

PRECISION KNOWLEDGE: NECESSITY TO KNOW, TERMINOLOGY AND LAW

A lecture given on
12 November 1952

You're training for a graduate designation of Professional Auditor. All right. That is granted to you. You're expected to go forward from there.

There is no large, wide demonstration of use included in that. We have to be fairly sure you can get results.

But your next grade up from that depends upon the use you have made of it. It depends upon your having gotten very wide usage out of it, and so on. Training in this field is not really a finite affair; it doesn't just suddenly start and stop. You get to a certain point where you know theory and practice. And then there's another point where you are practiced in being able to practice. And then there's another point further than that where you're practiced in being able to practice in a great many areas of knowledge and beingness. Now, we'll take all those things in due course.

And I want to give you the limits of what a professional auditor is expected to know.

You have a mimeograph sheet. Has that mimeograph sheet been issued to you? Has this class had this mimeograph sheet? [See Standard Operating Procedure for Theta Clearing at the end of this lecture.]

Male voice: Here's one.

Another male voice: Yeah.

Another male voice: Yes. I did issue them.

Do you have them?

Male voice: Yes, I think so.

A mimeographed sheet. One sheet of paper, and it's got all the Gists of everything on it.

Now, we're expected to know the definitions of each one of these and how each one of these items on this sheet integrates into a whole subject.

Now, something is being asked of you here which has not been asked in the humanities. And man has gotten into a very sloppy habit with regard to the humanities. Nobody knew! Nobody knew! And I don't care how you want to compare this with psychoanalysis or compare it with ditch digging or do comparisons of lines, the point is that nobody knew; that's the horrible truth of the matter.

Your boys out there now, having valuable and important cases put in their hands, training allegedly good, and working in the field of the mind, do not know! They do not know anything. It is just fabulous! You haven't had that experience, most of you. I did not know that this condition existed until 1948—it was so far outside my ability to grasp idiocy. And you know, you have to have a special ability to grasp something idiotic. It's remarkable. But you'll notice the tendency in yourselves of trying to make something sensible which is idiotic.

Somebody would put in here something with a lot of dials and meters on it and with a couple of lights that flashed on the top of it. And if you walked in and you saw that thing sitting in

the center of the floor, why, you'd probably have quite a little discussion amongst yourselves as to what the purpose of this thing was.

You'd have assumed something very strange and that you didn't really have any right to assume—and that was that it had a purpose. Or that it knew anything or could do anything. The truth of the matter is it simply might be a gadget with some dials and a couple of lights on top. And what is its purpose? None. Why was it built? Well, maybe it was just built to use up some meters and some lights that were lying around.

And yet you would be surprised how man has strained his brains, has gotten down and just ground without first asking “Does it have any purpose? Is there anything back of this? Is there any reason back of this? Or is the reason back of this a logical or a good reason?” Instead of going back and asking that, he takes the accomplished item or datum and goes forward from that accomplished item or datum just as though it had a reason.

Now, you will find him proceeding in the humanities from high-level abstractions which were never proven. He assumes, for instance, that human behavior would be skin to the behavior of voice or rats. He assumes that in psychological laboratories. There is no reason for the assumption. Man is alive and voice are alive, but he has not proven anything beyond that—they're alive. He hasn't even defined what alive is.

Now, we take off from that in the humanities. Somebody paints a picture. Gorgeous picture—it has an emotional reaction upon you. You look at this lovely thing and: “Now what was the reason he painted it?” everyone wants to know. Well, that's a funny thing, but there doesn't happen to be any reason in the field of aesthetics. The battle in aesthetics is Why? and What is the reason? and There it is. There isn't any point in it. There doesn't have to be a point in it; that is not demanded in the field of aesthetics. So you have such things as art critics who write very logically on something where there is no logic. The essence of aesthetics is a wide differentiation—the very essence of it—not logic.

Now, I showed you these three categories of identification, association or similarity, and differentiation. As you go up tone scale, you'll find one getting further and further toward differentiation. Therefore, to go up tone scale one must be further and further able to differentiate.

Now, we have, through lack of differentiation in the humanities, fallen into a very, very sloppy habit of thinking here on Earth. We think nobody knew, so anything goes.

I was reading in a magazine the other day—somebody writing from the “Pathetic Foundation” or something—a guy I . . . Once in a while I used to try to get him to get me to process him, because we used to have trouble with this boy. He used to rush in and rush out, always wild-eyed and so forth. And he writes down and he says, “Well, we finally have figured it out that the real aberration, and all that aberration is”—this was in a magazine a very few days ago—he says, “is a departure from the will of God; a disobedience of what God demands. And when you disobey that, then that's aberrated.”

Oh, by God, let's all go blow our brains out! And yet, guys all around the shop will integrate that as though that's Dianetics or has some shadow of Dianetics in it. Oh, no. No. You see, I told you before that there's two sides to this subject, as far as I talk to you here. I talk to you about data and laws of action, and so on, and I give you my opinion of them. It is pretty obvious to you what my opinion is, but it should be equally obvious which is the data.

This data produces results. It doesn't produce results in one case or two cases. You go down the line with these techniques and you will find that your preclear will respond uniformly to these techniques. One preclear may be tougher than another, one may be less solvable than another, but there isn't anything freaky going to suddenly step in on you. You're not all of a sudden going to find out that you really have to apply a crank to his left foot or something

and wind it for a half an hour. Now, that's the field of what was called the humanities—those inhuman methods of controlling people that were laughingly called the humanities.

