MOTION AND EMOTION

A lecture given on
16 August 1951

How One Acquires His Chronic Tone

This subject happens to fit in to Human Evaluation very solidly. I am afraid that what the human race knows about emotion it has very badly mixed up with motion. That is because the two of them are tied together almost inseparably and one stems from the other.

Motion is, of course, something or other in space measured against time. That is really the definition of motion. You can't have motion unless you have space and time; motion depends on space and time. If you just had space and didn't have time, you would have the same condition that Einstein claims would happen if you drove a spaceship up to 186,000 miles a second, the speed of light: it would stop and freeze there to the end of time. It is interesting to even try to envisage anything without time passage.

The physical universe happens to be made up, at least as far as a physicist knows, of the three quantities of energy, space and time. And the energy, moving in space and time, combines in fields of energy which create matter. It is not a very complex thing, but actually there is no such thing as either energy or matter any more than there is such a thing as space or time. If you took all the matter in the universe and reduced it down to a complete condensation, you wouldn't have enough matter to fit on the head of a pin, because all it is, is motion. Matter is actually a vibration.

Theoretically, the new pursuit plane they are going to build in 1988 will create standing waves which would wipe out Wichita, not just scare it to death. The point I am making is that a sound wave, for instance, is the motion of particles, and these particles could move at such a vibration that they would finally create a standing wave or a near standing wave which would be solid, although it wouldn't be solid air, it would be just a solid wave. If you ran into it, it would be like hitting a brick wall.

Now, electrons are supposed to be particles of energy. That is very interesting, but all an electron is, evidently, is an unthinkably intense motion. It is so intense that it makes a little localized standing wave.

Nuclear physics shifts its tenets quite regularly and decides that anything that was thought in the past period is now out of date and that they are going to have to go on to something new. It is one of these rapidly changing fields. But that one thing—matter, energy, space and time—they don't change. That is basic.

But they don't know what time is. What a tremendous discovery it would be if somebody suddenly discovered what time really was! I can't even begin to give you a definition of time, but I can give you a description which will impress upon you the fact that time exists. That is the fact of motion. Motion takes place in space but it is plotted against time. If there were no time involved, no motion could take place.

In auditing, for instance, where you have somebody stuck on the time track, one of the major reasons he can't get sonic is the fact that he can't get sufficient motion on the track to let the sound reel off.

Now, in the matter of action in space, you have to have space to have the action, you have to have time to have the action, you have to have motion to have the action. Without time and space, you certainly wouldn't have energy. You could conceive of energy without time and space easier than you could conceive of space without time. But when you start to conceive of energy you have an idea perhaps that an object exists as a solid object, which is not so. An

object is a series of unthinkably rapid motions taking place which makes a solidification of nothing. There are these terrific motions.

What I am trying to show you is that the basic phenomenon of the universe is motion. Actually, there isn't anything else. You can derive space and time in terms of motion, and so on.

So you actually have, with time, space, matter and energy, the four facets of this phenomenon. If there is too much motion, inevitably there will be matter, which is an energy. Motion has to be intensified to a point where it is matter, really, before it becomes actionable enough to exert the motion.

How do you tell that there is some energy there? You tell it in terms of motion. You say, "Electricity? That's easy! It's . . . well, you can read it on the ammeter, on the dial." And what are you reading on that ammeter? You are reading a magnetic-field pulse, and that keeps the needle over. You are reading the motion of something along a wire, and this brings about this magnetic field, and so you have a motion. That is the energy, and that motion is the manifestation with which it is measured.

Now, it is all very well to condense everything down to a lowest common denominator, but sometimes after you have done that, it all disappears, so I had better stop. If anybody really cracked this problem, probably the universe would disappear! Or maybe after he had the formula written, or something of the sort, he could just wave his hand and a new universe would appear. This is that terrifically fundamental.

The physicists who are cracking atoms and getting atomic fission are bringing an energy up to an instability of motion. They get an energy—which is actually a terrific vibration—vibrating, and it can vibrate in the physical universe at a certain rate; then another energy of the same kind can vibrate at this rate till you bring them together. The only reason you get atomic fission with plutonium is the fact that too much plutonium mixed together becomes unstable and disintegrates into its basic motion. That basic motion can wipe out a town most beautifully. It has terrific power.

That reminds me, by the way, of a story about the men out at Los Alamosl and up at M.I.T., who were very upset about the atom bomb. I don't know how they could have believed this, but they were told by the government, "Now, we are not going to use this bomb on anybody. We are going to ask representatives of the foreign governments to come over and observe the explosion of this bomb." The government is always coming up with these fantastic statements and schemes to get people to do things.

They told these boys that they weren't going to use this atom bomb. They were going to bring people from these other governments down to the desert in New Mexico, and they were going to touch a button and explode an atom bomb and then say, "Now, you see? You had better stop the war because this can wipe out your whole country." The boys at M.I.T., being scientists and therefore not too bright in human relations, said all right, and they went along with it. And then the first thing the men at these various development projects knew about the atom bomb was Hiroshima.

They were quite upset about the whole thing. So they said, "Let's have a big banquet and have all the politicians from Washington there, and we will feed them on plutonium tableware and serve them on plutonium plates and so on. And we'll talk to them about it and say, 'Now, are you going to fix up this atomic-bomb situation so that atomic fission will hereafter be used only for the benefit of man?' " And if the politicians didn't agree with them they were going to stack the plates.

Anyway, this shows that there can be intensities of motion.

Now, man is aware of nothing so soon as he is aware of motion. Motion comes in through the senses very easily. That is what a person detects with the senses; he detects motion and that is

all he detects. But a sharp, fast motion of an object where he can sense it, or a sound which seems to denote the motion of an object, will alert him, will alarm him. If a fellow is standing someplace and doesn't suspect anything is around, and all of a sudden he sees a motion of an object, he will turn toward it. If a sound suddenly occurs, he will turn toward it.

The concentration on the physical universe is a concentration by the awareness of awareness of the individual upon sources of motion, and if an unusual or unexpected motion takes place, it will occasion the impulse of a sense message which will attract his attention so he will be able to preserve the organism and move out of the way of the hostile motion. We are in a conflict and combat of motions. Motion is very important to us.

One of the symptoms of a severely aberrated person is the fact that when he is returned when he is trying to see something which he has seen before or recall a scene, he recalls it either by not seeing anything or in terms of still pictures. He gets still pictures; he does not see those pictures move. He is stuck on the track or other things have happened. In other words, there is something wrong with this fellow's motion. And seeing something wrong with his motion, just in that sphere, you know that many things are wrong with the many motions of which he is composed, because he is actually merely a composite of motions. If the awareness of awareness—that is, the "I" of the individual—is unable or has conceived itself to be unable to control the majority of motions in its immediate vicinity, then it is aberrated. That is the basic definition of aberration.

The control of self, the control of the motions of self, the control of the motions of things—particularly dangerous things—in the environment and the control of the motions of things which are prosurvival in the environment all add up to sanity. A person is then able to predict his survival. How is it, then, that the awareness of awareness of the mind suddenly conceives itself unable to do this? And what would this have to do with an individual's value to an industry, to his fellow man, to himself?

The basic aberration is inability to control motion. Practically nobody controls motion to 100 percent of his capabilities. We don't have to think in terms of vast and complex machines to see how this fits into industry. You take a janitor with a broom and send him down the aisle sweeping. You don't have to have a person who can control the superultimate complexity of motion to have that janitor, but you would be surprised how many accidents he has if he is low on the tone scale. He will shove the handle of the broom through this and that and he will knock a template off here and there, and he just goes through the place. But if he is a very low-tone-scale individual, if you were to take all the objects which he had broken, bent or displaced during a year and strew them up the aisle so that you could see all this happenstance at one instant, it would look like the Battle of Gettysburg. He is not only unable to control his own motion with coordination but he conceives almost all other motions in his vicinity to have some ingredient of hostility. He is possibly up to the point where he can only express his hostility, not to objects which are capable of motion, but to objects which are inanimate. If the thing is completely dead he can attack it. So he will break things—objects.

