

ACTIVITY OF THE AUDITOR IN THETA CLEARING

A lecture given on
24 September 1952

Tonight, I want to talk about the activities of an auditor in Theta Clearing. This talk is being delivered here at this time just before you go into a very heavy lot of auditing and processing. And I want you to take very, very good notes mentally—devil with a piece of paper—because you want to be able to do these things, not know them. So I'll ask you to take this material and just file it in the action bank, not in the memory bank.

The problems of an auditor are dual; they are actually greater than the problems of a medical doctor and are much greater—much, much, much greater—than the problems of psychiatry.

An auditor is looked upon, on the one hand, as somebody who processes people.

In a very short space of time there is a book coming out called *How to Live Though all Executive*—is its sort of slang title. It's known as the *Manual of Communications* and is industrial communication—industrial, group, governmental communication systems—actual systems worked out, perhaps, for the first time and codified.

They mean an enormous difference, for instance, in the ability of a group to be causative. The rules of communication amongst a group have been worked out down to a rather fine point in that manual.

Well, if you're an HCA, you'll be expected to know that. You'll be expected to know, as well, how to put groups together, and that's a brand-new subject all by itself. You'll be expected to know the proper conditions of prenatal care and delivery. You should be able to assure some woman who has not been able to have a baby, or some man, of some success in this line.

One of the easiest things you can take care of, by the way, is that particular department of knowledge—the conceiving, gestation, delivery and raising to infancy of a baby *Homo sapiens*—and that's very easy.

When you look at the span of knowledge encompassed in something which says it is a science of knowledge, go ahead and faint. You should be able, however, whether you know it or not, to work it out that (snap) fasts You're up Tone Scale, and the first thing you should learn about this subject is how to think in it.

Now, having burdened you with that, let me burden you with this: There is something else here that you are doing. You're doing something efficient, you're doing something active, and if you do not produce results on your case, you just didn't know what you were doing.

It's something like playing chess as compared to cassino or blackjack—vingt-et-un. There's some luck in a card game—not in a chess game. When somebody says, "Checkmate," why, that just means you weren't up on the game that well; you weren't as smart as they were. It's a condemnation.

Now, it's no use to say, "Well, take care of 50 percent of them; the other 50 percent of them don't care." No, because you'll feel the strain and disappointment within yourself too acutely to banish away such a thing.

Yes, I can tell you there will be case failures. These case failures will be traceable to the environment into which you return your preclear. They are solved by taking the preclear out of an environment for the length of time—fortunately, a very short time now—required to condition him. But these should be minimal—minimal.

I would invite you to specialize in Theta Clearing on the one hand, and the eradication of chronic somatics on the other, rather than trying to treat human aberration.

There's a little grim jest, you know, about all this Some of the Homo sapiens they keep in insane asylums, and the rest of them they let run around loose.

And this boils down to the fact that when you are hitting the lowest bracket of sanity, you are not hitting at an acute problem of Homo sapiens. Criminality is; that's an acute problem. There are many criminals for every announcedly insane person.

You take almost anybody in the society—he has an impulse to do a good job, try to get along; he wonders why he's failing, why he's stumbling; he's already fairly able. You can make him a great deal more able.

And in that field, if we wish to bring a culture to a high level of fruition, we can triumph. You can treat all the insane people you want and you won't have done the culture an ounce of good. Horrible fact.

If you were to set up a system, however, which made the managers of firms way up on the Tone Scale—if you made Theta Clears out of the manager of every business and concern in England, you made these people Theta Clears, you think you'd be worrying about rationed butter? A European army wouldn't have a chance. The frontier of finance has always been a superior line of conquest.

So, on one level we can say, "Poor, poor, poor Homo sapiens. Poor people. Let's find the really bad-off people and then process them." That's a good way to stagnate a society.

An auditor who does this announces to his fellow auditors his own position on the Tone Scale. There is a maxim about this, a little law that goes along: People try to help people lower than themselves on the Tone Scale. And the people who are lower than themselves on the Tone Scale, if an auditor is down around 1.8 or 2.0, would of course be down in the insane band, even though they were apparently rather sane by current standards. They'd be badly off, badly neurotic, something like that.

Do you know that somebody at that tone band will also militantly create a low-toned state of mind in other individuals so that he can help them? People up to about 2.3 on the Tone Scale will actually try to make others below 2.3 so that they have the triumph and glory of having something to help.

We're not going to get around that law, as such, in our own cases, but if we can ride at 8.0, 16.0, 20.0—ha! who will we be processing? We'll be processing people that are down there around 4.0, 3.0; those are the people who are getting things done in this world.