You place somebody in time and space and place him in time and space and place him in time and space and don't let him place anything in time and space, until he's finally in apathy, and then you hook him up to a machine and let him pull a lever. Or you hook him up to a desk and let him make a certain motion with a pen. You got him. You got him nailed on the time track with possessions and necessity. You've got him in a body that will die unless he fits it into his economic system. And this was what was called "humanity."

All right. What we're studying is a series of laws—we're not talking about general value, but we're talking about they have the same level or same activity of application as any other natural law. You'll find these things don't go varying on you. They are natural laws.

Now, very few people have the habit of either studying or looking at precision. It's not very well known and it certainly does not exist in what were called the humanities, but it existed in physics. It existed to a lesser degree in chemistry, but it did exist in chemistry. You put sodium in water in chemistry—you put sodium, a little blob of sodium, in some water—and it'll go bang! And you take some more sodium and you put it in the water and it goes bang! And you take some more sodium, you put it in the water and it goes bang! Now, that's what I mean by a natural law; it's a universally applicable law.

Now, in the humanities, it worked this way: You took the sodium and you put it in the water and it went zzzt! And then you took some sodium and you put it in water and it rang a bell. And then you took some sodium and you put it in some water and you had ink. And then people stood around and looked proud.

Now, when we say "You get your preclear to locate something in time and space—his time and space," that's what you do. You don't locate him in energy sometimes, and you don't locate him sometimes in Rolls Royce's, and you don't locate him sometimes with a spade in his hand—you'd locate him in time and space. Time and space.

When we say gradient scale, we say it goes from nothing to almost nothing, to almost everything, to everything—with all the stops in between, and it doesn't have any missing stops in it—and that is a useful scale to you.

It perhaps is bad taste for me to mention the fact that these laws are precise. It would be if they were my laws.

Now, we have moved in on the science of physics and have gone over the top of the science of physics. And we can do, with our information today, more with electricity than has been done with electricity. Nail that one down. You are studying in advance of the electrician; you will know more about energy when you finish up than a nuclear physicist knows. It just happens that it's simpler. But the laws that fall into line are not unknown in other fields. They're not unknown, they're just not evaluated and they're not lined up. And if all of this thing was a dream-up out of the blue and it rested solely on my opinion, yes, you could walk around this material and say, "Well, maybe," and "I guess," and so forth. But if you do, it'll bite you—because it's been tripped over by about a hundred thousand human beings to date.

The chair of physics at Columbia took one look at the first book—as imprecise, really, as some of the portions of that first book are—and he had to come right straight over to New Jersey. He was upset! He was really upset! Here was a man who was trained in precision thinking who had suddenly, to his horror, gazed upon precision law in the field of thought. And he spoke of it in the terms of "the diabolical accuracy of your predictions as to what will happen when you do thus and so." He was offended. The reason why he was offended: he realized that somebody existed on Earth that could probably take him apart the same way he could take apart a radio set. That would have been unfortunate if it were true. We're dealing something that's a little harder to get up on a higher level of that.

But all this is leading just to this, and that is, that when you're studying this you're studying a law. And if you look at this law . . . Let's say it's in the field of physics and it's the law of "What is power?" Now, power means many things in the humanities, but it means just one thing in physics. And when you say "What is power?" now you know the definition What is power? Or you say, "What is inertia?" Now, you can observe those things, you can observe them very sharply. And your ability to use them is your ability to define exactly what's said; that is your ability to use.

Now, I can walk into a physics class down here—somebody's teaching physics and the first semester is practically gone—and we look at the students, and some of the students say to us, "Well, I'm getting along fine." Some of them say, "Well, it's sort of vague and I have trouble with this."

You say, "You have trouble with what?"

"I have trouble with . . . Well, all this stuff about steam engines, and so forth—figuring this out about steam engines. This is just silly—I mean the stuff about steam engines—because I can't figure this stuff out about steam engines and I never was able to figure out anything what happened with these steam engines!" And he's kind of mad about steam engines.

You say to him, "Hey, what is a British thermal unit?"

"Oh," he says, "it's a . . . Tsk! Uh . . . it's something these British have! And we have something different." And then he'll give you this terrific, imaginative rundown on the thing

And you say, "Well, what's a calorie? Does that have any bearing on a British thermal unit?"

"Oh no, they'd be different things; calories come in food."

And you say, "Where the hell have you been all this semester!" That's just what you'd ask, because a British thermal unit is exactly so many heat units. And you measure that by raising the number of pounds of coal necessary to raise the number of pounds of water—it's 776 foot-pounds of energy. (Let's see, I have to go back over that.)

How many pounds of coal is it to raise one gallon of water one degree Fahrenheit, I think it is. Whatever that is (look it up somebody, next time, and tell me), it is the basis of measurement of steam engines. But we know what a calorie is. We know what a calorie is. That's a unit of heat. Again, we have precision units. It has numbers in it. It says so-and-so and so-and-so.

Newton's law of inertia is an interesting law, a fantastically interesting law. It says that "the tendency of a body is to remain at a state of rest or a state of uniform motion unless acted upon by outside forces." Ding-zee-abrhra-bong! And that's inertia. And that's all inertia is, and it isn't anything else.

If you've got a little ball and it's running down here on a frictionless line, and so on, that ball has the tendency to remain in that state of motion unless something stops it. That something can be friction, it can be gravity, it can be your hand.

