

## **BASICS OF SCIENTOLOGY AND DIANETICS, PART I**

A lecture given on  
21 September 1952

Now you're studying a vast sea of data and this sea is studded with many facts and some are more important than others. For you to understand the operation of the human mind, it is really advisable to understand it from its most observable level. In other words, let's first examine it in the field of agreement and reality.

You should first take some agreement point. Here is the will of Homo sapiens. What most closely agrees with it and what is most swiftly reachable ?

This is for you. This is for the student to understand. This is for his understanding. It isn't for the understanding of your preclear. You don't care with techniques today whether your preclear understands anything or not—or even whether he talks English, actually.

Now, therefore, the easiest point of entrance on this material is, of course, your most basic things which were first discovered in Dianetics. And actually the entire track from the issuance of The Original Thesis, which is mostly in Book One, straight on through till now, is a graduated scale of knowingness on the subject of humanity. And an auditor must have a good acquaintance with that whole track; otherwise he suddenly finds himself adrift.

If you could consider that there were three bins of knowledge, one of those bins of knowledge is the abstract knowledge. It contains all the truth there will ever be, and everything in it is true, and none of it's related to the real world at all.

And then we take bin two. And bin two is routes by which we get to truth. Bin two would include all processes of knowing.

That would include religion, mysticism, chemistry, yogi, physics, witch doctoring, psychiatry, biology, how to be a carnival barker, anything. Any route of knowingness would be bin two. Dianetics and Scientology provided in the first steps, in which are found in the Logics, a good bridge for bin two: a frame of reference and a way to think about something.

And that's why the Logics are separate from the Axioms: because the Logics are applicable to any universe at any time, evidently, and the Axioms are only applicable to this universe—MEST universe—a special ized, motion universe. There are all kinds of universes possible.

All right. We have bin three, then, and that's what man thinks is real. Nothing in that bin is beyond that point. Everything in that bin is what man thinks he knows, he knows. It's his data today. This bin changes from generation to generation, century to century, age to age. Changes wildly.

If you were to walk up to an ancient Greek and you were to say, "Who was your father?" or you find out his name was Macolos and you say, "Well, is your father the Macolos of such and such a village?" he would be very upset with you, because he knows very well that nobody can trace who one's father is. The only certainty you have is tracing who one's mother was. You're sure of that.

And you'd find the entire matriarchal society quite baffling to you; it would be quite strange. And yet that's as true with them—to them as having a policeman down here on the corner directing traffic. But that would be a wild fact to him. He had one reality, you have, in this world today, quite another reality.

It's whatever happens to be real at the moment, that is real, in bin three. So bin three changes. Actually, nothing in bin three has anything but a relative truth. The very highest truth there is

in bin three is a relative truth. Highly relative. Very, very questionable—only true because something else is assumed to be true.

That's a very rocky sort of a reality to have, isn't it? But that is reality. And when you take these symbolisms of three—this symbolism of three bins, you'll find that man is living in a world of the relatively true, and it's only relatively true because he has agreed it's true, and that's the end of it. There is no more truth in it than that.

But he has certain ways of communication, certain ways of reality, certain methods of affinity with himself and his fellows and he uses these in certain ways and he behaves in certain ways, and this he considers to be real. Fascinating. He feels much better when he approaches what he thinks is real. But you see, he would be in a very bad state if he had to be assured that something was real, if he himself couldn't merely assert a reality.

If a man were able, himself, to do anything and say, "This is a reality and be quite content with it and quite active with it, he's cause. He wouldn't be in very much ARC with his fellows, either. He'd be in a bad way, because nobody would be agreeing with him.

It takes a considerable amount of courage and stamina, by the way, to suddenly announce that this happens to be true. And then, if it's very easily demonstrable, you find people will start to agree with you. And then you have a lot of people, and they all of a sudden go out of ARC to some degree with others. But if their truth is a workable truth in relationship to the other truths in bin three, something astonishing happens: The group who has the more workable truth becomes cause—whether it will or not—to the group who has the less workable truth.

And an immediate fight ensues, at first, whereby the big group that was already there is saying, "This is what we consider to be true, and therefore you, as a new unit, can't possibly . . ." so on. So the new unit has to be very slippery; they have to be very, very able. They have to know. They can't fumble.

