will have to be in a much higher level of operation depends exclusively upon how long it takes us to produce the number of miracles necessary to put the society at 1.0 with regard to Dianetics. I would say five or ten such cases to a town would adequately do it. Twenty miracles in one area—say, Wichita—might suffice for the whole nation, also, because word of mouth is very peculiar; it runs fast.

Newspapers love to tell you they are necessary to the community life. They do have some value—they carry classified ads and help you keep lost your lost wallet. They whet your appetite for various types of automobiles and so forth. They give you an instantaneous sort of a thing. But I have never received a major piece of news from a newspaper. I have yet to receive a major piece of news from a newspaper. Somebody has always stopped me and told me.

I walked out of a little cigar store on Eighth Avenue in New York and a bum was standing there; he had just had access to a radio and he stopped me and said, “Pearl Harbor is being

bombed!” I imagine that the number of people who were at radios at that moment was not too many, but the amount of news which suddenly spread from those radios by word of mouth was tremendous.

People have calculated it takes twenty-four hours for a joke to get from New York to San Francisco. Some argue with them and say it takes thirty-six. But the rate of travel on hot news or hot interest is very fast.

So we are not going to worry about the newspapers.

I think I have given you a quick brace on what we can expect.

I expect something else to happen. Each individual one of you, ever since you came into Dianetics, has wanted to see your own case snap to. Let them snap, because they will snap now. I know they will.