Newton's law of interaction is "For every action there is an equal and contrary reaction." There's nothing to this; I mean, it's just zing! You take a look at it, you say, "It's a number of words" at first. And then you say to yourself, "Well, let's see, could I think of an example of this?" and you kind of get it unscrambled. And then you say, "Well, let's see, for every action there is an equal and contrary reaction. Let's take a croquet mallet and hit a croquet ball. Well, the croquet ball goes out that-a-way. Well, I guess they mean the mallet. Oh. The mallet is hit by the croquet ball as hard as the croquet ball is hit by the mallet. Hm, that's interesting Never thought about the mallet before. So you've got that sort of an action. And

then the croquet ball is hit by the tree it runs into as hard as it hits the tree. Ho, ho. Law of interaction.”

Fascinating, but what do you know, those are a couple of the basic laws of motion. The third one is the law of acceleration. But here are your basic laws of motion. They don't just happen to apply to Earth or apply to the island of Palduvia or apply once in a while when a psychiatrist gets around to it. They work all the time on any planet anywhere. Anywhere you've got matter, energy, space and time you will find these three laws of motion operative. And you start to build something that has something to do with motion in an ignorance of these three laws . . .

Do you know why we didn't have a steam engine before Isaac Newton? We had some things that went whirr-clank-boom! and took the engineer with them. Or why we didn't have airplanes and why we didn't have railroad trains and all kinds of other things here on Earth? Because nobody knew the three laws of motion; it was simple as that.

All sorts of superstitious and wonderful things existed. Oh, just wonderful. There was the caloric theory of heat: Heat was really a fluid. And although you couldn't pour it from one glass into another, it was a strange fluid and it had various limitations. And it sort of ran uphill; it kind of defied the law of gravity. But that was all right, it was still a fluid! And a student of those days would have been flunked flat if he had dared say that heat was not a strange and mysterious fluid which got poured around.

Actually, heat is—demonstrably—heat is a transfer of vibration. Heat is something which is an increased motion. And then, as it touches other things, it increases the motion of other things, the speed of motion of other things. And that speed of motion is such that, when you, for instance, introduce your delicate little finger onto something which has had its motion motioned up the line to red-hottness, your finger doesn't like that much motion and it has a tendency to come away from there real quick or cease to exist as a finger. It's very positive, very positive in its definition.

And at the risk of seeming terribly didactic and very mean—and I wouldn't for a moment be didactic or mean about this sort of thing if we had the next twenty years to kill on this subject. Just for the sake of speed—just for the sake of speed—when we run across one of these laws (there is a finite number of them, they aren't very many), we run across one of these Axioms, or something of the sort, take the thing, look at it. Don't examine it to find out whether or not it confirms your superstitions; we're not interested in your superstitions, we're going to wipe them all off anyhow. But we'll process you down to nothing if you persist in that line! I mean . . .

You just take that and look in the real universe, or in your own imagination, or in something, or in some energy level or whatever it applies to. Take a look at it and then say to yourself, “Let's see, how does that apply? How does that apply? Let's see, can I get an example of it? Can I get an example of it?” And you get an example of it. And you get this example of it and you think this example over. And then you say, “I wonder—let's see—how that would apply to other people and other things.” And as soon as you see how that will apply to other people and other things, you own it. It's then yours; that law is then yours. And until you have done that, you could memorize it and memorize it and parrot it and parrot it, and all of a sudden there sits your preclear: Your preclear is screaming. Your preclear is screaming loud enough to be heard two blocks down the street. And don't think a preclear can't scream that loud, because they can. I have had neighbors from two blocks away sending the police down to see what was happening, and all I had done was get this preclear into a light engram. I didn't ever know before Dianetics that the human voice had that many decibels of sound in it.

Just recently I was processing somebody and we got a couple of those, didn't we? It's a case, a specific case, known as a screamer. The person is not too well off when they do this sort of thing But I have seen a Foundation just so shaken to the core by somebody having processed a screamer all morning . . . Gee! But the human voice just can't stand the strain, that's all.

And after you bring them up to present time and they're out of the session and everything, they walk out and they're smiling and cheerful and they're all happy.

All right. There you are. And you're sitting there, and this preclear has just hit eighty decibels, or whatever it is, and high G: Boy, that is not the time for you to take out a book of rules and look through and start wondering, "Let's see. What is the exact definition of a secondary? Let's see, what is a secondary? That means the thing you run second? Oh, that's what I should have done second in the case. Well, it's called a secondary, so I didn't think it was important. Oh, I guess that must be what's wrong with him. Or maybe . . . maybe . . . maybe he's got demoniac possession! Let's see, did Ron say something about demoniac possession? I'm sure he did. Or was that something I read in an old book? Let's see . . ."

Well, boy, if you get something like that on your hands and you're in that state of unknowingness, you want to watch out. Because that's the only time you blow up as an auditor. Other auditors will sit around unsympathetically running it out of you probably for a couple of days. It's just whether or not you know the definition.

Now, in order to know a definition you have to speak a language. And there is a language called Scientology. There's another language called algebra. There's another language called French. There's another one called English. There's another one called MERSIGS, which is merchant signal codes. There's another one called naval codes. There's another language called International Morse. There's another one called International Semaphore. These are all languages. And don't make a mistake on this; they are languages.

You walk in the room, you want a chair. And it's in France, and you want this chair and you say, "May I have a chair?"

And they say, "Comment?"

And you say, "May I have a chair?"

They say, "Comment?"