Well, we could just process on and on and on to accumulate a lot of MEST. And those of you who've been outside and taken a look at the MEST which you're packing around already will have some idea of what MEST is and how valuable it is or isn't—the accumulation of MEST, that sort of thing.

Putting together some kind of a world, and a society in that world which is a society of peace where everybody isn't tearing everybody else apart, you could make a sort of an asylum on the track all by itself. A different kind—a game preserve for thetans!

And so, in such a wise, there is a large mission to be accomplished. And it won't be accomplished by comparing yourself to a medical doctor or comparing yourself to a psychiatrist. You are not playing in the same league; you are neither one.

Friend of mine once wrote a story in which he described a civilization. And in that civilization there were a number of men who were known—and women—who were known as “synthesists.” And these synthesists simply pulled all the lines of knowledge, crossed them together and made sure things got planned right, and the whole culture healed up. And there were only fifty or sixty of them on this whole—in this whole culture.

It doesn't take numbers. That's a Napoleonic idea that it's a number of battalions. Actually, a half a dozen people in a high state of repair, in very good condition, would make a dent in the civilizations of earth the like of which has plainly never been made before.

Don't fall for the old saw that “it is the age and the culture that produces the man.” Hm-mm. The half-dozen produce the conditions of the millions, of the hundreds of millions and of the billions.

A fellow by the name of Ibsen is a good example of that. Norway and Sweden had a culture that should have only happened to a cow. And Ibsen came along and he wrote a lot of plays. And the plays were performed, and Norway and Sweden took the stage behind the footlights. And they're there today, playing the plays of Ibsen, with their manners, their politeness, a desire for some art and a desire for some beauty. He taught them that.

Now, you could say, “It was a lot of people who did all this.” And you could undoubtedly go back in history and find out that twenty years before the birth of Ibsen there was a fellow who had some wrapping paper and wrote five words on it “and this proves that there was writing before there was Ibsen.”

But there was a fellow by the name of Pericles, way back earlier, who, in that age—whoever it was in that age, they weren't very many—you get the great works of Greece. And what do we do? We could sit right here, even those with a very scanty knowledge of Greek arts and sciences, and we could probably name them all off just on a chant. They're not ten men.

So therefore, there is some chance and opportunity to produce with what one knows, a wide betterment, and to use the knowledge to do less actually insults it.

Would you get a trained motor machinist and send him to school for a long time and then turn him loose to repairing the left wheel on a child's toy? Well, that's what you would do with this knowledge if you devoted it exclusively to “Milady Gotbucks's terrible neurosis about fleas.” And it's all very true we can use funds, and in the beginning we will probably be treating a lot of Lady Gotbucks. That's true, that's true, and we'll probably have fleas all over us.

But that's only up to a certain point of planning. That period, by the way, is necessary for our own sakes, to achieve as high as possible a knowledge and a reeducation on ourselves, and to know what we actually know. You see, it's one thing to know and another thing to know that we know. It'll take some months before some of us find out that we know, even though we know very well.

Now, the next point on the line that makes an auditor different is lots less general, lots less high-flown. I've already said he's there to produce an effect, he's there to cause a change. If he can't, he should be ashamed of himself. But there he should cause a change and he should be able to do this fairly markedly. And in that one thing he differs widely from former practitioners in the fields of the humanities!

The auditor is there to produce a change. Former fields hardly dared—most of them—go higher than to effect a no-change: “Let's get the fellow back to where he was just before he got sick.” And we consider this all right. And yes, it was, since it matched up with the skill which was present. This is not a condemnation of that. It just shows you suddenly—should open your eye to the fact that there's a change of viewpoint here.

We're not interested in the status quo of Homo sapiens!

All we can see, actually, as an auditor, as we look at Homo sapiens, is raw meat. Here is something, here is raw material, here is a relatively worthless product, here is a piece of junk with a jewel in the middle of its forehead and with a strange capability of being able to span up the line to a very, very high level of beingness and to be more than anyone ever imagined a man ever could be.

Now, that's an entirely different goal. Milady Gotbucks is going to lose her fleas, until we've got lots of training and quite a bit in the exchequer so that program two on this can go into effect. But that won't be very long and is not our goal—and I hope you agree with me that that is not our goal.

Now, this next thing I just mentioned is the fact that an auditor is using the strongest and most powerful tools applicable at this date to the betterment of the self-determinism of an individual.