Of all people, a group with a new reality which is demonstrable to an old reality must have thick hides and a very good command of their new workability. As such, whether they want it or not, they will become cause to the other group. They can repair the old reality.

We have a more workable reality.

We have to know that more workable reality to work this other reality which is still in bin three. Therefore, you should have, yourself, a nice bridge between these two realities. You should have some sort of an idea—and you do have a very adequate idea—of what was true in bin three, what was "absolutely true" in bin three, what was "true or we will burn you" in bin three, which of course means—probably—a damn lie.

But they asserted this terrifically workable truth—they thought. Now we've come along with another truth. So therefore we better know why *Homo sapiens* behaves as the unit *Homo sapiens*—as he does—and that he has engrams and that overt acts and motivators will get him in very bad shape, that you can process him just as a unit in one lifetime. You know what his factors are, you know what his beliefs are—you got that. You go up the line just a little bit further, and we know, then—still in the field of this workability—we know that this individual is experiencing below the level of his awareness, as far as he's concerned, certain things. And we suddenly dig these up like magicians and we show them to him and we say, "See?" And he says, "Ohhhh! Uhhmmm! It's true!" He's accepted your truth at that moment.

And then we go a little bit further. And then because we are experts—we don't even bother to consult with him, we are clear beyond his reality—we can practically, by the pass of a hand, make him well.

At this moment he'll—he tries to misunderstand completely—I mean, he doesn't want to know. He's just satisfied at this point to say, "They're cause! If you want so-and-so done, you go see one of them."

Now, that's all there is to that. He reasons up to that point, and he's quite happy at that time.

We're getting to that stage fairly rapidly in the States; we'll be here certainly within two years, at the very, very outside, because it's too spectacular. Your touching off all the rockets there are in the world, simultaneously, don't make as big a flash to an individual, or as much impression on an individual, as you suddenly giving him a few simple words in English and he suddenly experiences sensations he never dreamed existed. And he finds out that the truth which he accepted must be entirely false. And at that moment, why, he's yours!

Now, you'll find yourself doing this with people, and they won't have to understand what they're doing. But you have to. You don't ask them as individuals to build this bridge all the way up.

Now, you can take—and the first thesis will be available for this subject—you could take that and you could say, "Yeah, this is Dianetics. This is elementary. Read it."

Fellow looks through it and he says, "Gosh, that's right, that's right, that's right." Fits into his reality.

And you don't suddenly take this last text—it's going to be pub fished shortly—and say, "Well, here you are! The facsimiles are different potentials, and they discharge one to the other, and this creates an electrical display."

He'd say, "Oh, my God!"

But you tell him, "What you're trying to do is survive. And you're trying to survive, not just for yourself, but along eight dynamics."

If you want to be very simple, tell him he's trying to survive along four dynamics; he understands this even better. A big weight goes off of his chest, because the reality which he has is an enforced reality—it's been forced on him; he doesn't like it.

And so he comes up the stage just that far. So you don't have to sit and tell somebody just endlessly and forevermore and on and on and on, all about this material, unless you're trying to make out of him a practitioner, trying to make out of him an expert who can get results. That's something else. If you want to interest him in the subject and make his life a little more workable, give him something like The Original Thesis, the most simple piece of work on this subject. Or give him Self Analysis or give him the Handbook for Preclears. Handbook for Preclears is a little bit steep for people. That will be available here in about twenty or thirty days, by the way, and is a very good tool for the auditor. He can always hand it to a preclear and he can say, "Well, there you are."

And the fellow looks it over and he says, "Yeah."

It's not so simple that he realizes he doesn't need help with it. And you can assign him page after page of the thing to do. Oh, it's very elementary, really, compared to what you're doing, but there it is.

Now, the big joke is that what you're doing is far simpler. It's way out of reality, but it's much simpler. You don't have to work that hard. The boy who really had to work hard was trying—the boy who was trying to make chains of prenatals vanish. Now, he really had to work. And a fellow who would get in there with the snapping fingers and try to snap demon circuits out of the case just with a phrase . . . Yes, a good boy who really knew could do it. And, boy, you really had to know. Why, there were a thousand—and the computation on the

case was a very delicate thing; it had to be done with great expertness. Fortunately, that isn't the case.