And you say . . . And they say, "Len!" That's silly, isn't it? Well, that's because you didn't know the French word for chair, that's all.

And by the way, you very often use the oldest techniques there are. Preclears will come in to you and say, "Yap-yap-yap-yap-yap."

And at the end then you say something or other, and they say, "Yap yap-yap-yap-yap"—same yap-yap. And you explain that away and then they say, "Yap-yap-yap-yap-yap."

And you say, "What do you know! This person is a dramatizing psychotic running the recording of a prenatal engram." You know that, you'll have his skin texture, and so forth, and that's what he's running Unfortunately, that's what you run.

Here I sat one time in Phoenix. I had a preclear I had these brand-new, glossy techniques, all polished up with the dials bright, and so forth. And he sits down—and I'm just itching to run these on somebody myself. I'd been watching a couple of auditors that were researching on the line, running them, and so on, and I just—all set, see?

And he says, "Yap-yap-yap-yap-yap."

And I say, "Well, all right."

And then he says, "Yap-yap-yap-yap-yap-yap."

And "Oh, no. Oh, no."

What he was saying was specifically this, and this is the one: “Well, I’ve just got to get rid of it. That’s all. I just don’t know what I will do if I don’t get rid of it. And it’s something I’ve been thinking I ought to do for a long time, but I kind of have a moral feeling about it—like maybe I shouldn’t get rid of it, but really I ought to get rid of it.”

And you say, “Well, we’ll try to run it if we can,” and so forth.

“Well, really, I’ve got to be rid of it. But I have been arguing with myself about it. I don’t know whether I ought to get rid of it or not, because it just doesn’t seem moral to me to get rid of it.”

You say, “Well, if you just think this over for a moment. Now, let’s get . . .”

“Now—well, really, do you think I can get rid of it? Do you think it’s all right for me to get rid of it if I want to get rid of it?”

And you say, “Oh, no. Mama in doubt about having an AA done. There it is: prenatal.” Honest, we left prenats clear back in 1950. Nobody runs any prenats anymore, and yet here sits a preclear who doesn’t know anything about Dianetics at all who insists on dramatizing this prenatal!

Now, what can you do about it? You use Technique 80 on it. Only he doesn’t want to use Technique 80 on it. He never heard of Technique 80. He doesn’t want anything to do with it. He wants to run a prenatal. He just thinks if he could get rid of it . . . So what do you do? You start him in on it and you run it. And he gets well!

So you say to him, “The somatic strip will now go to the beginning of the incident.” Well, don’t you be sitting around wondering what a somatic strip is.

You learn your language. What’s a somatic strip? Well, it’s an old term, and so on, but it’s there! It’s there, and it’s the only set of words—somatic strip—which describe this thing that is there. You could call it your focus of attention, but that isn’t it. It’s some kind of a preselector device that gimmeygahoodjits back of the whatchawubs, or does something—you don’t know quite what it does. I don’t know what this thing does myself. You tell somebody “Your somatic strip will now go to . . .”

And he says, “Zung-zung-zunt, it’s there.”

“Now, the first words of the engram will flash.” And they will. And he’ll be back down the time track a dozen or a dozen million years—wherever you told the somatic strip to go. That’s what’s fascinating

Actually, what it is, is you tell the thetan that he knows this and to focus his attention upon it. But if you call this a somatic strip, your preclear says, “What is the somatic strip?”

“Well, that’s something that locates aches and pains and incidents.”

“Oh, yeah? Well, all right.”

“Now, the somatic strip will go so-and-so,” and it goes—kaboom! This surprises you.

But you’re learning a language and the language is called Scientology. And if you are drifting around anyplace, if you wonder what these laws are all about, if you’re not quite sure of what is taking place, it’s because you don’t speak Scientology. So you come into the room and you say, “Give me a chair,” but nobody there speaks anything but Scientology.

And they say, “Comment?” or “Somatic strip?”

And you say, "A chair, a chair, a chair."

"Never heard of it."

Psychoanalyst comes in and he says, "Give us your libido theory."

And you say as a Scientologist, "What? What? What?" You see, you have to learn psychoanalysis to talk to a psychoanalyst. This is necessary. It's true! It is true! He won't learn your language, you learn his. And it's quite a language. There's a lot of language to it.

We only have one bridging word, and that is the word transfer. That is used in psychoanalysis and it's used in Scientology. And in Scientology the word means "the incident or a type of incident wherein the thetan is snapped into a head." It is a specific incident.

The psychoanalyst calls it, amongst other things, the feeling the patient gets by transferring to the psychoanalyst, and so on. And it's very interesting. But what he's really doing, probably, is restimulating something or other so that the psychoanalyst, after all, is the head—or something. I've mocked this up and tried to figure out just exactly why this worked that way, and that seemed to me to be the way it worked. But that's just opinion.

That's one word that bridges. All of the rest of the words are different. You might as well go to Turkestan and try to be understood as try to go into the world of psychoanalysis and be understood when you're talking Scientology—and that's on purpose!

We didn't ever try to reevaluate a single term which existed, but have tried, by the process of converting adjectives into nouns, to form a descriptive language which was exact and definite in its meaning

There are no hazy words in Scientology. When you say TURN NINE in Scientology, you mean turn 90 degrees to the right. It's that plain.