Worse than this is the poor personnel director and the poor foreman over a series of very complex machines who pick up a man who doesn't have motion visio. This person will have motion all around him. There is a big machine running and this machine is in motion, but the view he is getting of the machine demonstrates it to be stopped. That is a fact. He knows this machine is running, he can perceive that this machine is running, he works with this machine continually, but it is too dangerous to see a motion. So he gets a sort of a stroboscope effect. He knows where all the wheels are and he knows the wheels are moving and he thinks he sees the wheels moving. He knows that an arm comes out and cuts off the piece of steel in front of him and the ruddy rods comes over to one side and another thing goes to the other side and something else comes down somewhere else, and the hole is punched with this other thing—he knows all these things are taking place. But unless the workman who runs that machine has a very able concept of motion, sooner or later he will discoordinate because he actually isn't observing motion. He may not do it for a year, but he will either wreck the machine, have an accident himself or permit some portion of this machine to maladjust and hurt somebody else.

Now, if you get a person pretty low on the tone scale and you put him on that machine, you can just kiss that machine goodbye. It doesn't matter what it cost; that machine is going to go to wrack and ruin simply because it is a dangerous object if it is moving.

You might take this individual off a rapid-moving machine and give him something where he turns a wheel which pushes a die down through to make an impression, and then he releases the wheel, the piece comes off and he takes out a sheet, and he does all this manually. In other words, he could work on a machine on which he could exert his own full and complete control and which was not otherwise motivated. He could work on a machine for which he himself furnished the motion. He can be compatible with an inanimate machine because it is not dangerous enough to kick back against him. He can handle it and he won't get disturbed. But a machine which is running by another power plant, which is running with a motor, requires an individual who gets along very well with his fellow man. This machine is to that sense alive in that it has motion, and it does a certain amount of self-determined action. That is, the machine does certain motions.

Another human being is another object which is capable of selfdetermined motion. Just as a very good jackleg test, if you want to know whether or not somebody is going to be able to handle a nice, big, complicated machine that runs on its own electric motors or its own gas engine or something like that, get someone who is fairly good to have as a friend and he will take fine care of that machine. He will get along with that machine, because that machine has to be cooperated with. That machine can't be controlled completely; it has a mind of its own to the degree that the levers come out and the ruddy rods go here and the things bounce and so forth.

Now, because people are far from optimum in this society (when I say optimum, I mean something which is very high; that isn't a dirty crack), manufacturers of machines build on experience, and they keep trying to make machines more and more self-determined so that the operator has to do less and less to them. What they are trying to achieve in the ultimate is a man they won't have to hire and a machine that will do something very complicated and which nobody will have to think for. Then they know they can find one man who can take care of ten of these machines. They may be trying to cut down on their payroll and plant overhead, but actually they are perfectly confident that they will be able to get one man for ten machines. They are confident, just by experience, that they can find one man who evidently, by some mysterious factor or other, can walk down the aisle and all these machines will keep on running. But they rather despair of these machines in a less self-determined line if they require five men apiece. Where are they going to get that many men who can do this job?

They don't quite know what they are saying when they say "who can do this job." A lot of people could actually do the job, but how many people can accomplish the goal of the job? Accomplishment of the goal in a cooperative level with the machinery and with their fellow human beings around the plant is more than just having a smooth-running plant. It is having an efficient plant, it is having the machinery of the plant well cared for and it is turning out a good, standard product. All of this depends on high-tone-scale people.

Man has been so terribly susceptible to aberration that actually he is not quite as satisfactory as the machines. As a matter of fact, the electronics engineer (they have this one very badly; they work with machines that think) is very prone to tell you, "I'd sure hate to work with a human being on a job like this. They're full of mistakes! And a machine like this, this is perfect! It never makes a mistake. Not like a human being—they always make a lot of mistakes."

If you say to one of these guys "The human brain is designed to be perfect, you know. It's designed to be perfect, and it's probably a lot more reliable than these machines," and you try to stand up for the human mind for a moment, you can't sell him that. He knows by observation that these machines are more accurate and therefore the human mind is no good and of no use to anyone; that is the conclusion he draws. He never asks himself what designed and made these oscilloscopes and vacuum tubes.

Now, on every hand, the resolution of the complexities, interrelationships, personnel problems, interpersonal relations, problems of training and education—all these things—depends upon some knowledge, some ability to predict what a given person will do in a given situation. If you can't find this out, then you won't know quite what to do with him. That is to say, we have somebody to educate: What can we expect, and what can we do? What can we expect this fellow to do with the knowledge we are giving him? What can he do with the items of equipment which are going to be placed in his hands? And could we alter an educational pattern for him in such a way that we could at least safeguard the equipment and the job that we are going to herd him into? Is there some way that we could do this?

Yes. There are three therapies: Education, environment and Dianetic processing will accomplish this.

You can educate a man in such a way that he is prevented somewhat from accomplishing destruction. For instance, you could take an accidentprone and cut down the possibility of accidents just a little bit by making him a splendid driver through instruction. You could just train him and train him and train him. But what are you doing? You are substituting yourself for his awareness of awareness. You are just running yourself in there between him and his motor controls, and you can to some degree take over the motor controls and you go on driving the car. You and his muscles go on driving the car; you never see him again. That is what education can do. It can alter this pattern but it won't bring a fellow up the tone scale to any degree. And if you take this fellow away from that educational pattern, he begins expressing himself 100 percent across the boards again.

Now, motion is so close and intimate and dear to the hearts of the universe, life and everything else that man somehow or other instinctively named the affinity manifestation of life emotion. It expresses a certain volatility. Although it is not exactly movement in time and space, it expresses a volatility of some sort. It is a changeableness. Any change more or less gets registered against time and space. Actually, there was a good reason for doing this. He did it instinctively but it was completely correct, because emotion comes about because of motion, and the two are very, very intimately interrelated.

You can derive the tone scale all the way down the line to the bottom and back up to the top again simply in terms of motion and what the individual does in response to motion.

Situations are motion situations. A situation is a situation because movement is imminent. Movement must take place of one kind or another in a situation.

Now, how a man reacts to his situation, any given situation, is important. In a person who is completely unaberrated, the reaction to a given situation would be very predictable, except for one thing: it is nonsurvival to be predictable. So you would get the called-for response with the variable of radical action so as not to be predictable. But there would be a positive and continuous response to various given situations. In other words, you take a person who is fairly unaberrated and confront him with an African lion—there is a staircase behind him—and he will turn and go on up the staircase and close the door at the top. He is unaberrated. He will accomplish the motion of escape, in other words. If he got to the top of the stairs and found that he was barred at the top of the stairs, then he would probably turn around and come back down the stairs again and snarl at the lion and try to drive him away and get on by the lion while the lion was distracted. He would do something rational about this.

Now let's take a very aberrated person and suddenly confront him with this lion. Of course, a lion isn't a good test because it brings a person's attention units all up into present time. He hits a necessity level and he is liable to do something. But let's take a person who is very low-toned and raise his necessity level clear up to apathy. You confront him with a lion and he says, "Oh, a lion," and lies down to be eaten.

Let's take a person whose necessity level raises him all the way up to 1.5 and put him in with the lion, with a door right behind him. All he has to do is step out this door and close it. What

does he do? He gets mad at the lion! He will just raise the devil with this lion for a couple of minutes. But lions weigh about 450 pounds so that would be the end of him. It would be a nonsurvival action. But it is the action called for by anger; anger is attack.

What does this fellow at 1.5 do when suddenly confronted by a machine which is recalcitrant?

We have a machine which just suddenly breaks down. The unaberrated person takes a look at it and says, "I wonder what's wrong with this machine," and he finds out that the ruddy rod goes across the gimmigahoosis and that the little cotterwhumpus has become snopped. And he either fixes it with another snop or he goes down the aisle and finds the fellow who is supposed to repair the machines. And he comes back to the machine and he says, "I guess we got that fixed." In other words, he knows that this is an inanimate object, except that it has a motor driving it, that it is subject to certain breakdowns and that repairs of it are accomplishable.

But the person who is at 0.5, if his machine breaks down, will sit there and weep. All he has to do is go ten steps down the line to get the mechanic to fix it, but he will sit there and cry.