If you knew old-time auditing (the comparison is, old-time auditing —small rifle, long range)—you could do the job. Long time, long range; would have taken an ungodly number of troops to have solved the problem. It was easier to solve the problem higher than to hire more troops. There just weren't that many troops. It looked to me before, it would have taken one year of one half of the world processing the other half of the world with the first book, and then one year of the improved half processing the other half, and then a third year to scan it all out.

Now we're not in that kind of a circumstance. And I bring this up not as a comment on techniques but as a comment on an auditor reaction.

Once in a great while the navy will put a sailor in a gun turret and have that sailor at the first wham of the eleven- or fourteen-inch guns— “Nyahhh!” He suddenly found out he wasn't playing with a cap pistol. When it went off, it said, “Boom!” You'll have to learn that by experience, but be prepared, because you're not playing with a cap pistol. You're not playing with earlier—the rifle that we had earlier. You have practically got an A-bomb in your hands.

Now, it requires a certain care in handling, a certain care. And the first care is: never lose your nerve. This gun never—you understand me clearly on that—this gun never backfires, so long as an auditor has got his nerve.

This is a weird sort of a weapon. It consults the auditor's state of mind, and then it says, “Oh, you're scared? Oh! Now I can blow the whole breech out!” And it will! But that gun could be handled by a baby—it could be just that, it could be handled by a baby—if the baby had his nerve. Real cast-iron nerve: calm, cool, quiet, collected.

The state of mind in which you do Theta Clearing is an inexorable knowingness that it's going to take place, and a complete and utter belief in one's ability to take care of any franticness, upset or emergency. If you cultivate that state of mind and if you do your auditing in that state of mind, then your preclear will never come to any harm and nothing bad will happen and everything good will occur.

If I could put this in eighteen-point caps, or maybe put it in type the size of—type the size that they print an announcement of war with, and then make it into italics and then print it in red and then throw it up on the wall with a tremendous amount of white behind it, it would still be an understatement of how much there is behind that.

The very essence of Theta Clearing—the very essence of it—is an inexorable knowledge that it's going to occur and a complete belief in one's own competence to carry out whatever happens with cool courage. And then to continue that state of mind and to behave on those lines throughout the auditing session.

The only reason any one of you would feel any qualm whatsoever about letting any other one of you or any particular one of you audit him is contained in that: “This fellow might not believe I can do it, and he might lose his nerve.”

Now, as far as the belief is concerned, he doesn’t get out because you believe it. But you can sit there, actually broadcast at him enough “You can’t do it. You can’t do it. You can’t do it,” until he can’t. And you can put that into your voice.

You can say, “Well, all right, get out now. Yeah. Mm-hm. Oh, you’re out? Mm-hm. You’re sure you are, huh? You know that, do you? You think you’re out, huh? Oh, you’re out, huh? Well, huh! Let’s see? Well, what’ll I do now?”

And do you know that the thetan in the body, in a large number of cases when the person—the combination, body plus GE plus thetan equaling Homo sapiens—when this fellow, in a large number of cases, starts into the field of Theta Clearing, his entire press and effort is to keep that thetan in the preclear’s body. “Huh! Don’t let him out! Don’t—don’t—don’t do that. Whsst! He’ll get loose! And if he got loose, he’d zap me! And if he zapped me . . .” You’ll be surprised.

I watched a group of trained HDAs with their first experiments in Theta Clearing as auditors. Oh, my God! This happened twice before I bothered to observe it. These fellows are competent auditors. They’re perfectly competent auditors. They can audit engrams day and night, they handle psychotics, they can do all these things; it’s just wonderful, everything is fine!

I popped somebody out of his body and straightened him up pretty well. Noticed the thetan was quite raving mad; straightened out a couple of postulates and made the person feel better, snapped him back into his body, intended to audit him again.

Next morning—quite unusual in this sort of thing, in fact, it’s so unusual that something else has happened—this person is there on my doorstep in a frantic state of mind. Unaccountable! I mean, how did this happen? So I go ahead. I have great faith in humanity, for some reason or other. Never bothered to ask why this happened or what had happened, but I go ahead and I get him out again. I change a couple of postulates and get him in again and say, “Now move in and out several times.” They do. “Now scan out all the sticking stuff.” They did. I say,

“Are you all right now?” “Yeah! Yeah. Yeah, I feel fine. I do feel fine,” he says. Goes away rejoicing.

Next morning, calls me up in a state of frantic terror!

“Shall I come over?” this person wanted to know.

And I said, “No. I’m going to come over there.” And I did. And I said, “Who around the institute here audited you?”

“Well, I said I wouldn’t tell, but night before last it was . . .” and he named off two of the top auditors in America.