There's only one really coined word in Scientology and that's anaten. I didn't make that word up. It's of limited use, but it means "analytical attenuation" or "a shortening of awakesness." It's going blotto; it's going unconscious. And that is anaten and that's a composite word. And it was dreamed up by a doctor and a nuclear physicist one night when it was very late. And I woke up the next morning and found this had been incorporated into an article and one of my words had been changed in the article and this other one substituted for it, and so it became a word. And here it is, it's riding there, but it's really the only example of this—of taking four or five words and maybe coining one word out of them.

The rest of them are either entire makeup's or they are adjectives turned into nouns. And that's a good way to make a new language, because the language then looks kind of familiar; people are used to pronouncing words of that character, but they're now nouns. And do you know that there aren't very many words in that language? There are less than eighty words in Scientology. That isn't very many words. And you get the precision meaning of eighty words and you get the precision definition of each one of these laws which are listed and, boy, you've got it—you've got it. And you can think with it and you can use it.

But it works exactly. You want it to work exactly, don't you? Do you want to be able to do this and that to a human being and have that take place? Not this take place. When you want that to take place, you do this and that, and that takes place. And if that doesn't take place, then you do this and that to get that to take place again, and you go through this single cycle to get that to take place, and pretty soon you get it to take place. No matter how rough this case is, it will take place. The manifestation will take place. You want it to work that way.

Now, let's go even further than that: let's fix up the boss so that he gives you a raise. Let's get very, very common about this whole thing. Let's fix him up so he'll give you a raise. Just

that—kaboom! How do you do it? Superior knowledge, superior skill—ought to be pretty easy. All you do is locate the poor guy on the tone scale. From there on, anything can happen because you know exactly how to agree with him. You know how he will go into a state of being a bosom buddy with you from there on.

He's at 1.5. When you come in, damn everything Don't damn him, just damn everything. "Clerks are no good, the shop's no good, the people who work are no good; they all ought to be destroyed. Labor ought to be all blown up. Everything ought to be all blown up; it ought to be destroyed. Motion is taking place; it ought to be stopped," so forth. And you'd be surprised. You wouldn't think that tanking to somebody like that about his business would get you anywhere at all. And the first thing you know, he's just: "Gee, there you are again," and is he glad to see you. He'll make you a partner.

You want to sell somebody a box of soap. He's a dead soap buyer as far as you're concerned. I mean, he'll buy; he can't help but buy. If he's in apathy, you convince him the soap is terrible and it will ruin him, and hell buy it.

To sell a farmer in apathy a tractor, you would have to convince him that it'll break down, it'll be uneconomical, it will be very expensive for him to run, that he couldn't possibly use it on his farm—he'll buy it. He's on the succumb side of the tone scale and, as a result, he will want to be helped only to do one thing, and that's succumb. So you show him ways and means to succumb, and hell succumb. He's very good at it.

Now, you take somebody who's in a level of covert hostility: How do you sell him something? You show him that it is damaging, but nobody would suspect it. That it might even damage him, but nobody would suspect it and he might not even suspect it either. He'll buy it.

You see, your uses and applications of these things are terrible, because here you've got as prey this poor fellow, Homo Sapiens, who is a stimulus response character who is usually below 2.0 on the tone scale and is having a rough time. This really surprises anybody and makes him ashamed of himself if he starts to use this on a control side of the ledger. And he generally will just back off and he won't use it on the control side of the ledger anymore. I don't. Because it kind of makes you ashamed of yourself. Supposing you went down the street and took candy away from every little baby you saw that had any candy—you just made a practice of this.

Or supposing you had rabbits who were tied up by the collar out to your fence. And you could go out there every morning, and you had a double-barreled shotgun that went off every time, and the cartridges cost you nothing, and that's what you're going to use to kill this rabbit? Oh, no. No. If you have any sport in it at all, if you're going in on the side of killing things, or something of the sort, the least you could do would be to take a lighter-gauge gun and let the rabbit run. But it's something like shooting sitting ducks; it's insidious, it's horrible and . . . The best thing that happens with it is when you start to use it on control. What happens? You say, "Ha-ha. No, no, no, there's no randomness there."

The fellow is a 1.5. You look at him, you look at his build, you look at his beingness and you say, "Yeah, that's what we're going to do." Then you suddenly say, "Well, it's a wonder to me that you really don't do more about these employees, in view of the way they think about you and talk about you and so forth. It's just a wonder to me."

And the fellow will say, "Well, yes, I just have to restrain myself."

And you say, "Well, and it's too bad that there isn't a more effective control system over these employees," and so forth, "and it gets them longer hours and shorter pay," and so forth.

And he'd say, "Yes, there is; that's too bad—too bad there isn't. The good old days were different, you know? We used to have a feudal system; that used to be good. But they don't know their places these days."

And you say, "No sir! They don't know their places, that's what! They insult you!"

And he says, "You sure they do?" Boy, you're in agreement with him.

Fascinating. You go in to talk to a government employee. You want him to sign this voucher. He's in apathy, of course. He's sitting there and you say, "Well, I guess it's just . . . probably take too long to sign it, and it's overtime anyway. And it'll probably make you late to get home. And . . ." Just point out all the ways this voucher is going to make him succumb, and you'll get your signature on it. Fabulous.

And of course, you get up in tone, then you're going to run into something terrible. You're going to run into anti-enthusiasms. That's a special cult that exists amongst Homo Sapiens here, is anti-enthusiasms. But you'll find a great many people—you've probably not been able to understand this in your youth—will resent with brutality any effort on your part to look at the bright side or the enthusiastic side of anything.