Now let's take the 2.5. And foremen certainly know a lot of these 2.5s. The fellow sits at the machine and all of a sudden the machine breaks down. This 2.5 is at boredom, and he just sits there. He looks around, admires things and takes a chaw of tobacco. The foreman comes down two hours later—there is a rush job on the assembly line—and he says, "The machine's broken! "

And this fellow says, "Yep."

"Why don't you do something about it?"

"Oh, me?" That is this fellow's emotional reaction.

Now, suppose you had a 1.1 working on this machine and it broke down. This 1.1 is afraid of the machine. It wouldn't matter whether it was a machine or a wildcat or a girl or whatever, he would still be showing fear toward the object. However, he can't make any frontal attack, and if he is going to go on living he has to go around the back when nobody is looking and do something, and then he will say, "Well, what do you know—the machine broke." He hardly recognises the fact that he went around and did that.

It says right in the directions on this machine, "This machine is made for cutting steel 1/4 inch by 1/4 inch," so he takes these 2-inch-square pieces of steel and feeds them in, and the machine takes the first one and it takes the second one and it takes the third one—and that is that. He knows darn well that he shouldn't do that, but he is afraid of this machine.

The button that turns this machine off is within two inches of a working part. He is supposed to be able to hit that button. The machine all of a sudden starts to go wild—a flywheel starts to run too fast or idle or something like that—and he just screams and falls back from the machine. The rational action is to touch that button but of course that is the last thing he would touch, because he wants that machine to blow itself to glory just to show it right. After all, it scares him to death all the time.

By the way, as you come down the tone scale below 2.0 you will discover that people consider inanimate objects as having personalities more and more. The further they are down the tone scale, the more and more personality there is in an inanimate object. That does not mean that because a person has conceived inanimate objects to have personality he is low on the tone scale.

Therefore, when you are dealing with individuals, you have a certain index of emotion toward practically any situation, and you have for any emotion a set motion. At 4.0 you get motion toward or the rationale indicated. This motion predominates—motion toward, swift approach. This fellow sees that a machine is broken down the line and he goes right down to see what is

wrong with the machine, not out of morbid curiosity, but to fix up the machine. If he sees somebody is hurt he goes straight to it to fix him up.

However, if he is confronted by a chipmunk, he will neither turn and flee nor will he particularly move toward the chipmunk. If he is confronted by a saber-toothed tiger, he will flee. In other words, he has a rational use of all possible motions to fit the given situation, and he will weigh the evidence before him to establish and determine his action. His action will be dictated by a rational conclusion as to what action should be taken.

At 3.5 you get a motion toward, but you don't get the same swift approach. The machine breaks, so the 3.5 says, "Well, let's see. Is it any of my business to go down and see what's wrong with the machine? Yes, it is, kind of, but—well, I'll go down." If someone is injured, he says, "Is anybody else going to take care of him? Well, guess not," and he will go over and take care of him. He is also dictated to by rationale, but there is one thing that he is not completely capable of, and that is the occasional wild charge that life demands.

When it takes a really wild, enthusiastic charge to win, get the 4.0. It is funny how many times a wild charge will win. All of the graybeards sitting around the boards have it all figured out, and four days after the last emergency is dead they put something into action. They come out of the office with a big chart in their hands, they have all the orders signed and everything set up, and they find out that the lieutenant of marines of the enemy has already hoisted the enemy's flag on the citadel. He only had one squad with him when he came in and attacked the place, but he has it now and they are his prisoners. The whole country just surrendered.

The United States lost Canada because of a slight drop on the tone scale on the part of one individual. Benedict Arnold, in the early part of his career when he was of great service to the revolting colonies, was up at Quebec. They went up in the morning very early and climbed the palisades and looked at the bastions and so forth. Arnold was very fast to approach ordinarily, but on this morning he didn't. Everybody was standing around and they were all tired, and there was only a handful of American troops. But Canada didn't even know the Americans were attacking and there Arnold was on the Plains of Abraham; he looked at all the defense works—earthworks, abutments, enormous gates, tall castles—and said, "We'll wait till the rest of the supplies come across the river." There wasn't a single soldier mobilized, there wasn't a cannon loaded, there wasn't a barricade manned by the Canadians and the gates of the town were wide open. He and a squad of men could have walked straight through to the governor's mansion, stepped in with nothing more than a drawn jackknife and said, "We will take the surrender of Canada," and they would have gotten it right there! But they didn't do that, and they laid around there all winter long trying to storm the place. They gave it days to finally alert. It was a rather pathetic picture with these troops starving, smallpox eating away their ranks and so on, and the crazy frontal attacks they made on the bulwarks when they finally managed.

It takes rationale, though, to figure out timing. It was just for lack of a person able to make an all-out wild charge that America didn't get Canada.

There is a certain timing involved in all this, then, and efficiency sometimes requires it. When a person's adjudication of a situation means that he does so-and-so and that such-and-such is what it requires to win this situation, you want to have a person who will accomplish the rationale, the rational action, regarding that situation.

As you look down the tone scale you will notice that, at each level, the rational actions above it are not accomplishable by an individual in that level except in a moment when his necessity level goes way up.

When we get down just below 3.0 the motion is even slower. Now this is a rational adjudication. Here we have a fellow who sees the machine break down, he knows there is a machine breakdown, but he doesn't go down to it. It may even be his job to go down there, but he doesn't go down there. If somebody comes along and tells him to go down there or if he can

see that something a little bit nearer to hand is running down because of this breakdown, he will finally walk down there. If somebody gets hurt he will stand back on that situation too.

Just below this is 2.5. This is boredom in action, but the motion of boredom is to move away—slow motion away.

Now we get down to antagonism, 2.0. This one is motion away, swift. This fellow says, "Machine broken down there. Oh, those damn machines— to hell with them!" If a person gets hurt, he says, "Aw, somebody is always getting hurt around here!"

This cycle of action, which depends on rationale and so forth, actually has another aspect. We would say of a person who was half-conscious that his remaining consciousness was mainly a stimulus-response type of consciousness—in other words, a highly reactive consciousness—while the upper levels of consciousness are thoughtful or analytical consciousness; the person can think. Just as on the tone scale people from 4.0 down to 2.0 have survive as the main goal and from 2.0 on down to 0.0 they have succumb as the main goal, so do we have this double situation.

These upper-level motions are dictated by survival motives; they are done on the survival line of action. If these motions mean survival, the person accomplishes them. Below 2.0 we get, actually, the same cycle. Just below 2.0 you get motion toward, slow attack. Then at 1.5 you get motion toward, violent attack. When you get down to 1.1 you get motion away, slow retreat. But just below 1.0, at about 0.9, you get motion away, violent—fast motion away. At 0.5 you get slight motion, agitation in one place, suffer; it compares to boredom. Below that is no motion and succumb. But all of these motions are predicated upon the fact that they will cause the individual to succumb. The solution is toward succumb, not toward survive.

Now, as we go down the line from 2.0, we find that the individual goes into anger. The person who is in anger attacks.

The next one is the person who is just above where you really get into fear; he moves away—slow retreat. "This thing is dangerous," he is saying. This isn't rational at all down at this level. It is just that he sees something and that thing moves, so therefore he should begin a slow retreat. And at 0.9, he sees a motion and that means he has to flee; he is afraid at 0.9.

At 0.5, he is in grief, hopeless. This is the level of suicide and so on, and you get slight motion, agitation in one place, suffer. He just stays there. Suicide is all set to be eaten, anyhow, and the no-motion is in apathy. When they get down to apathy, they say, "I am so little life and so much physical universe that I must be simply a physical-universe item and I am edible, so I just might as well lie down and get eaten."

So that is the cycle of action. This ties in on the emotional scale.

This is the adjudication of what you do to one object or to one situation. In the rational line you have a sensible resolution as to what the situation is, and clear on down to 2.0 there is some thought involved in what one does; but from 2.0 on down there is just a stet reaction, an emotional response to any dangerous situation. Furthermore, it is a response out of the fact that the individual has postulated that the situation is dangerous, regardless of whether it is or not. There is misadjudication and there is misemotion applied to it. Both of these things are taking place at the same time. What the person conceives to be dangerous is merely charted against how fast the thing moves or how suddenly it moves.