And those people couldn’t keep their hands off the preclear! They had to get to this preclear and get him in the body and seal him in there quick! “Nice preclear. There, there we are. (panting)”

After I left there a couple of hours later, we didn’t have any trouble afterwards with that. We didn’t have any trouble at all, but everybody was in apathy. Because they started auditing—these two boys—and I found out that they had already tried to get out of their bodies, they couldn’t get out of their bodies, they had decided that something like this was bad or

something, privately to themselves, almost unknowingly to themselves, and then had spent almost their entire auditing effort afterwards in making it impossible for anybody else to get out of his— with, if you please, conscious knowledge. They knew they weren't doing this preclear any good.

Now, we are facing, in this regard, an obsession which is a brand-new obsession in the field of Dianetics. It's a brand-new kind of spinbin fodder—brand-new. It is "Don't let them get out of their bodies. Do anything, but don't let them get out." And it's an obsession which hits people after they find out that it can happen. They're perfectly all right before that, and the second you do something like that, why, this obsession will hit somebody. Not your preclear. It'll never hit your preclear. It'll just hit somebody around him. You'll find him going home to his wife and his wife will say to him, "Well, dear, do you think that's safe? Are you sure? Have you asked the minister?" I mean, just as bad as that.

You'll find this person—slam! crash! anything—get this guy nailed down quick. Invalidate him: "How do you know you're out, dear? Huh. Oh, you mean you're not sure now. Well, you should be careful. You remember the doctor used to tell you, you had to take those pills. He said if you took too many of those pills, it could give you hallucinations. Well, these hallucinations are pretty bad, dear, and, as a matter of fact, I don't think you better go back to see that auditor anymore. I think you better go over—we got a nice, nice, nice fellow over here who gives you electric shocks. That'll keep you in!"

Why do you suppose the electric-shock machine is so popular? It's a dramatization—a low-scale dramatization of the electronic incident. And why do you think the electronic incident was handed out to bodies? It was handed out to bodies to keep the thetan in. It's a dramatization of this, and it is a tremendous desire and so forth to nail somebody down and nail them down quick.

So you as an auditor are coasting out against all past postulates on the part of the race, which is "Stay in. Don't ever get out. When the body is dead, you're dead. Anything you forget, that's gone." The race is trying to run on these things and is running itself out the bottom of the spout on these things.

All right, all sarcasm aside, what do you do with this as an auditor? And if you find this sensation in you, and you start auditing somebody out to Theta Clear, you quit right then. Don't mess him up. Recognize it for what it is.

But it isn't going to happen to anybody present from this angle, because you're all going to know it. But one of the ways it's done, and you want to watch an auditor when you're training auditors and tip them off to this fact: They'll start the orientation step, and then they'll do a misdirection and a switcheroo and they will get the thetan to suddenly start treating some inaccessible portion of the body—anything to get him off the track of what he's doing—and get him to do something that's relatively hard or difficult or impossible. Or get him someplace where he shouldn't be, such as out in front of his face trying to straighten up the wart on his nose or something of the sort. Anything. Anything—but don't let him get oriented and don't let him get out.

Okay.

You as an auditor will have that as an antagonist in people around your preclear. You've never had that one—that particular facet—before, but it follows a familiar pattern. So, therefore, do your job well enough and fast enough, when you do your job, so that the fellow is in a very good state of knowingness and can't be shaken. After that, he's safe. That's right.

So you have to kind of know, how can I do this fast, huh? If you do it, do it! Inexorable. It doesn't take very long—some of you have found that out—it just doesn't take very long for it to happen. It could take quite a while for a thetan to come all the way up the track, but to get outside and know he is outside and be able to handle himself outside and start changing

postulates around and make himself better outside—a lot of you have an awareness of this as occurring.

Now, somebody would come along to you, when you've really been at this for a little while, somebody has done a fairly good job on it, and says, "Nobody can get outside of his body; that's nonsense." You'd think he was the nonsense, not the reverse. But your preclear is going to be victimized, because he's not going to be able to keep from bragging. And then people are going to play that old one on him I was telling you about today: "Prove it!" "Prove it," they're going to say.

Now, the best thing, as far as I'm concerned, that an auditor can do is be inexorable about it, don't listen to any nonsense about it, carry on through with complete courage and regardless of what the preclear does, boot on through with standard technique.

The first thing a person does when he goes into fear as an auditor is abandon technique. He throws that overboard and says, "We'll have to try something else." I'll let you in on something: there isn't anything else. I know, for the good reason I've been experimenting with this for quite a while. And you're using the "mostest tools they is" right at the moment.