So, we are dealing here with a paradox. We're going to do something that's terribly simple. And we're going to do something that is really so simple that you'll wonder, "Gee, how could that have remained unknown all this time? That's impossible!"

And however, if you want to tell somebody about it—or something like that, don't try to tell them about this, because you haven't built any bridge for them. You know, having been through the route, that you arrive at this point. And you are thoroughly connected with and in relationship to bin three. You know bin three. And you know you've got a bridge. And you know how you can get new facts. You also got a bridge up there into bin one.

But in trying to tell somebody about this subject, give them a copy of Self Analysis, something like that. You say, "All right, here, you're a preclear," and so on. "Here's a copy of Self Analysis."

And it says, "Are you a friend of yours?" and goes on from there, and just simply tries to orient him with the real universe, tries to tell him about what language is, tries to tell him about what symbols are. And you'll find—in the States, particularly, I have noticed this—that individuals read this and they feel very satisfied about the whole thing. The more unconscious a fellow is, the less he can operate. "Yeah, that's simple. I've felt stupid lots of mornings and I don't operate well." Imagine that! That's the level of fact you're going to get across.

You actually are looked upon as teachers. You're supposed to teach people things—they think. Well, maybe once upon a time you might have had to have taught your preclear something, but you don't have to teach your preclear now. You can do, and in doing you achieve a result. And you don't give a tinker's confounded doggone whether this person knows anything about the result. You don't care. You're just going to process him up to a point where he's apparently satisfied with the result and then you're going to shake him by the hand, pat him on the head and that's the end of him as far as you're concerned.

He'll increase his own understanding, because you, by teaching, trying to increase his understanding as a therapy is of limited work ability.

You can always make a person better by educating him, by the way. You can always give the person a better truth and make him feel better. You'd be surprised at the number of people who have picked up Dianetics and have read "survive," "four dynamics," "The function of the mind is to resolve problems of survival," and they've said, "(sigh)."

I've had four or five auditors lately, over at the house, one after the other, mentioning this factor, and telling me that I have neglected it—neglected it completely. I never make any allowances for what that does. Here's this fellow in this terrific wilderness. Mama and Papa and everybody down at the corner and the boss and the sergeant in the army and everybody's been trying to sell him that it's this and it's that and it's so forth, and he has never sorted his way through this wilderness of fact at all, and all of a sudden you give him a terrifically simple truth. And he looks at this, and you have just delivered into his hands an ax by which he can cut his way out of a wilderness of unknowingness. And he's very happy to be able to do that.

Hardly anybody fails to accept those points, by the way, except once in a while somebody will tell you, "Oh, I believe in the higher things. I believe in the much higher things in life. I believe in ethics, and that wouldn't come under survival."

I can point out more people who haven't survived because they've had no ethics. You can lay aside ethics for a short-term advantage. That's why the capitalist. . . I'm not a socialist, I'm not a communist; I'm probably an anarchist. I don't know what I am. But—Lord knows!

That's why they probably—the capitalist has such—what is really a perishable period in any society. I mean, he's quite—the philosophy rises up and it goes down in an awful hurry—is because the “business principle” is to do anything for a short-term profit. Lay aside ethics. And there's a direct relationship between expediency and survival.

Sometimes expediency is necessary—sometimes. But if you study this on the plane which we're going to be practicing it, if you study it on this plane, you'll find out that at no time, ever, was there any expediency in deserting the highest imaginable level of ethics. Get killed first. It's easier.

Has to do with survival? Well, the fastest way a man can die is by laying aside his ethics. He dies quick when he does that. You're dealing practically with the atom bomb of how to aberrate somebody when you make a man depart from his ethical standards.

Another way to kill somebody is to destroy for him that very fragile and obviously unimportant thing—and that one thing that “cannot possibly fall under survival”—a dream. You destroy for a man his dreams, and you've destroyed him. He can't even vaguely begin to survive without them—so much so that if you were merely to process, just as a complete process . . .