To a person who is a 1.1, the reaction to a motion is to get away from it and covertly stop it. He will go through that pattern reaction. In other words, there is a set pattern as you get down along the line.

Down to that point of 2.0, there is an adjudication. Something is moving fast—"Hah, ballet dancer. Oh, boy!" But down below 2.0 you get "This thing is moving faster—ballet dancer—

this thing is moving fast." There is no differentiation, really, that this fast motion is a graceful motion, that there is something else happening, and there is a little bit of antagonism toward this dancer when she is dancing. The fellow will say he enjoys it, but of course he is really incapable of enjoying it. He knows this ballet dancer for a while and then he meets her at the stage door one night and really fixes her clock for her. Why? Because she moves fast.

Let's take somebody who talks enthusiastically; he is married to a 1.1, and he is eternally coming home saying, "I just made a million dollars today, and I'm going to take you out and buy you a great big Ford car and I'm going to diamond-plate it from end to end." And her 1.1 reaction is just "Fine, dear, fine." She is trying to stop this voice. That is the whole concern—how can she stop the voice? He is offering her things, it is good news, but he talks to her loudly. It is a loud sound, therefore it is a dangerous sound. So it must be attacked.

Actually, somebody could walk in and make an enthusiastic announcement to a person at 1.5 and get shot dead. It has probably happened a lot of times. This happens because the guy is moving fast and he is loud, therefore he is something to be attacked.

These are the stet reactions; they are pattern reactions.

At grief, all you would have to do is say "Hello!" and the person would sit down and cry. I did this to a beggar once and I was very surprised, and I completely misinterpreted the whole thing. He was about half-asleep and I threw him a penny, which hit the pavement alongside of him and bounced into his lap. And he broke into tears—very violent weeping! I thought, "The poor fellow, nobody has given him a penny all day, and this is such a tremendous appreciation for the penny," and so forth.

Then I realized suddenly that he had not even realized there was a penny. He had been kind of half-doped off; he hadn't seen the action that had occurred. I could have stood there then, probably, and given him something slowly, and he would have shut up.

These pattern actions are representative of motion. Therefore the lower levels of the pattern are representative of certain reactive motions; they are reactive motions.

One of the columns of the Chart of Human Evaluationl is a list of the physiological reactions which take place at the various levels of the tone scale. This column is based on the fact that the mind has a control and monitoring system which it uses on the body. It actually employs two control systems. One is simply the control system through the motor controls—you might say the mechanical control system. It is a system of levers, weights, balances and so forth and it is very mechanical.

Somebody found an interesting datum as they worked with rats. There are two panels on each side of a rat's brain, and each one is the shape of a rat hanging by his heels. It actually looks like the rat; it is as though you had cut a silhouette of a rat hanging by his heels. There are two panels on each side of his skull, one on top of the other, and they control opposite sides of the body.

Now, on each side, one of these panels applies strictly to thought and the other connects up with the muscles. So this rat thinks "Cheese" in the thought panel and an impulse goes over to the motor-control-system panel, and the rat moves his tongue and starts toward a source of cheese.

In a man you have the same setup, with this exception: the hand and the tongue are enormously exaggerated. There is an image of a man hanging by his heels, but the hand is very big and the tongue is enormously long. There are two of these strips on each side of the brain, and they hang down on either side of the head. On one of these panels on each side is where the thoughts register, evidently, and on the other is where the muscle control is set up. The panels on each side control the opposite side of the body.

Now, let's take this man, and he has the thought of a steak. It is 5:30, he thinks of steak and he goes through all of the muscular control units, impelling himself homeward, thinking about steak.

That would be all very well except for one thing: The mind is something that controls; the function controls the structure. It is not a subordinate proposition where the function is controlled by the structure. That is very easily proven in a number of ways.

The point is that the mind is running a carbon-oxygen motor. This carbon-oxygen motor is a low-heat engine. The material body is a low-heat engine that runs on a carbon-oxygen system. It runs at a temperature of 98.6 degrees Fahrenheit, and the combustion that takes place makes it possible for the muscles to move and so forth, and there is energy being released into the various systems. The mind runs on an oxygen battery system which is wonderful. It runs on 2. watts, and this battery system makes each little cell a battery which furnishes its own power. These panels are, you might say, the mind's switchboard, whatever the brain has to do with it. The brain certainly handles the switchboard system on that horsepower.

Now, there seems to be an additional energy which overlies this and monitors it and which has been overlooked before. This additional energy does not run on carbon-oxygen battery systems, but that is completely beside the point. We could consider this setup as carbon-oxygen batteries and carbon-oxygen motors and mechanize the whole thing if we just overlooked the directive impulse—the "I" of the individual.

Let's take a look at how this works: "I" thinks, "Gee-whiz! Great Dane, bite, bad situation. I'm in his yard—the gate is right there—run!"

That is fine, but that was only the thought computation. Now what happens? He thinks "Run." Run means that certain muscles have to go into operation, so the thought pattern happens up in the thought strip and this says certain muscles must go into operation. There is evidently a switchboard setup there, and all of a sudden these muscles go into that operation and the fellow runs.

That would be all there is to it, except for one thing: when you step on a throttle your motor runs faster. But I have never yet heard of a motor running faster that wasn't fed more fuel. You can't sit in your automobile, merely going through all the motions of driving fast—even making the car bump and so forth—and go any faster unless that motor is moving faster. So how do you step on the accelerator of the human body? Because, strictly speaking, it is just a motor system that you are operating.

You step on the accelerator system very simply and very easily. Via the pituitary gland, evidently, a series of catalysts are thrown into the body in such a way as to produce further catalysts in the glandular system which permit a great deal more fuel to be burned. The fuel is right there; the food and fuel is right there, and what you are doing is adjusting the spark the way you do on an outboard motor, instead of adjusting the gasoline. More oxygen has to be carried to these areas, but the food is going to furnish the carbon side and part of the oxygen side of this reaction, and the energy is right there ready to be burned. But before you burn very much of it, a lot more oxygen has to be pumped in and that is why a person under stress starts to breathe more heavily.

I will give you here a little correlative datum: A lot of psychotics breathe that way all the time. Some of them don't breathe at all; that is apathy. However, if a psychotic is up on this upper band but below 2.0 and completely spun in, he has that fast breathing reaction—oxygenation. - Of course, it isn't going anyplace or doing anything.

I may have thrown you a curve by mentioning two catalysts. I mentioned that because up in the pituitary gland there is evidently a series of what you could call switches which you just throw, and they say, for instance, "Pancreas quarter speed, pancreas half speed, adrenals quarter

speed, adrenals half speed, adrenals all ahead flank.l'' So there is a little switchboard system in there which is about the size of a walnut. It sits right back of the forehead.

The glands throw the stuff that makes the fuel burn faster into the bloodstream and the various local areas of the body. There is a certain amount of glandular excretion going on continually. It takes several glandular compounds to produce an optimum fuel. The glands that produce these compounds are in various parts of the body and they are on to a greater or lesser degree.

Now, it is all very well to say it is a carbon-oxygen motor, but it is a carbon-oxygen motor plus the spark plug; it is like a gasoline engine with a spark plug in it, not a diesel engine without a spark plug. The spark plug is simply glandular fluid. That glandular fluid has to be released into the body, because when the thought strip says "Run! " and then the motor strip says "Run ! " and the muscles of the body get this order and they start to run, you wouldn't get any action like stepping on an accelerator unless this pituitary switchboard said "Run! " too. The motor strip says "Run! " and you get muscular reaction and then the pituitary says "Run! " and the rest of the catalysts feed into the body. We don't even have to interest ourselves as to how many kinds of these catalysts there are.

Because there are certain reactions that have to take place, different mixtures of glandular fluid are made in order to produce various types of reaction. This glandular system also commands the kind and type of action which is necessary.

This beautiful coordinative system works up, and "I" sits up on the throne and says, "Well, it looks to me like we're going to have to fight, boys," and this system suddenly starts throwing the body into line, it gets all its armament prepared and so on.