And they're in Steps I, II, III, IV, V. And if you find yourself processing VI and VII, be sure you're well paid. (audience laughter)

So, there's your fort. In a regiment, it loses the battle the moment its line or formation crumples. Let its formation go out of line or crumple, it's a dead regiment.

But say it has a thousand men in it; if it cuts and runs . . . If it stayed right on the line of fire, it might lose 50 percent casualties, but if it cuts and runs in the action, it'll lose about 98 percent.

There is nothing sadder or more fatal than retreat. There is only one answer to auditing, and that is attack. And when you've gone to the furthest limit of attack and you know you can go no further on the limit of attack, you have held the line, you are using standard processes, techniques, you are being calm, cool, collected and quiet, you have your very, very best bedside manner, and it's just working fine, and your preclear is shaking all over the place and little prisms are falling off the chandelier, and the people downstairs are wondering what the earthquake is, and the teacup has just soused off on the floor, and the mantelpiece is starting to cave in, and you can see clearly that the preclear in another couple of seconds—he didn't notice it, but he had his cheek in between his teeth—his teeth are going to go right on through the cheek; you say, "All right now. What feeling do you have toward . . ."

You're going to be sitting there, occasionally—luckily or unluckily—you will suddenly ask somebody to do this, he'll do so quite ably and start for the nearest star! He wants nothing more about it. But two seconds before this he was perfectly happy; he seemed to be a very wellordered Homo sapiens. And you say, "Get outside," and all of sudden you see this body go back like this and go like this and then go blong! And you say, "What's happening? Did you get out all right? Now where are you?" The body is all over like this and it says nothing; it doesn't do a thing! You're sitting alongside of, actually, a corpse! (audience laughter)

And then it tugs like this, and you say, "Well, he still had a circuit attached to him. Ha-ha! But you don't do that; but you don't do that. You say, "Well, yes, now you're positioned properly. Let's just take a look at the body now and feel a little sympathy for it." And the body starts going like this, and so forth. This fellow is on his way for Alpha Centauri. That's going to be his first stop! He met a babe there a couple of hundred lives ago, and he thinks she's still around.

His whole attitude is escape; he wants nothing to do with it. And very often, pathetically enough, he'll be trying to escape in a state of unseeingness, unfeelingness. He just happens to be in a complete state of beingness for the first time in ages. He suddenly knows where he is.

He says, “My God! I’m me after all, and I thought I was that damn body!” He’s not going to wait for the next freighter Mars-bound. No, he’s on his way.

So, what do you find? That you have to sit there and look at an inanimate body, and you get no replies from it. And you just sit there and you say, “Get the feeling, now, toward the body.” “Now your feeling of the body towards you. Can you get that? That’s fine.” The body—you can hear the vertebrae starting to creak, see, in the body. It’s going around like this and you know at any moment that you’re liable to hear that neck snap or something of the sort.

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

. . . thetan-plus-body range of the Tone Scale. And this thetas plus-body range goes from 0.0, which is a dead body—being a body. [marking on blackboard] And above that at .375 is apathy (the thetanplus-body range now); 0.5 is, for all truth, intents and purposes, making amends; 0.8, propitiation (this is your present processing Tone Scale, by the way, so you better have it); 0.9, sympathy; 1.0, fear; 1.2, no-sympathy; 1.5, anger; 1.8, pain; 2.0, antagonism; 2.5, boredom; 3.0, conservatism; 4.0, enthusiasm; 8.0, exhilaration; 20.0, action (action optimum); 40.0, serenity (here is Buddha regarding his navel). Okay. That’s thetan-plusbody range.

Now, let’s take it as the thetan scale range. It doesn’t mean any more than it says here. You got this? Well, that’s all right. I’ll go over here and I’ll make this break point [marking on blackboard] a little higher level in order to get this whole scale together here. And we’ll get—this is thetan plus body. Now, this is the full scale range of a thetan; it just keeps right on going down, and at 0.0 is, of course, being a body.

Now, a thetan would come all the way down through this line as himself without having any body, you understand? He would go all the way down from 40.0 to 0.0 without having a body. And then he’d keep right on going down as soon as he acquired a body. As the thetan, he’s below 0.0 when you initially discover him.

Thetan plus body is a stimulus-response, built-in educational pattern that is a complete—it’s just cultural level; it’s stimulus-response and very automatic in this range and it really has no . . . The second you get out of stimulus-response on the thing, the thing starts to go off behavior.