By the way, you're tremendously wealthy today; you have just thousands and thousands of processes, any one of which works. They almost all work equally well. There's five or six processes up at the top that are the kingpin processes, and these work, with a capital W But almost anything in this thing works.

You could just ask a person, “Recall the times when you felt you weren't going to survive.” And the fellow will think it over for a while. aRecall the times when you were sure you were going to survive.” Let's just keep this up for a while, and the fellow will be much better. One of the most elementary processes you've got.

Anyway, here is this terribly fragile thing—the dream. And when a man's dreams are dead, he's dead. Just as simple as that. I can tell you why this is, and it sounds very coldblooded once it's taken apart and demonstrated. It so happens that aesthetics are at a wavelength of point twenty-six zeros six [.0000000000000000000000000006] or in that band, centimeters. Terribly fine little wave. And theta is a zero or infinity.

And this was, by the way, worked out by just extrapolation: that it must be that aesthetics, then, are the most aberrative, or subject to the greatest amount of aberration. And it couldn't possibly be that you could get the heavy wave of effort to hang on to theta, because theta is a zero wavelength. So you'd have to have something which a person could confuse with a zero. If a person could confuse a wavelength with a zero, then you'd have to have a very thin, fine wavelength, wouldn't you?

I mean, here would be your two wavelengths: One 710 wavelength, and for—to get from no wavelength to a wavelength, you would have to have a very, very fine one. And you would have to get him to identify between these two things. And only then could you get this very fine one to hold on to a heavier one, and then this heavier one to hold on to a bigger one and the bigger one to hold on to a bigger one, and the bigger one to . . .

How do you amputate the whole bank? You run aesthetics. All of a sudden the facsimiles—if you're going to practice facsimiles—they just fly away like chaff in a windstorm! They haven't anything to hold on to.

Process a man's dreams and you're processing in the aesthetic band.

You disconnect it.

There is no engraving, there is no facsimile, there is no experience to which the person is hanging on, that does not have a high aesthetic value for him.

And you just say, "Now, let's get the beauty—let's just get the beauty, now, of being dumped in a rain barrel." You're trying to run an incident where a bunch of kids dumped him in a rain barrel. "Well, let's get the beauty of that—being dumped in the rain barrel." He can't get it. You say, Well, let's get the beautiful sadness of being dumped in a rain barrel."

He thinks about it for a moment. "Yes." All of a sudden he says, "You know, it's very noble of me to let them dump me in a rain barrel."

And you nod. You say, "Get the horrible ugliness of being dumped in a rain barrel."

"Yeah, uh-huh."

"Now get the beautiful sadness of that. Now get how cute it was of you to let them be interested enough in life by dumping you in the rain barrel."

"Oh, ha-ha!" Boom! There's the whole experience. Only there was terrific effort on this thing. There was choking, there was drowning. They took him out, they laid him on a doctor's table. They revived him with pulmotors, they—everything is—all this enormous experience. And the only reason he's holding on to it is because it was noble and beautifully sad of him to let them do this to him. There was an aesthetic value in it. And you've gotten the aesthetic and the counter-aesthetic—what he considered aesthetic about it, and what he decided wasn't aesthetic about it. And you process those two things out of it, and the incident goes psheew!

Worked out by extrapolation that the highest band I knew of was the aesthetic band, and this was the only band which could connect onto theta if the theta-MEST theory were true. Boy, you're really building a strange castle there of "ifs." And the funny part of it is the castle of "Hifs" stand there, and instead of a castle of "ifs" we have something which has terrifically heavy granite ramparts. Because that is a process.

You're going to process facsimiles? That's a process. That's Aesthetic Processing. Now, you run that into what's called Aesthetic Black and White Processing. And you run Aesthetic Black and White Processing into processing of ridges, and you have a big, broad process that's covering almost everything. Now you want behavior of energy.

Actually, you're not terribly interested in processing the past anymore. That's happy. Used to say all the time there was really no reason why you should process the past. We know a fellow gets better if you process the past.

Today we're processing the present. We're processing energy flow—live energy flow—in present time. We're processing "right now." And "right now" gets affected by "then," just as you learned in the first book and just as you learned in subsequent publications and all you've been practicing to date. "Then" affects "now." But all you will have to process, really, to get rid of "then," is "now." So you can process "now."