As a matter of fact, part of fighting consists of rigidity and toughening up, actually armor-plating the muscles, armor-plating the skin and so forth. A lot of fantastic things happen. Part of the action is moisture in the palms—moist palms hold on to things better. Also, moisture comes on to the soles of the feet so they can stick to rocks better. The whole response is conditioned to be done without shoes, so the feet perspire. There are all sorts of these glandular combinations to produce various physical conditions to meet various motion conditions.

Now, let's look at the condition of anger. The fellow is going to get mad. That means he is going to attack, so he armor-plates himself to some degree, his energy level goes way up so he can go ahead and do this, and his blood starts speeding up and so on.

His respiration, however, doesn't speed up until he sees he is losing the fight, and then you get a completely different order that goes through, saying "Get away from here!"

Now, motion away, slow retreat, is about the first thing a person would get below anger. That is just down the tone scale that much, and there is a whole endocrine pattern for motion away, retreat.

The action required by fear is to retreat. We recognize that as the beginnings of fear—motion away, retreat.

Then you get real fear—motion away, violent—and here you get another kind of catalyst. But something else is happening that is very interesting: the body is squaring itself around so as to be inedible. If you have ever run into a person who was in a rather chronic fear state, you may have noticed his body odor. Very bad body odor usually comes out from this flee reaction.

A person who is afraid can be smelled very easily. Not only can dogs smell him, but a human being can smell another human being who is afraid. It is a lousy smell. Actually, it is a poison which makes the body inedible. If you shoot a deer that has seen you and is running, trying to get away from you, it doesn't matter how many glands you cut out of that deer or how you try to sweeten up his meat, you will sure know it. It is a very foolish thing to shoot a deer who is

very, very frightened unless you are awfully hungry, because a deer in this state is practically inedible.

That comes on full by the time someone reaches grief. But it recedes in apathy. The body says, "All right, eat me!"

Now, resentment is just a little bit of the mobilisation of anger. It is just a preparatory alert. Then comes anger, and then "This object is not going to surrender quite as fast as I thought. It's not quite as killable," so we get the propulsion back and the preparation not to be eaten. And then he goes down further and that is apathy.

But as you come up the line from there, you get greater and greater freedom of action and you don't get overpreparation.

At the level of 1.5 you get tremendous overpreparation. If a 1.5 dramatizes 1.5 it is really terrific. This fellow's adrenalin glands and so forth are on full. But as the person goes down the tone scale they get frozen—more and more frozen into a standardised reaction. So as you look at people at various levels on the tone scale, at any point where you find one of these people you will find the glands turned on which are demanding a certain action. It is as though you had stuck the throttle on a railroad locomotive; it is going to travel at a certain speed. It is just as though the throttle or the clutch were stuck and the steering wheel were frozen on a car, and it is just about as safe as that.

At anger the fellow's adrenals will be on too much, and at fear he has all the various mixtures of glands turned on which cause the fear reaction. This person hasn't got a chance! The throttle is stuck; it is always on the same level. Fear says, "Go away. I've got to leave here," and the body is being continually furnished the glandular substances necessary to make him get away from there. He is afraid functionally, which puts the structure into operation and it comes back up and makes him afraid. He says "Be afraid," and it says "Be afraid," and this echoing reaction—"be afraid," "be afraid," "be afraid," back and forth—starts up and it just keeps intensifying.

It is very important to know how an individual gets stuck on the various levels of the tone scale. How come he gets stuck? What fixes him? His motion has been impeded too often—actual motion. There is an interposition between the thought panel and the motor panel—these little men hanging by their heels. I would not be a bit surprised if there were a double set of pituitaries there. There is a division—the anterior and the posterior—but very little is known about this pituitary setup. The British know more about it than we do, evidently. I was reading in a British publication one day, and I think it said that there were twenty-eight new substances that had been discovered in the pituitary that we knew nothing about. This journal was about four years old but we didn't know about it in this country.

What is happening is that "I" is giving orders to these switchboards and to the pituitary, and this system takes over and goes through the reactions.

So "I" commands these various reaction systems and as long as "I" stays in control, you get a very nice smooth flow of action from one to the next. It doesn't matter what happens to this person; he can be all bunged up. But if this flow of self-determined action can keep on operating smoothly, he will be all right.

Now, somebody comes along and puts an interposition between the nervous panel and the motor panel. How is that done? It is very simple to put an interposition between these panels. You could take an individual and restrain him from some movement—for example, keep him from raising his arm. If you kept at it for a long time the person would probably go into apathy on moving his arm. If you took a little kid and told him positively to move his arm, and you restrained him from moving his arm every time you told him this, eventually the words move your arm would mean that he held it still and was being held back in one place. So the words don't mean a darn thing; that is an opposite reaction. The words don't mean anything.

To get an idea of the actual force of words, as you are talking put your hand out a short distance from your mouth and feel the terrible force of those words.

There is no force. We have built up an enormous magical illusion.

The child has to be moved in life. The child tries to move himself and somebody says, "No, you don't! " Only he doesn't know what "No, you don't" means, so the grown-up says, "That's silly—there he is, four months old, and he doesn't know 'No, you don't' yet." Wham! Then the child gets angry and does a resurgence, but the parent puts more force on and we get this tug of war. When the child is trained that way, what you have done is trained his motor responses to follow you and words, not "I." You have trained him to expect exterior direction or command, and what that child's tone level will be depends to a large degree on how persistent life has been in training up his muscle systems.

Self-determinism and ability to move self are synonymous, utterly synonymous—self-determinism and ability to move self on own choice.

What happens when this self-determinism gets interrupted? Take a little child and have him sit in your lap, without restraining him at all. He is comfortable, you are not bothering him, he is perfectly contented; he is not squirming. Then just reach out and put your hands around the child. Don't touch the child, just put your hands around him. The child will say, "Oh-oh," and start to pull away. Hold him tighter and he will push harder. If you don't let him go he will keep squirming and he will get mad! I don't care how old this child is—he may be only six or seven months old—he will get furious. As a matter of fact, if he hasn't been beaten into a "proper civilized state of mind" he will probably bite you or something.

If you go on letting him get mad he will become afraid. There is some reason why he is being held, and he will try to get away. And if he can't flee along that line he will cry, and at the end of his tears he will go into apathy, if you are cruel enough and if you have that much patience. You haven't said a word to him but you have brought him all the way down the tone scale.

There is a point in fear where fleeing goes into misdirection. He may start to think there for a minute. He is in anger and he goes down into fear and tries to get away, and he will go into a misdirection; he will lie very still for just an instant and then you will relax your grip for a second and he will strike through. But if he goes down to tears, he will drop off into apathy right below tears and he won't try to get away. He will just lie there.

If you ever really want an obedient child, just repeat that often enough and he will do anything you want. He will be a nice little robot. Of course, he won't ever amount to anything, but that is beside the point!

I read some ads in the Journal of the American Medical Association, and the lead pamphlet that has still got me is "How to Control Your Child." I could write one that really showed how! You could bring a child down to where he was in apathy all the time.

Now, on the tone scale chart is a column about hypnotic level. Down at apathy a person's hypnotic level is everything is literal. You try to tell a fellow who is in apathy a joke and the fellow says, "Hm-hm." So you try to punch it up, and he realises "Oh, it's a joke! Oh, ha-ha-ha!" You wonder what he is laughing about, but it doesn't matter. He has no sense of humor. Everything is just going in. He accepts all the words given to him as commands. And you can actually take this person, particularly when he is a little tired, and if you lift your hand up off the table, the first thing you know, he will start lifting his hand up off the table without observing that he is doing it. He is doing a mimicry on you. The mimicry motor control is so interrupted that because you are doing this it is tantamount to a command on him to do this.

The interruption is imposed, then, by accidents, illnesses and training. Accidents, illnesses, training (and operations too, they are always bad accidents; most of them shouldn't happen)—these things interrupt this pattern. Training always, to some degree, is putting a block in this

pattern; it is interposing another “I” between the motor strip and “I,” so that the motor strip will react to somebody other than the actual “I.”