But down below this level, 0.0, this is a minus scale. 0.2 is being other bodies—other bodies. Not only is he one body, he looks up and finds out he’s going to be other bodies, too. This could be considered to be the outward-bound thetan—hell, mixed up. Minus 1.0 would be punishing other bodies. These figures, of course, you know, are quite arbitrary.

I say punishing other bodies. It’s not correct; it’s just punishing bodies, own body and others—each one of these—own and other bodies.

Now, -1.3 is responsibility as blame—as blame. That’s “It’s my fault.” “It’s somebody else’s fault.” “They are to blame.” “I am to blame.” Way down there.

And -1.5 is controlling bodies; he has come into an anxious band about controlling bodies. Up to this time he did it so automatically that it didn’t matter at all to him what he was doing, and then we get into controlling them. And he’s concerned, by this time, about controlling them. Now, when he finds out that his control of them isn’t too good, he does enough overt acts to get protecting bodies. And then, below that, we get -3.0, owning bodies. When he gets down this far, he owns a body. He has to own a body; that is to say, you’ll find fellows—this is jealousy right in this band, too; this is your thetan manifestation of jealousy. Of course, jealousy appears up here in the old upper scale as a social-response mechanism. But when your thetan is demonstrating jealousy, he’s down here at -3.0. He’s got to own bodies. He

can't control them, he's got to absorb them. He's got to be all through them. He's terribly concerned about who owns this body, and this goes out in the manifestation of jealousy.

Now, -3.5 is approval of bodies. And -4.0 is needing bodies. And -8.0 is hiding.

Now, your Tone Scale range, then, at this time, is on this whole bracket here. Your thetan is picked up on a case level V—Roman numeral V—in “hiding.” Your thetan is in hiding—very desperately so. And he's . . . If you want to process him up, you process him up this Tone Scale. And you actually can process him up this Tone Scale by each one of these steps - ptock, ptock, ptock, ptock, ptock!

Now, there are a couple of additional little steps in here that we can fit in on the line—and that's at about somewhere in the neighborhood of about a -6.0—is some kind of a psychotic attitude called desertion. It's just a . . . You see, it becomes silly beyond silly at this point, actually, because here he is at 6.0, here he is at 6.0, and he's got on his mind the fact that. . .

See, it's a horrible joke. Up here he's not anything. He's not a body. At no time on this whole scale is he actually a body or is he actually, really, a part of anything. But as his self-determinism declines, he is so much a part of something, that in order to depart from it he would have to desert it. You get the idea? Some such rough approximation. So we will put desertion down here just to make sure it's here.

These are just very arbitrary, they're not even necessarily in the right order, but we're just hitting them here so we'll have a consistency of communication, more than an exactness. Down here, let's put, at the moment, at 7.0, just so it will be on this scale, the emotion of desperation for the thetan and a -8.0, let's have hiding.

So, just to make sure that we've got all the factors, we process on the same doggone scale. Okay?

I don't guarantee these numbers at all. I just dreamed them up, because this is obviously a workable modus operandi, and so on. And I imagine as we examine these things, we will find out they are roughly fitted in here as lower harmonics of the upper scale—they're very roughly fitted in there.

And we know that a thetan can go way down below body death; that's why we have a minus scale. And we know that as he dwindles down below the level, himself, of body death, he is deader and deader and deader according to him, and he has all sorts of locks.

Actually, he's already a body, and at -1.0 we get the attitude of punishing bodies as a body.

Now, look how this scale will range. Your individual will be, let us say, at 0.9, stimulus-response sympathy as a thetan plus body. And he's going around being so sympathetic to everyone. “Why don't you all get tired and quit? You work so hard, and so on. We have to be concerned about you.”

By the way, I get that maybe three, four times a day. And it's very, very difficult for me in a relatively uninhibited state of mind not to say “Erkl” in the person's face—say, “What do you want to kill me for?” is my immediate response on such a thing. That's the full intention of it.

So 0.9, he's got stimulus-response-mechanism sympathy, see?

And now, way down low on the minus scale you will find things that act like sympathy again, because the actual fact is that from 0.0 down you have a sympathy mechanism involved. The thetan is the body; the thetan thinks he is the body. And what is sympathy? A definition of sympathy would be that we have something being something else. We strike a

tuning fork and it is at the rate of 512 vibrations per second. If we have another tuning fork sitting over here that is not struck, we just leave that second tuning fork alone . . .

I ought to get one of those things; I'm always using this damn tuning fork. They have them in every physics laboratory in any nation that knows anything about physics—of course, that includes the United States.