You're processing live, present time energy flow. And you get a live, present time energy flow process and the person becomes Clear—with exclamation points—and clearer than you ever thought anybody could be.

But you'd sure better know what "then" consisted of, in terms of mechanics. What can be in "then"? In other words, what is a facsimile? What is thought? What are past postulates and what are these various things which compose the "then" that you're getting rid of? If you don't know what these things are—you don't have to know what they are to process them, but if you don't know what they are, you all of a sudden find that "then" turns into "now."

The trouble with your psychotic is that he has too many “thens” which are so strong that they have become “now.” That’s all that’s wrong. He’s just got too much energy potential in his thennesses.

And he will tell you that—on an electronic incident—that it happens to him every night when he goes to sleep, that these beings come around and they gather around his bed and they bap him.

No, they don’t. But an engram goes into restimulation every night. You’d better know what was in that engram so you’ll know what he’s talking about, that’s all. Might even be handy for you to know how to process an electronic incident, because every once in a while you’ll find yourself with a preclear who’s got one there and he says, “This great ball of fire keeps rolling in front of my face!” And you say, “Find the center of it. Just put your attention on the venter of it.” His face gets hot, and it blows up, basically. It’s had him crazy for about twenty weeks before.

You’ll get, then, the gradient scale.

Now, I’ve probably thoroughly confused you about all this; that, of course, was my obvious intention! (audience laughter)

I’m going to give you a list of factors which an HCA definitely should know and should have down, not just cold, but should have at least at a -273 degrees centigrade. There shouldn’t be any motion for him in these factors, because these factors are the static with which he is working. And these factors are, for him at this time, the static that make him cause, because cause is a static which handles motion.

Therefore, people seek a stability. And this stability is composed of, of course, invariant, unvarying factors, which are themselves the basic bric-a-brac and mechanics of cause.

Now, we will start in here with the outline. This material is partly in my head—the answers to these things—partly in my head, part of it’s in publications (very little of it), and part of it, you will all of a sudden say, Sure!” You will know that you know it. And out of these parts, why, we will fix you up so each one of you has a static more strongly. Very simple.

The first factor on this is the introduction. [marking on blackboard] And the introduction factors are survival, the dynamics, the basic definitions of the mind and the function of the mind. Very simple. Quite simple material. Find this material in the first book. And this is covered, actually, in The Original Thesis or Book One. It’s just what it says in Book One, that’s all. Very simple.

Now, that’s introduction—introductory. And you’ll find out that in this reference—this frame of reference—you can communicate with people in what they laughingly call the real world. And that introduction is your communication with them. And you want to talk about this subject to them, talk about it in that reference, and they’ll never misunderstand you.

And you immediately tell them—you can tell them some of the background—”Well, there’s an electronic background to this.” That immediately sounds mystic to them, but it doesn’t sound too strange to them because they know that physics exists and they know that nuclear physicists exist and they know all this is too complicated possibly for anybody to understand. So they’ll abandon at that, but they know that’s real! Everybody knows there’s an atom bomb, so therefore there’s nuclear physics. That’s real. And you say, “Well, there’s electronic flows around a human being. You adjust these and . . . That’s very interesting, but that’s the process. But we’re getting back to this . . . Now, the purpose of man is surviving.”

Now, I want to point out to you something that is a joke. There’s a big jest contained here. The beingness that you’re processing is immortal. And how—how on earth. . . You are immortal. All that you know right this minute and what you know with is completely

unkillable. And you are fighting so that it will survive! Grim jest, huh? That's—people all down through the years have been carefully coaching the immortal to be able to survive.

As far as these dynamics are concerned, if you had eight dynamics—if you got a preclear up on all eight dynamics, of course, he would be God; that's all there is to that—he would be God. But the funny part of it is, is there's enough randomness in the world so that there could be technically many gods. And you will find that an individual will only get so high up on these dynamics, each one, and he'll go into action. And he won't ever get to be God, he'll just go into action. He'll get up to a high level of action and cause in relationship to his environment and he'll suddenly recognize Gee! Look at all that MEsr and look at all that energy and—gosh!”