A person’s ability to move and the tone scale are synonymous. The tone scale is also a scale of the amount of energy a person has available. The person in apathy cannot move at all. If you notice, his motions in life are very slow, he looks tired, he tells you he is tired and so forth. One step up from there, in grief, there is practically no motion to amount to anything. Another step up, in fear, there may be considerable action, but there is almost continual exhaustion. And up in anger there is a lot of action, and all of it is destructive.

An anger case full on is doing destruction. He may be taught, however, to do something mechanically on a motor-strip level, but don’t ever ask him to do an adjudication about it. Therefore, you could teach a workman practically any mechanical action regardless of where he is on the tone scale and make him go through the motions, but you would drive his “I” to complete apathy on the subject of controlling him, until you had interposed yourself in there directing his motor strip. So you could take a person and drive him down to an apathy on any subject.

The definition of apathy is that “I” is not controlling the motor strip. That is real apathy: the motor strip is being continually handled by past trainings.

If you can take a man’s hands and put them through the action of what he is supposed to do and just keep putting his hands through the action, explaining to him what he is supposed to do at the same time, and if you can just keep that up with an individual, you can train him into a stimulusresponse pattern that he will follow through very reliably. For example, tying an intricate electrical knot: if you can just guide his hands through tying the intricate electrical knot and then tie another knot, and keep it up, the first thing you know, the fellow will go on and tie these knots. You are interrupting the motor control. That is one kind of training. You can’t teach a man to think that way, but you can teach him to go through mechanical motions. You could teach someone to drive that way. Driving requires very little judgment; it is almost all mechanical reaction. You see something—you do something. It is pretty well spotted out.

As a person goes through life, then, what is the primary thing that happens to him? It is an interruption of action. And he is at a point on the tone scale according to the level that his action has been interrupted. There is probably even a proportion involved here. I don’t know what the proportion is, but if a quarter of his action had been interrupted, this might bring him down to 2.5, or if half of his action had been interrupted, it might bring him down to 2.0. If it is more than half, it might bring him down to 1.5; about three quarters could bring him into fear. I don’t know that these are right, but the factor is, how much of his action has been interrupted in life?

Now, there is actually a sensation of motion which a person perceives. One perceives that he has moved. If one could remember the last time he was held still—and I don’t mean by somebody asking one to sit still, I mean held still or held down or pinned back with something—if he could, without having to remember any words or anything, just get a perception of the motion of how it felt to try to wrest himself free and be unable to, and if he could get that perception two or three times, all of a sudden he would feel better.

You get cumulative arrestings of action all through life. Every time action is arrested there is a delivered impulse: “I” says, “You’re being held still—move.” and you get a kickback, Can’t move. “I” says, ‘‘Mover’’ and you get a kickback, Can’t move. “Move!” and then all of a sudden you get a kickback from that, and “I” says, “My God! I’d better get out of here. Run!” That is the next motion. “Can’t run? Well, cry.... Well, crying isn’t doing any good. Go ahead, get eaten. I was tired of living in this body anyhow.”

The most basic thing that can happen to an organism is to get eaten. Its evolutionary ancestors back to practically the beginning of time have been many times eaten. Sometimes they have been considered palatable, sometimes not so. But being held still against one’s will is death.

That is being eaten, because the main and predominant reason one would have been held still was to be eaten. Quite the natural and most basic response of an individual is "Don't be food." "Eat," it says, "don't be food."

Now, "I" starts to hand out dictation on the subject of the procurement of food, and if "I" is held back from procuring the food, there is the same descent down the tone scale. "I" says, "Ah! I just received a message here from olfactory—rutabagas! Okay. Cameras, lights, action—let's go." Right away, the first motion toward the rutabagas is good and swift. Then he is walking in the muddy field and he notices he is being impeded and he says, "What the devil? Oh, it's mud! Mud is holding me back. Well, that's not so bad. If I just walk a little more carefully here on these ridges, then I'll get over and get to the rutabagas okay."

The only trouble with the ridges is they are so much softer. As a matter of fact, a fellow could go right up to his ankles in this stuff. And he thinks, "Shoes are getting pretty muddy. Oh, the devil with the rutabagas"—he is bored with the rutabagas. But the next thought is "You know, I'm pretty hungry. The devil with these doggone ridges that are impeding me from getting the rutabagas." And the fellow will antagonistically get through. Now he is developing enough energy to plow through the soft mud or to plow through the soft fur of the animal he is killing or whatever it is. Then, if he can't get through the ridges, he will stop worrying about the rutabagas or even stop thinking about the rutabagas, and he will actually exert some destructive action toward the thing which is impeding him. For instance, have you ever seen a man kick a car that wouldn't run?

The next thing the fellow finds is that he is going to sink up to his hips in this doggone field. This field is really dangerous—he had better get out of there. If he can't lick it he had better run from it. If he can't run he just says, "Well, poor me. Maybe there's another man around and he'll help me out of here." And if there isn't even any other man around and he can't do anything about it, he says, "Well, the only reason I am stuck here in the mud is because something wants to eat me. This mud wants to eat me, but here I am so I just give up." There is approach toward being interrupted.

Now, let us postulate that there are one thousand thought units that can be absorbed. We could postulate it perhaps even a little better by saying there are one thousand thought units that go into effect on each computation. A certain number of the energy of these thousand units gets dammed up in trying to go through these computations as the person moves down the tone scale. There is a certain amount of force or energy there and at each tone level a certain amount of these units could go through every time, but less than that number couldn't go through on the bulk of the activities of this individual.

Let's say his mother would give up at the time he bit her—it was habitually that way—and we find that he could throw such a terrific tantrum that even the little boys in the neighborhood would turn pale and run. In other words, he kept getting through all the time at this level, he kept winning at this level. The first thing you know, he starts omitting the higher levels for the simple reason that every time he tries to use them they run into past circuits which are jammed for that action. He says, "Be happy. Let's be happy and approach it swiftly." That circuit is jammed; there have been 872,000 times in his life when he said happily, "Let's approach," and he couldn't. So, along about the last 100,000 of them, his idea of approach is just nulled. Then he drops down to the next conservative approach and so forth, and he just keeps coming down the line, and at anger he finally gets into action. There he gets into action and he finds that that action works. And he has had to be mad at so many objects and so many objects have been mad at him, so many people have been mad at him and he has been so mad at so many people, and madness was what succeeded all the way along the line anyhow, that there he is at 1.5. He is vibrating, you might say, at 1.5. That is the successful action—the only successful action.

Once a person has come down to that as a successful action, he doesn't go back up—this side of processing. He can fluctuate around on that area.

But what is his physiological aspect? He has full autonomic mobilisation for violent attack—complete inhibition of craniosacral, thoracolumbar in full action, respiration and pulse fast and deep, stasis of gastrointestinal tract, blood to peripheral vascular system.

And that is what will be wrong with him physiologically, because you can pump a man full of just so much adrenalin for just so much time, you can keep him in an emergency anger status for just so much time, and the food can sit there and wait to be fed into the bloodstream for just so much time. He will develop a certain definite physiology: he is the broad, very square, rather overweight individual.

I came up the tone scale the other day about .0001 points, and two inches came off my belt line just like that! It is quite remarkable, the changes that will occur as you bring a person up this tone scale. You can change him physiologically. People are only really in very good physical condition from around 3.5 up.

But at 1.5 you have a situation where the fellow is all mobilized. Isn't it funny that people at 1.5 uniformly have depository illnesses like arthritis? They are all mobilized; they hold on to this stuff. Their give-and-take reaction in life is very simple: they want something, they get angry. .

You could look right across the line on this—for instance, ethics: "What the hell do you need ethics for? All you have to do is get angry."

Now, anger is destructive, and this fellow will start to swing a pattern of this character. Notice the beaten appearance of people in his vicinity. The girl who has a 1.5 for a husband is at least down there to 1.1. He usually gets her driven down to 0.5 before he gets through. His command over his environment, of course, being an anger command over the environment, is very interesting: he smashes or destroys others in his environment.

It is funny how fast an anger case will spin in, however. If he gets hung up on anger, he doesn't easily go on down the scale; he doesn't get beaten down the scale.