You see, they have it confused. They're so undifferentiative that they identify it with antagonism. And they think you're pointing it right straight at them and that you're being antagonistic. And they have it all mixed up. A man's pretty bad off when he does this, by the way.

So you walk in, you're all enthusiastic. You say, "We're going to do this and that! And how about this? And what do you know, I just walked down the street and I found this fellow down there and he wants to have done exactly what we're trying to do. And we're going to meet our payrolls after all, and everything's going to be fine!"

And the fellow says, "What's the idea coming in here like that?"

You just can't quite add that up. You see, he's in a stop-motion or a hold and you were in a state of flow. This person, by the way, at the same time, will keep you from being afraid. Hell be nice to you. If you seem to be afraid or ready to walk off from something, then he'll be nice to you. It's fascinating. What a contradictory character he seems to be. You try to tell him something good news, he hates you for it. You try to walk away from something, he tries to make you stand there and encourages you.

No. But you can be sure about this character, by the way: Every time he encourages you about something, he thinks you're scared. It's fascinating, but it's just the Chart of Attitudes at work.

Your people at your hold-motion positions hold motion, and the people on the flow positions flow.

All right. We add all this information together, we do get a control of human beings. You have a worse thing than that. You actually have, inherent in this subject, ways and means of making a human being into an abject slave—insidiously true. That is one of the reasons why the material never could have been released in its primitive form without very adequate methods of undoing what it could do.

The discovery that narcosynthesis, no matter how deep, yet was implantable as hypnotism—that a person was commanded by and would obey commands given to him when in the deepest state of unconsciousness—opened up the doors to the greatest black operation that ever could have appeared on the face of this earth.

What would have happened? Mr. Blow goes out for an evenings conference. He walks out of his house, he gets into his car . . . And he wakes up the next morning—and he knows he went to the conference—and he says, “You know, it’s a funny thing, but I’ve been thinking it over and I think that I’m no longer in favor of the Labor Party; I’m really in favor today of, oh, Digism. It’s something new and it’s something I ought to do,” and so forth.

Or worse than that, he comes home one night and his wife looks a little bit pale but no different otherwise. “Did anything happen, dear?”

“No, nothing’s ever happened, dear.”

She starts to sell him on the idea of Digism, or why he should suddenly blow up the morgue, or the darnedest things. Because she’s a woman and he has to obey women or something, he does.

What happened? What happened in the blank moments? That’s all. Just a pocket handkerchief around the guy’s neck, pressure against the two nerve centers in his throat, or even so far as a shot in the arm, lost consciousness, pain in the head—twist his ear or something—and say, “You will now do so-and-so and so-and-so and so-and-so. And any time in the future that you hear such and such, and such and such, you will do so-and-so and so-and-so. And you know this is the truth and you do not know where you heard this and you do not know who said this to you and you have no idea. And you will now go in the house and you will lie down on your bed and you’ll be there. You wake up the next morning, you will not know anything happened to you at all.” There he goes—black magic.

Why, a certain one of these techniques controlled all of Asia once. The Sharif Mohammedan cult—hashshashin (from which we get the word assassin)—controlled Asia by simply taking young men, knocking them out with hashish, making them wake up in a garden where there was milk, honey and a lot of beautiful damsels, and then telling them that they couldn’t come back there again unless they performed a certain deed and act. “You really do want to come back there. This is paradise,” they’re told. “This is the only way you can go to heaven.”

Out they go with hashish; the person wakes up and finds himself in far-off Baghdad. He knows what he’s got to do: All he’s got to do is walk up to Prince Ali Bullah and slip a shiv in his guts; that’s all he got to do. Just as crude and as blunt as that, and hell wind up in paradise. How can anybody stop an assassin who doesn’t care if he’s killed, but who wants to get killed?

And all hashshashin’s—all that whole cult had to do, for three hundred years, was simply to write a note to any such Prince Ali Bull, anyplace in Asia, and say, “We would like to have forty-five camel loads of silk, eighteen trained dancing girls, one carload lot of ivory, F.O.B. your town. Signed .” And it came. Boy, it didn’t come slow! It came on high-speed camel freight with runners going along before saying, “It’s coming! It’s coming! No, no. It’s coming, really!”

Three hundred years that went on and all of Asia was monitored by a small group of people who sat in a mighty citadel. That citadel was not reduced until one day in sport a fellow said, “What? There’s a castle that hasn’t been pulled down?” So he went over and pulled it to pieces. He didn’t even know about what they did over there—force being as idiotic as the other force.

When you have an unknown phenomenon loose in a society, this is what it can do. So don’t know this stuff poorly; know it very well. Because a lot of it depends on you figuring out what it can do.

If you could make a man well, believe me, you can make him sick. And if here we have the techniques to make people well and also the techniques exist to make those people sick, you, and the few publications which are around, are the only single bulwark that stands between a

completely controlled society of man and a free man! So it isn't unimportant that you learn these things well. It's not even vaguely unimportant.

They did this weird trick with the atom bomb. My very good friends rushed in and invented an atom bomb. That was great! They let three billion dollars be appropriated to the construction of an atom bomb. And I said to Bob Cornard, "What was the appropriation for the force screen?"

"Oh," he says, "you're talking Buck Rogers stuff now." He says, "You've always been talking to me about Buck Rogers stuff"

"What about the force screen? Where was the money appropriated for the force screen at the same time it was appropriated for the atom bomb?"