And he gets a level of ecstasy about it that the little kid gets . . . Did you ever see a kid start playing? Oh, just—oh, they love to play! They're playing cowboy and Indian or something of the sort, and— slurp!—wonderful! Have a terrific ecstasy.

You want to know what sensation about living you ought to have: It's the same sensation with which you used to play cowboy and Indian. You also know that it isn't real when you're playing cowboys and Indians.

That, by the way, is on the upper strata of ecstasy. It really becomes ecstasy when you know you have to pretend that it's real so that it can be real. You're really in command of the situation then, and you can have a good time! It's fun. One of the biggest control mechanisms there are is: “You've got to take this seriously. You've really got to be serious about this. If you're serious enough about this—hm-hm-hm!—you'll get somewhere in life.”

The surest way to get nowhere in life is to be serious about it!

It's the most annoying to the moralists to have these offhanded, gay, debonair fellows, down on the track of history, who haven't given a doggone for man or devil. And who just gaily go through life with apparently the goddess of fortune handing out to them on every hand every single prize they have in the locker! Oh, how sad this is! Fellow doesn't even care what prize he gets. He says, “They're pretty, pretty.” Set them up someplace and forget about them. And then this other fellow that's been educated all his life to believe how serious he had to be and how hard he had to work, and he slaves and he works and he gets all A's in college. He gets married and he lives in the right place and he's nice to the boss and he does his job well and he takes his responsibilities seriously and so forth. And they finally bury him, and two guys walk behind him and his widow goes begging in the street. Why? Well, this isn't justice; this isn't right. He did everything he was supposed to do and it all came out wrong.

You want to know how to invent a therapy? Just look at a whole society. And then everything they're thinking and doing, just get the reverse on it.

The reason why you can do this is because what they're thinking and doing were control mechanisms imposed—even by themselves. On the horrible thought that somebody else wanted to live more than he wanted another part of the dynamic to live. And an imbalance on the dynamics finally resulted in everybody more or less believing in their own controls.

And these controls are reductive of human beings. Every one of them is reductive of human beings. So you want to know how to free man? Find out what he believes and reverse its vector.

You can look around you anywhere in society, really. If you want to know how to heal a business, put down all the factors in the business and then make a complete column, just arbitrarily, of 180 percent [degrees] difference against it. Now, out of that, by using some reason on it and looking it over, you'll all of a sudden produce some brilliant-plan which will tell you how the business can survive beautifully.

Now, as far as the mind is concerned, the mind has an anatomy. There is an anatomy, and we now know the structure and anatomy of the mind. It says carefully in the first book we do not know the structure. This book is not about structure, this book is only about function. So we have a mind and its function. And what I've brought here to you is the structure of mind. It has an actual structure that has nothing to do with neurons, synapses, nerves, really, at all—except as it works. Your mind could work a PBX board as well as it can work the human anatomy. It can work any switchboard.

So, when we study this mind in this introduction, we are treating a thinking process, we are treating a thinking process that Homo sapiens is dimly aware that he has. So, we're dealing with this introduction here, it was only necessary for us to talk about this thinking process which he knows he has. So that's the level we're dealing with in this sphere. Okay. Now, section two: We start to go into a little more action here. [marking on blackboard]

And by the way, prenatals and engrams, that sort of thing could also be part of that. It's not necessary for them to be. Prenatals and so forth.

All right. Now the second one is the beingness of Homo sapiens. And his beingness would be the field covering his actions. This would be the theta-MEST theory energy laws, much in theory. You would have this self-determined.

That's why—I go over that very rapidly because your energy laws and so forth are Logics, [marking on blackboard] Axioms. We start right out with those there, and the theta-MEST theory. Doesn't that look complicated? Hm?

This is a trick, a trick that you should know very well in putting people in their place: is figure out some very erudite and learned way to write something that's terribly simple. And then write it down that way and insist that that is the only correct way to write it, and then write a big tome, an enormously thick book, on proving that that is the only way to write it.

And you see those two Greek letters, theta and phi, and phi stands for the physical universe, and I never heard of the Greeks using a hyphen, but I could probably write a very large book on proving that this is absolutely right.