Now we are talking about the difference of an individual's reaction over a period of a few minutes and over a long period of life. Just as a person finds it a little bit difficult to get over having been angry five minutes ago, so does he stick there after life has gotten him fairly well fixed, after his pattern of life has gotten fixed along this band. He doesn't get over that. But he doesn't get much below it and he doesn't get much above it. The person's success line is anger; this is his action line, his success line, his stet line. This is the way he has procured things and he has found the give-and-take of life along in this line. His attitude, though, is one of failure. He is already below 2.0, and if you break his anger dramatization—if somebody turns around and gets three times as angry as he is—he doesn't go through 0.5, he just dives right straight into apathy.

If you thoroughly enough break a 1.5 dramatization he will kill himself. He will certainly talk about killing himself, but it takes a terrific amount to break a 1.5's dramatization.

The fascist is inevitably carrying with him poison for self-destruction. He is going to win against others or die trying. As a matter of fact, most of Hitler's men, who were at the tone band of fascism, knocked themselves off. They were just above fear.

If you break the back of the 1.5s' dramatisations and they find out they can't destroy anything in the environ, they will destroy all they have left of the environ over which they have control, because they will destroy anything over which they have control. But they would rather destroy the surrounding environment than themselves, although they don't care too much about themselves either. You get destruction of the environ along that band.

It is very interesting that the society takes a very strange view of the 1.5. The 1.5 is thought to be forceful, a leader and so on. A bunch of people in fear will elect a 1.5. And yet his actual

worth to society compared to apparent worth is very low: he is insincere, a heavy liability, a possible murderer. Even when his intentions are avowedly good he will bring about destruction: "Now, if you boys stick together with me we're going to take Czechoslovakia and Austria, and we're going to make the German Reich great! Come along boys. We're going to really fix you up. We are going to sell you all glory." Then all of a sudden you have a dead Germany on your hands.

Put one of these 1.5's in charge of a labor crew, even one with no machinery involved, and count the accidents. These boys will really be beaten down quick in his labor crew, but he is "obviously doing a fine job." He has these fellows really ordered around.

The army, during the last war, finally found out that 1.5's weren't automatically to be appointed to sergeancies. It took them 160 years to discover that it was a bad thing to do. Troops actually don't fight well under a 1.5; they get beaten back by the 1.5. They become afraid.

So, you have this crew of men under a 1.5. You are going to have a bad turnover of personnel and you are going to have accidents. But you will really be in trouble if you put him in charge of a crew and machinery, because the machinery will really break down.

A very funny aspect of this fellow is that he is the kind of a man who is likely to get the Medal of Honor or something of the sort. But don't ever confuse worth to the society with worth in war. That is a totally artificial value at this day and age. A man's value in attacking the enemy when there is an enemy to be attacked is very fine, but remember that this is destruction. And how well a 1.5 can carry out his action in battle! He is a good soldier, no doubt about that, but he is kind of bad to have around the station when there is no battle going on because he will start a mutiny. If there is no other way he can fix the ship or the station or the trucks up, he will think of that.

Now, his ability to handle responsibility is what is very interesting, because this fellow is forceful, this fellow can "handle" men. Obviously— they are afraid of him! And yet he is very respectful to you, too; quite often the 1.5 is very respectful. That is because there is always some fear and a direction toward succumb at this level. He won't, however, respect anybody lower on the tone scale than he is; he will sometimes respect people higher.

This tone scale is almost a caste system, by the way—sort of like the pecking order of hens.

Now, this fellow will do almost anything to get responsibility, if he is really a good, solid 1.5 with a lot of volume. He will be respectful to you and toady up to you and flatter you and so forth in order to get some responsibility, because he wants aid and assistance in carrying forward destruction.

However, when you start to give this fellow orders you get some interesting things. You say, "Now, how about going and stringing that telephone line." He has this crew of men and a truck, and he goes out there to string the telephone line. If he has been well educated you could have indoctrinated him into stringing telephone lines or even into ordering men to string telephone lines and this anger dramatisation will only be filtering through slightly, but it will come through. He will express it.

So you talk to him about it: "You know, that's a terrific telephone line we're stringing there, and there's a swell way to go about it. This is a very important line, and the best way to go about this is with a special truck that will take care of this. Now, you get this special truck and string that line and . . ." Then you drive out the next day to find out how he is doing on this line, and you will find out the special truck isn't there. "Well, why isn't the special truck here?"

"Did you tell me to bring the special truck out?"

"Yes! Sure I did!"

“Oh yes, I think I remember now. But it was much better, and so forth . . . a couple of other things came up, and we didn’t bring it.”

He didn’t hear you. That is the truth of the matter; he stood right there in front of you and nodded but he didn’t hear you.

You could have said, “You know, this truck that we’ve got is very dangerous. The last two times it went out, men fell from the tower on it and they were killed. It’s a very dangerous truck. I want you to be very careful of this truck.”

“Oh, yes, sir, I’ll be careful of the truck.”

You go on out there the next day and he has the truck out there. That is not really because you told him it was dangerous, but because you put in a communication on a line that he could understand: death, destruction, “Knock it apart,” “It’s dangerous,” “It’s a terrific emergency,” “A lot of people are dying,” “A lot of people will die unless this is done,” “You’ve got to act to save this situation; it’s almost gone.” This is stuff he will listen to.

But if you had said “There’s a swell new machine which will fix all this up for you,” then you would have been talking to a guy who was deaf. This is an actual energy shut-off. It isn’t just the fact that he doesn’t listen. He just doesn’t come in along that line.

You give this 1.5 an order—you say, “When you get out to the field out there, I’d like you to tell Sergeant Hokes to send the ruddy rod back. It will probably be here about four o’clock, so you tell him to send it back.”

“Okay.”

Four o’clock, no ruddy rod. Five o’clock, no ruddy rod. Then business is through that day. The next morning you drive out. “Where the devil is that ruddy rod?” He has brought you down to his tone scale level now.

You see this other sergeant and he says, “What? The ruddy rod? You told me to bury it! I couldn’t understand what you were talking about, but . . .”

“Now, look, I didn’t tell you to bury it.” But that is the message he got: not to send it back, but to do something else with it. And probably it was not the ruddy rod, anyway, but the Willys jeep that he had, and he was supposed to exchange that for the Ford. Whereas you wanted him to send back the ruddy rod.

You can get the most fantastic twists of communication through a 1.5 It is just fabulous what happens. When he asks a 1.5 to act as a communications relay point, an executive takes his life and his sanity in his hands, because it will go some other way.

Now, remember lots of women can be 1.5s too. They are less often 1.5s; women are usually lower on the tone scale if they are badly off at all. But if you were unlucky enough to have a secretary at this level, the things that would happen to your correspondence would be just fantastic! What would happen to your appointments? You would say, “Tell Jones I’ll see him at two o’clock,” so she would call Smith and say you wouldn’t be there that day. These are just automatic responses. You actually have to have a little experience with this to really appreciate how gruesome it can get.

Now, another thing that is going to happen to this 1.5 is that, though he won’t have as many days out as maybe a lot of other people, he is going to have days out. He is going to be sick and when he gets sick he will get sick along the order of “I require lots of treatment and I’m leaving for the Mayo Clinicl for an operation.” He gets quite sick. He gets mad at his sicknesses too; you can hear him rave and rant about his arthritis.

The ethic level of one of these fellows is interesting, too. A 1.5 won't do as many crooked things as people below that level, but he will do things for you that are crooked. You are sitting in your office one day when all of a sudden the cops walk in and they say, "How about the lumber?"

And you say, "What lumber?"

"Well, the lumber that was down there on your project that you had picked up from Jones's project."

"I didn't have any lu What the hell are you talking about?"

So you call Mr. 1.5 that you have down there on the job as a foreman because he is so forceful and he says, "Well, confidentially, boss, it was sitting over there and I just thought you needed it and so forth, so I brought it along. Is something wrong in it?" He knows there is something wrong in it, and he will destroy you just as quickly as he will destroy something else.

The funny part of it is that his general persistence is low. A fellow who is well up the tone scale can hit a few disappointments without going under. But a 1.5's persistence is not good. He will tackle something, then he will hit anger on it very quickly and he will keep running along that line of anger on the job unless he hits some kind of a very solid obstacle—something that drives him down a little bit. At that point he will quit.