"Oh," he said, "never heard of such a thing"

I said, "Well, you've let loose upon the world an unlimited weapon against which there is no defense." That's how important the force screen was. You just don't do things like that and still maintain any kind of stability or advance or progress in a society. You don't make an unlimited weapon, against which there's no defense, and then use it. Because the result will be destruction on every hand.

And at this moment we don't like to think about it; it isn't quite nice, it isn't polite, it isn't anything we do. We like to preserve a rather quiet, detached attitude toward this whole thing.

But there isn't a capital of a nation on the face of the earth today which has anything like security. There isn't a government on the face of the earth today, if it came right down to that, that could enforce its sovereignty, because sovereignty, by international law, is dependent upon the government's ability to defend its own borders and its people. And its right to exist depends upon its ability to defend, against aggressors, its lands and people. And that's a national government.

And when you have an unlimited missile weapon loose in the world, which asks of no borders, which no army can stop, you'll get a decentralization and an enturbulence of central governments—even before it's used against them. They try to centralize. They recognize this. They try to pull everything in quick, try to make everything hard and tough, and stand up to it and hold on, because they know they're on their way. And nobody appropriated three billion dollars for the force screen. And so they unstabilized all of society.

Fifteen hundred B.C., horsemen with swords swept out of the steppes of Asia onto the plains of Europe. And for two hundred years there was no civilization in Europe—so much so, probably most of you in glancing through school histories don't really know that there was any civilization in existence in that day. It was wiped flat! It takes a very, very hard search ethnologically and archaeologically to discover that civilization, but it was a pretty interesting one.

Fifteen hundred B.C. until 1300 B.C. there wasn't an organization, there wasn't a village, there wasn't anything any larger, for instance, than the unit of one man that could organize or hold any commerce, trade, in Europe. And it was a time of pestilence, of famine, of disaster on every hand. No man could have a home, peace, anything. It was a world of brigandage, because nothing could stop this unlimited weapon. It was a horseman with a saber. And he could go through any foot troops. And anybody who could get hold of a horse and a saber became a missile weapon.

Foot troops—wasn't till ages afterwards they invented pikes. There wasn't anything to stop these people. Sweep through a village, knock down any existing armies, and the heck of it is, is cavalry can't fight cavalry. Oh, you read of these thrilling actions about cavalry fighting cavalry, and then you say quickly, "Well, who won?" And they say, "Well, the infantry came

up and . . .” They’re very thrilling, but they never held a thing because cavalry is a 100 percent striking force and no defensive force. That’s military tactics.

And you have the whole world today involved in this silly operation of an unlimited weapon which can be aimed at any capital on Earth by any capital on Earth, practically, now. Nearly everybody’s got atom bombs now. There’s nothing to this.

One of these days the Argentine will haul off and bomb France. And France will say, “That was Russia,” and bomb Russia.

And Russia will say, “Well, we knew the United States was going to do it!” and so they blow up the United States. And there we go.

Fascinating No safety, no safeguard.

Well, we did it the other way around in Dianetics, because you have an unlimited weapon in Dianetics unless you have processing. And that’s why we have to have fast processing You don’t want slow processing. Slow processing is a terrible liability. You want the fastest process that you can use, for two reasons: (1) The fellow goes back into his environment and gets enturbulated faster than you can pick him up if you have a slow process.

You can process him and then hell come back next week and he’s in worse shape, and you process him and he comes back the week after, he’s in worse shape. You’re just watching the frog: he’s climbing up three inches and falling back four. So, you’ve got to have a fast process.

You take him out of the environment, process him and send him home, and the environment says, “Yap-yap-yap-yap-yap,” and he comes back and he’s still better. That’s fast processing

And on the other hand, it doesn’t take very long to make an implant with Black Dianetics; it just doesn’t take long. It takes ten minutes, maybe. And so, if it only takes ten minutes to make an implant, how long does it take to pick one up? Supposing you had to run it as an engram, then run off all the chain of all the implants there were on the track. How fascinating, how fascinating—you’d never get there.

So you need a technique that’ll make somebody sane in the same ten minutes on that subject. You’ve got one. It would be impossible—particularly these dumb Ruskovitches. Oh, they think it takes seventy days to implant somebody in a cell. The last couple of fellows they did it to—Mindszenty, and so forth—they think it takes all this time and, oh, they make hard work out of it. I guess it’s because they got all those steppes and wolves or something, and they figure . . . I don’t know, I never quite figured it out. But the Russian, if it takes the Russian ninety hours to do something efficiently, he’ll always figure out a way to do it in 880 or something Because that’s a fact about that—that he thinks it takes about seventy days to get a fellow’s wits shaken!

It doesn’t. It just takes ten minutes! All you have to do is figure out your implant—very restimulative—put in a lot of bouncers, groupers and deniers in your phraseology, read it right straight off, let him wake up again. Oh, is he in terrible shape! He’ll be all right that afternoon; nothing will be wrong with him. Next afternoon he’s all right. Next day he’s probably all right. And then all of a sudden he hits the key-in. There he goes. After that on that subject, he’ll be completely gone—he’ll just run a record.

If you don’t get him real good the first time, hit him again, hit him again, hit him again. They’re always available. There aren’t enough police on earth to stop anything like that.

One group, possessing only Black Dianetics, with no remedy for it, by keeping it secret, could run civilization off the rails. This has always been true, but nobody ever made it quite that efficient before.

We've got a technique, and we use this technique which will undo it as fast as it's done. And you are the first class to be taught this technique. And that's why I am stressing this at this time. And I can come out much more in the open about it in case somebody else thinks it up.