You know what the theta-MEST theory is? There's a lot of people going around and argue about the theta-MEST theory. They don't know what they're arguing about. Action is produced from relative inaction reacting against action. It's very simple. In other words, you've got a static and a kinetic—talk about it in terms of physics. You have a body in a state of rest. To produce action you have to come along and kick it. You're a kinetic, it was a static. And when the kinetic and the static acted together, you got motion. And you see how that is? Very simple.

You have a body which is moving slowly, and you come along and move it fairly rapidly. You're faster than the slower thing, so you have a relative action. There's a car traveling down the road at ten miles an hour, and everybody says, "That's a heck of a speed to travel," and somebody comes up behind him and pushes him forward to a speed of twentyfive miles an hour. Here you have two motions, each one of a different velocity. Two motions, and their interaction cause an action. This is the essence of simplicity.

If at any time anybody tries to tell you this is difficult or if you try to prove to yourself this is difficult and so forth, take a chair or something and knock it over, and the crash will wake you up. Because all we're talking about when we talk about the theta-MEST theory is all imaginary or hypothetical complete motionlessness, and an imaginary or hypothetical complete motion.

So we're talking about the two extremes that are possible: The stillest stillness that can be, which is unattainable—just as nobody can get down to complete coldness, which is -270 degrees centigrade. Nobody can get anything that cold. But they can get close to it, and they

know that 273 degrees centigrade, minus, is there, somewhere, around there. They're fairly well aware of this.

Now, that's hypothetical—unattainable, evidently. But that would be a complete motionlessness. That's a static. That's zero. That's no motion. It's also the infinity, because if you have a wavelength or a wave which has no wavelength, it might as well be an infinity wavelength; it might as well be infinity long as no long. It doesn't matter which way you say it.

But when we talk about what is the completest motional motion that you could get—you'd get the thing which was all motion—you'd have something in the form of a chaos of energy. Oh, it would just be a chaos of energy going in all directions at random, at velocities, and so forth. It'd be—all the motion there was would be in that item. And that is the chaos of the physical universe.

The physical universe is not, though, as “motion” as you can get; you could get even more motion than this. So it's not the ultimate, either. But it's hypothetical, then—MEST, you say—MEST. What you really mean, then, is a chaos of motion. And those are the two widest of the polarities.

But you get a fellow going ten miles an hour, and he doesn't look he's—like he's going very fast to the fellow who's driving twenty-five miles an hour.

[At this point there is a gap in the original recording.]

Now, when we get that down as a principle—that's very simple as a principle—we'll see that emotion is less action than effort. Here's a fellow walking, and a fellow doing a slow boil or a burn or being angry—he's not in as much action as a fellow who is walking, is he? So you can play emotion against effort. Why? One is relatively motionless compared to the other one.

So, when you start processing effort, what is the next thing that will show up on the case? Emotion, naturally; it's the other dichotomy.

Now, a dichotomy merely means two sides of this stillness and “motionalness.” Now, we get up above that and we find that people are very critical: the isn't rational: he's very emotional.” And what do we find as the two offplays there? Very simple. They're very narrow, you see, these two bands. This fellow—one is sane, the other is emotional, and between the two they get an awful lot of action, believe me. They get into what's commonly called arguments.

But you start getting reason off of a case . . . “When are all the times you've figured out answers to problems?” You just ask a guy that, the next thing that's going to turn up will be probably the lower band—not effort, but emotion. He'll find out how sad he was to have figured something out and how happy he was to have figured this thing out and so forth. He's right in there. Emotion is right next to logic—rationality. Rationality is another point on the band. You see, they're not very far apart.

Well, let's go up a little bit higher. Let's go into the art world. And we find out that artists are painting without any reason whatsoever, except it gives them a mmwhh!—whatever it is. And nobody is desirous of this except the artist. Except other people can come around and look at this and they think “My, isn't that nice! Isn't that wonderful!” “Oh yeah, it's nice”—ooh-ah over it or say, “Gee, isn't that horrible!”

And what do we find, though? We find art critics, don't we?

They're being "rational" about it all. They're saying, "Well, the reason why he tried to represent the social consciousness of the Lower Slobovians was very well indicated in his own sociological background."