You hit the 212 or—512 vibration over here, and 512 tuning fork which has not been struck, then says “Hmm,” see ? You get them vibrating the same. You hit—there are two tuning forks, they're the same vibration level; you hit one, the other will vibrate. Very, very simple.

Sympathy, which would mean co-vibration, and in our case could mean an intermingling of vibrations. Actually, that's what happens, when tuning fork A starts tuning fork B running, tuning fork B then sets up a co-vibration and an intermingling of vibrations.

All right, we have these two tuning forks going from here on down. The thetan is vibrating at body level. And that's how the scale reverses, because up this high, he could at least—if he were here all by himself—he would not be vibrating at any such level. The actuality is that this is the thetan scale and a cultural scale and has no real actuality in the body. Because you really want to know what the wavelengths of the body would be: the wavelengths of the body, actually, without a thetan bumping it along, are just MEST. So they are, of course, below—below -8.0—the actual wavelengths of the body. But the thetan's beingness plus the body's beingness plus social-cultural response over here, makes it possible for a person to behave above 0.0 on the Tone Scale—look alive, move, act, talk, be polite, tip his hat, help old ladies out of carriages instead of tripping them into the mud and so forth. You know, the thing that is done and the thing that's not done, and all that sort of thing— that's just all up in this band.

Truth of the matter is, though, if you now had a body Tone Scale—the body Tone Scale isn't on here. If you had a body Tone Scale, the body Tone Scale would be clear down here. It would be below -8.0, if you had a body all by itself, because it's worse than its actual vibration level.

And the reason this gets snarled up is because we have put 0.0 as body death, but that's only the point where the thetan leaves it. He says, “It stinks too much, I'm going to get out of here. Finally I am driven to break out of all of my aberrations at this moment. This thing is rotting, obviously, and they're going to bury it and somebody is going to shove formaldehyde into it. And all of my fondness and lovingness for it, and so forth, seems a little bit dismaying at this present moment. So adios, body. Between-lives, here I come!” In other words, for a brief instant there, about fifteen minutes, he gets some sense in his head and he doesn't have anything to do with a body. Okay.

Now, the theory on this, very admittedly, is not a smooth theory. The theory on this is just this: It is a working theory. If we got busy, some of us here, with a cathode-ray scope and if we got very busy in fixing up scopes that would measure the proper wavelengths and that sort of thing and we put in a lot of time on it, we would get the accurate scale. This is just a working scale.

But, you know, when they train a young lieutenant or ensign to navigate, they always train him up in these wonderful, wonderful methods of subtracting, and degrees from angles, and looking them up in the books and back and forth. And you'll go into the chart room and one of them is figuring out a chart; he's been beautifully trained—oh, yes, very beautifully trained. And what he knows about navigation is the more or less elementary mathematics which any navigator has to know. And what does he do? He doesn't know how to take a sight, by the way, and if he took a sight it would probably be of the sun and he'd say that was Arcturus. But somebody—the quartermaster or somebody—has handed him this sight proposition, and he's supposed to figure it out. Well, he knows how to do that. So he figures

this thing out, and by golly, he spots the ship! Boy, does he put the ship on the chart! He puts it down there within about a fifth of an inch.

Now, there's an old story about this: Admiral was on board a ship which was in maneuvers. And the admiral came in and he says to this young assistant navigator there, and he said to him, "Mister," he says, "where are we?" And this ensign took a very, very sharp pencil and he pointed it very, very closely and minutely and carefully at a tiny, tiny flyspeck on this great big chart, and he said, "Sir, we're exactly there."

And the admiral sort of looked at him strange and he turned around to the assistant navigator, who just at that moment had come in—the assistant navigator had been in the service for quite a few years—and he said, "Well, mister," he said, "where are we?"

And the assistant navigator picked up a pencil and he drew a small circle and he said, "Well, we're in there somewhere, sir."

And at that moment the navigator, who was a grizzled, gray old seadog who did his navigation by every means available, just so that he kept off rocks and got the ship in and out of some ports most of the time, and he'd been at this for a long, long while . . . And the admiral turned to him and he says, "Navigator," he says, "where are we?"

And the navigator picked up his open hand with spread fingers and slapped it down on the chart, and he says, "Well," he says, "we're probably about here!"

Now, you get your level of accuracy. If we were dealing with physiological functions and setting up meters and doing our curing with meters and screens and antennas and that sort of thing, we would have to have the circle on the chart for these things. Preferably we would have the dot, but we would certainly have to have a "tolerance of accuracy." That's what's known in engineering as a tolerance of accuracy.