And he is not very fast to think of some new solution. You come out and look at the problem and say, "But why in the name of common sense didn't you do so-and-so?"

"Well, we would have done that except . . ." and the next statement is a lie. He will give you a lie. He will tell you why he didn't do that: He hit this obstacle. They went plowing across the field and there was a piece of cable buried across the field, and he didn't know the cable was there and so forth. He has been on the job three hours with four men at God knows how much pay and the field isn't finished, though it should have been, because he hit the cable. But the fact of the matter is that he didn't have to hit that cable at all. And he will probably tell you that the machine broke or something like that, and then you will find out later that it was because he hit this cable.

Having these people around makes management terribly interesting.

In the military services there are a lot of fellows who in civil life were at 2.5 or 2.0, somewhere up there. Then they would hit the armed services and of course get some more of this hold business, and they would go down the scale and sit at 1.5. Ordinarily they would have been about 2.5 or something like that. Then when they come out of the army they are a couple of points lower on the tone scale than they ought to be.

That is why we should have universal military training! Very "good" for people.

You could take a bunch of men who are fairly well up the tone scale and all you would have to do is stand them out in a field and start and stop their actions independently. If you could only figure out a system by which they elect to continue along a certain course and then figure out some way to interrupt that course, and if you could figure out how to get them withdrawing from something and then arrest their withdrawal—get them to use their free self-determinism and then physically show them why they shouldn't have—you could push them down the tone scale to a point of apathy where they would follow orders very well. And they wouldn't worry; they would go out on the battlefield and lie down for dear old secretary of defense or something.

I could teach a sergeant tricks on this stuff, by the way. When I first got into college, life was pretty dull and I needed a little recreation. This fellow came up to me and he said, "The Marine Reserves are organising a twentieth regiment. Why don't you come down?"

So I went down and I found out nobody down there knew “to the rear march, to the rear march, to the rear march,” and I happened to know “to the rear march, to the rear march, to the rear march.” So I went around to the captain and I said, “In view of the fact that I’ve been an admiral in the Greek navy,” or something of the sort—I have forgotten what I told him— “I’ll join up if you’ll give me a sergeancy.” I was nineteen.

He just looked at me. Then he went out and drilled them the next Sunday and they all fell flat on their faces. He finally came out just at the end of his drill period and he said, “Well, squads right or left as the case may be.” They had marched down along a line where there was a precipice on one side and he couldn’t get them away from it.

So he finally sang out to me, “Hubbard, let’s take the men back to the parade field.”

And I said, “Aye, aye, sir,” and we went back.

The only reason I knew anything about drilling is I had been hanging around with the marines off and on. He couldn’t find anybody else who could drill; nobody knew how to drill. All the people from World War I were out on the streets, unshaven and dirty and walking along kind of beaten-looking and so on, and nobody would listen to them anymore. So they made me a first sergeant. I figured I might as well cast my act, so I got my hair cut off short so it was sticking up like bristles on a pig’s back, and I stood in front of a mirror for a while and got this 1.5 look on my face, the way I had seen the most successful sergeants look. I cultivated a method of talking tough. I had known a lot of marine sergeants, a lot of marine top kicksl—tough boys— and I had seen them handle people, and I just followed a pattern and did what they did.

Somebody comes up to you and says, “You know, have you got any easy jobs around here? I’d really like to volunteer for something if I possibly could.”

“Well, can you drive a car? Can you?”

“Yeah! “

“Well, as a matter of fact, I’ve been looking for somebody that could drive a car. Come here.” Then you take him around to a wheelbarrow, and tell him, “You drive that for the rest of the day.”

Or a fellow walks up to you and says, “You know, I think “

“You what? What is your rank? Are you a captain now? Oh, captain, huh? You’re going to think. Well, I have some thinking for you to do. There’s a latrine to be dug back out here, and you can go out there and think with a shovel in your hands.”

You just keep it interrupted, you don’t let anybody get free or fancy or anything like that. And if you happen to notice somebody is having a real hard time doing something but he is still trying, you really fix him.

Now, there is a way of falling on a rifle whereby you go at a dead run and you can actually throw yourself down with the butt of the rifle in the ground and come up lying prone and fire the rifle. This is the method used by the marines to keep a wave of men firing, a wave of men running and a wave of men starting to run, so that you get an increasing wave action toward an objective. But that is really a tough exercise, and until a fellow can do this with complete abandon he just might as well quit; he will kill himself.

We had a very fat boy in that unit, and I found out that every time this fellow did it he would practically kill himself, so we kept him at it. It was about 95 degrees Fahrenheit down there at Quantico in the Virginia sun, and it was dry and dusty. Sweat was pouring off him and his khakis were just completely black with sweat. We kept him at it because he wasn’t doing it

well, and we let the other fellows stand around and see that we were keeping him at it because he couldn't do it well. After a while they just went down into apathy too.

The fellow, just completely caked with dust which had turned into mud, was in complete exhaustion. Finally he hit his rifle against a rock and the stock split. So I gave him a deck court-martial for wrecking a rifle. I was just modeling myself after the typical top kicks in the Marine Corps, that was all. That is the way they operate.

What you are doing when you do that is destroying the self-determinism of men. And if you destroy a man's self-determinism sufficiently you can then interpose yourself between "I" and his motor controls. If you can actually make a guy fall down and get in the mud and do all the rest of this sort of thing, the theory is that when you get him out there in front of a line of enemy firing, "I" is saying "Run!" and the top kick says, "Forward!" and they all go forward and they all get shot. It is a simple mechanism.

But how does he do it? He does it with close-order drill; he handles their bodies to the tune of his appearance and his presence until he is "I." If he can be 1.5, then his orders are 1.5 orders which will cause 1.5 action. That is just fine for military services but it is really bad for industry.

Of course, the Marines Corps doesn't depend completely on this mechanism. They have a little handy, jim-dandy assurance, and that is the gunnery sergeant. The gunnery sergeant in a marine company stands two paces to the rear of the last rank, and the reason he stands two paces to the rear is so he can shoot anybody that turns and runs. That is what his orders are.

It is pretty hard to make a bunch of naked-breasted men stand up to various small-caliber slugs which are flying with considerable velocity in their direction. But this mechanism can work and does work, but it only works by driving people down the tone scale into a complete regimentation.

However, when you have a system which requires sentient operation, which requires brains, where you have complex machinery and that sort of thing, this is not a method of training that you can use. You have to train these people along a self-determined line in order to raise their selfdeterminism with regard to their machinery, because if you don't, they are going to be fastened at some emotional response level toward every motion they have to make. If you are putting them up against things that are moving, things that have action and coordination, they will be at a tone level—if they have been trained by that method—whereby they will destroy the equipment. They will go through the motions and everything else, but the final result is they will destroy their equipment one way or the other.

Have you ever noticed how hard war is on machinery? If you ever looked at machinery which was used by troops in action, you know what I am talking about. Nothing may ever have happened to an airplane, it has only flown 150 hours and yet it is a piece of junk. There is just something about it. People along these various lower tone bands will make junk out of equipment, and they will make junk out of the people they are surrounded by.

There is actually a mechanism involved here by which the self-determinism can be willfully interrupted by another person. Parents, teachers, people in an individual's life keep imposing this, time and time and time again—restraints, restraints. And then they set up a whole verbal line of restraints to sit on top of the actual motion—"You can't go, you've got to stay there," all this sort of stuff. The person gets a set emotional reaction, finally, which will sit with him physiologically; he will get set into a certain level because of various restraints of his self-determinism. The restraint of his self-determinism winds up in fixing his behavior so that he as "I" cannot alter it. The environment is establishing his behavior. Below 2.0 on the chart, he is not establishing his behavior, but as he goes up the chart he is increasingly establishing what he should do.

And believe me, if you want anything left of equipment, if you want a person to be able to run fast equipment, to do anything with it that is effective, to be in the vicinity of motion or to engage in certain wellcoordinated motions, then you had certainly better look from 2.5 up, because a person cannot stand up to motion without getting emotional if he is too low on the tone scale.