They're not being any—even vaguely reasonable, but they're going on and trying to be reasonable about aesthetics. But aesthetics are pretty close to reason, but they're not reason. But they will interact, and you will get action by putting reason and aesthetics close together. And they are so close together that they cause action all the time. Any column of the art world—anything like that—they're trying to be reasonable. And the artist fights the critic like mad, because the critic's trying to be reasonable about something that isn't reasonable. In other words, here's action—close together.

Now, the complete serenity and stillness—as much a completeness of serenity and stillness as can be imagined by an artist, Homo sapiens—is right next door to aesthetics. Right next door. And the very funny part of it is, is just on the other side of aesthetics is all motion. So you get aesthetics touching at once upon stillness and you get them touching upon terrific action. You get the two together. You got a circle. It's a circle of wavelengths. The waves get—are first at zero, then they get a very fine wave and then a little coarser wave, and a little coarser wave and then a little coarser wave and then a little coarser—and then, it's so coarse that it's no wave. And you're right back where you started, see, with your circle. And this circle is very interesting, because it is process able as such.

Hence this thing called the theta-MEST theory. All the theta-MEST theory means is there is a static of life, and it in action against the motion of the physical universe produces problems, solutions, randomities, actions. That's all there is to it. Very simple.

And we get down here into the next thing: self-determinism. .

[marking on blackboard] Now, actually, people understand this to be something. But if they look at it very closely, they'll find out that self-determinism is for all the dynamics.

That's something hard for people in America to grasp, because nearly everybody over there runs on the first dynamic. And they say, "Of course, the first dynamic is all the first dynamic there is, so that's the first dynamic there is and that's self-determinism. That means only I could be God. I've got it! Tsk! That's it." And you'll find more of them in insane asylums saying just that. Yeah, they've got that all figured out.

Actually, the course of processing is to process a person so he can be the first dynamic. He can be the first dynamic. Though you have to work hard to get a fellow actually to be the first dynamic. Because at the beginning of processing, you invariably find him with the first dynamic at minus zero. There's a subzero Tone Scale that goes down to -8.0. And it goes from 8.0 [-8.0] up to zero. And the actual beingness of your preclear when you first run into him is at -8.0. He not only not is, but he is something else.

Now, a fellow's pretty bad off when he gets there. And he not only not is and is being something else, but he is hiding it. And so your first your first effort on your preclear is to get him to be the first dynamic. And if you build your first dynamic up, you've got to get a person fully and completely on the first dynamic, and then you can hit him on the second dynamic the way he ought to be, because it's only then safe for him to touch the second dynamic—the second dynamic being an inter action that's quite aberrative. It's an interaction with MEST bodies, and so it's quite aberrative.

Freud was absolutely right. No man was more absolutely right for a long time. Of course, he was also absolutely wrong when he said that . . . If he said that "sex is the cause of a lot of aberration," why, there's some correctness in that. It does, it causes aberration. It is more causative in this society than any other single cause, if you want to approach it from a Straightwire proposition. If you want to be terribly superficial and just patch something up

hurriedly, why, you just consider that the biggest thing you could process would be sex. It's not too far wrong.

I mean, a fellow—if you didn't know anything, that's what you'd process, obviously. Because it's so obviously wrong. But actually there is a type of incident that gives people nervous stomachs—that is a sexual incident—and you'll know more about this when we start processing.

The point I'm making is, is once you've got the fellow all the way up on the first dynamic so that he's perfectly content to be himself and he is himself and he can act as himself, then is the time to start hitting the second dynamic, because, you see, the second dynamic has to do with an interrelation with other people. And the second that you get the second dynamic, you are dealing with your first fringes of interrelationship with other people. And then, when you've got the second dynamic all under control, only then could you start really processing the third dynamic. And when you got the third dynamic, now you can process the fourth dynamic and the fifth dynamic. And you could look at all these things superficially in the preclear and say, "Yes, he's part of all those things." But when it comes to restoring him, it is just exactly like walking along a path which says, "Dynamic one, dynamic two, dynamic three, dynamic . . ." Just like this—let me draw you a graph—[marking on blackboard] one, two, three, four, five, six, seven, eight.

(Recording ends abruptly)