The young navigator, learning, by the way, he goes out and he takes a sextant, which won't place you closer than a mile on a gray day—which makes you placeable within three or four miles—and then he figures everything out down to a sixth of an inch. Well, it just won't figure down there, because he just can't figure it down there and he's not there anyway.

Well, that's very much the case with this chart. This chart is a functional chart. And so don't let anybody try to throw you around on this thing. I can tell you some vague approximation of wavelengths in centimeters. But even that is just approximation, because there's just no sense in putting in two or three months of very, very hard work measuring it up when we've got the next two, three thousand years full of budding scientists who can just have an awful good time.

Now, there's something about playing games. If you keep running out on the field and—somebody throws the team a football, and you keep running out on the field and running down and up the field with that football, why, it's a dirty trick; nobody can have a game. So we'll just let somebody plot this thing out. But this is functional.

You may find on test, and you probably will find on test, that your level of accuracy here is that -2.2 is probably—has its heaviest harmonic, and probably should be—down here just below -8.0, because you can run protecting-hiding as a dichotomy. Protecting and hiding are very close together as a dichotomy, and probably the strongest. But it's also up there at -2.0, which is the strongest side of these two dichotomies.

Now, just to finish this off, I want to give you—I just got this manuscript. This is a manuscript of a book that's about to be published in the States on this subject. And it doesn't say anywhere near as much as you know about the subject—very short book.

But somewhere up here there's the dichotomies. Here they are. The most important dichotomies are: agree-disagree; beauty-ugliness; emotion-effort, and effort-matter.

Playing off emotion versus effort, effort versus emotion, and then effort versus matter. It's quite interesting that in this range of dichotomies, the last one happens to be electricity, and we happen to be using it at the present time. The dichotomy of effort and matter, and you get an electric light and hot stoves and burned fingers.

And one more, which is above, actually, and should be in place of agree and disagree. (I'm correcting the manuscript.) It should be own-determinism and other-determinism.

Male voice: I see.

Own-determinism and other-determinism.

Now, once upon a time, I demonstrated how ARC at each level of the Tone Scale went higher to higher levels of the Tone Scale, and we had ARC again. And it was in Effort Processing. If you got an effort, that effort was really composed of ARC—demonstrably composed of affinity, reality and communication. And then we got the effort within the effort, which is a higher-level effort, and that was obviously composed of ARC. And then we got up into higher bands and higher bands and higher bands, and we sat there looking at self-determinism all of a sudden, and it was obviously composed of ARC.

Self-determinism is composed of ARC, and it's a nice gunshot concept. Self-determinism is ARC; that's something you ought to know.

Actually, it'd be—own-determinism-other-determinism would be your dichotomy, and you'd get an energy interchange and play between those two things. And the component parts—the dichotomies—under own-determinism and the component parts under other-determinism happen to be both the same. And that would be agree-disagree, communicate-no-communicate, and the emotional reaction and no-emotional reaction. And those would be your dichotomies, of course, on that.

Now, if I look through here again, there's another whole slew of these things. There are the following—the concepts listed here: an emotional concept is really a feeling. Concept is one thing—that's an idea—and a feeling is another thing and you notice that they're very, very distinct, one from the other.

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

Okay, here are the dichotomies:

Survive-succumb—number one.

Two: affinity-no affinity.

Three: communication-no communication.

Four: agree-disagree.

Five: start and stop.

Six: be and not-be.

Seven: know and know-not. I gave you all of these the other day, but there are a couple of extras here, and I'm just going to read the rest of this very rapidly.

Eight: cause-effect.

Nine: change-no-change.

Ten: win-lose.

Eleven: I am-I am not.

Twelve: faith-distrust.

Thirteen: imagine-truth.

Fourteen: believe-not believe.

Fifteen: always-never.

Sixteen: future-past.

Seventeen: everybody-nobody.

Eighteen: owns all-owns nothing.

Nineteen: responsible-not responsible.

Twenty: right-wrong.

Twenty-one: stay-escape. Now, that isn't in your list, then, the other day. So get that one, add that to your earlier lists: stay-escape.

Twenty-two is beauty and ugliness.

Twenty-three is reason-emotion. You'll find people are very specialized on that; that's a dichotomy—reason-emotion.

Twenty-four: effort-emotion.

Twenty-five: effort-apathy.

Twenty-six: acceptance-rejection.

Twenty-seven: sane-insane.

Twenty-eight: no sympathy-sympathy.

Twenty-nine: sympathy-propitiation.

Well, there are a couple there that I didn't give you before, and you have a longer list.