Now, the essence of any technique, however, is a precision knowledge of the language of the subject.

You are studying a point which has neither space nor time, but has the capability of creating space and time, and of generating energy. And this point has a personality and a beingness, and is the personality and beingness of a genus Homo Sapiens. It is detachable from the body. It could actually operate and work in full knowingness, completely independent of a body. It could work a mechanical doll as well as it could work one of these flesh-and-blood things. It has been aberrated and used in certain ways. From thetan to thetan the history is almost exactly the same. They vary in their potentiality and beingness from thetan to thetan—there's a wide variety of them. It does not need a body to stay alive.

And you are studying what this thing is, what its goals are, how to increase its potentiality, how to cause it to better handle the physical universe. And you are trying to use it—on a very low level, you will think of it as trying to use this energy in an effort to handle or improve or control a body. That's the lowest level of application, and it's very usable in that level. But that's something like using your double-barreled, twelve-gauge shotgun to shoot a young rabbit who is tied by the collar; it's just too much weapon.

Now, here this beingness is. You, as you go through with training, will have the experience yourself, sooner or later, of all of a sudden taking a look at your body and saying, "What am I doing in that?" And say, "Well, here I am.

"Where are you?" the auditor will say.

"Well," you'll say, "here I am, over against the wall."

"Well, can you see me?"

"Yes, of course."

Or the fellow will be saying, "I know I'm outside. I can't see my body very well. I don't know where you are. Yeah, I can feel the wall. Yeah. I know something is there; it's cold. Yeah, but I guess the body is over in that way. Gee, this feels awful strange. Maybe I'd better get back in the body again."

Or you'll have these various variations of experience. What you're trying to do is to learn a technology which is in excess of the data which was possessed by this being hitherto to this date. You're trying to learn how to keep this being from getting into the state he got into—Earth, 1952 A.D. And that is as important as getting him out of the state he's in. You're trying to learn the techniques by which he can increase his perception and his power.

And it is a study of something which does not exist in space and time, which can create or perceive space, time and energy—create, perceive, destroy, change, space, time and energy. It's capable of doing that. And its level of capability includes being able to produce very definite beams of energy which will do the strange trick, for instance, of the thetan walks over to this meter and he keeps hitting one of the terminals of the meter and the needle keeps going bzzzt! bzzzt! There's nobody else near that meter except the operator. And the operator says, "All right, make it go over to the other side of the pin," and it goes—bzzrruh! If a

physicist were in there, he'd go mad. And yet, this would seem very ordinary to an auditor and a preclear

Now, there are those of you who are pretty badly mired down. This thetan is so closely identified and associated with the beingness of the body that the thetan believes it's the body—believes it implicitly and completely— and that it's less than the body, and is so much less that it doesn't even exist, but only the body exists. That's the subzero tone scale. And believing it so, maybe this thetan is not only in a body, in the skull, but it's got energy ridges all around here. And every time this thetan tries to get out or to become detached, its vested interest in this body is such that it runs into these ridges—it cannot budge, it cannot move out of the line at all.

You've got to learn the techniques of how you solve that. And some of you, unable to get out, will have to learn the techniques anyway, and someday, maybe—who knows—get out.

All of you are going to get out. But you'd be surprised how fellow auditors can lose interest in a V. They're all flying around having a wonderful time, feeling good, and they're all polished up and life is wonderful and bright, and here's this poor Class V sitting there—he can't get out. He keeps trying. He can feel himself tug. Once in a while he'll get an instant, momentary glimpse of a side profile of his head, or something of the sort, and he'll say, "Yeah, it can be done. There is a reality on it. And I can't make it. Huh!" Just horrible.

How do you do this? Well, you're here to learn the theoretical height of this being, the capabilities of the being and how to make that being perform. And that's done by learning the language of Scientology and learning the laws and their application in this process.

STANDARD OPERATING PROCEDURE

This process is done in steps. The auditor with every preclear makes no other judgment than to begin with Step I and, failing to accomplish that immediately, to go on to Step II; if he fails to accomplish this immediately, he goes to Step III; and so on. When he is able to accomplish a step he labels the case as that step number, i.e., a III. He then begins working with that step. After a few hours work, he again starts at the top with the pc with Step I and progresses on through. Eventually the pc becomes a Step I.

Step I—Positive Exteriorizing: Ask the preclear to step a foot back of his head. If he does, make him go back further, then up, then down, practicing placement in space and time. Then one asks him to see if there are any items in the body he would like to repair, and proceeds to let pc repair them according to pc's own ideas as to how he should do it. Then educate the pc— by making him create and destroy his own illusions—into finally getting a certainty of illusion, and from this, a certainty of perceiving the real universe with all perceptions. (Note: The realest universe is, of course, one's own illusory universe, and it should be completely rehabilitated before one attempts to much perceive or handle or worry about the MEST universe. Rehabilitated, sonic, visio, etc., of the MEST universe are very clear and very certain. Clear perception in early stages is not a test of being outside. The only test is whether the pc knows he is outside.) Failing the first line of this step, go to Step II.

Step II—Negative Exteriorizing: Ask the preclear not to be a foot back of his head. (See subzero tone scale, where all commands reverse.) Give him commands in the negative which will be obeyed in the positive sense. Then orient him in space and time (the thetan can be out of time badly) and thereafter treat him as a Step I case. Failing this step, go to Step III.

Step III—By Orientation: Ask the preclear, still inside, to locate the inside of his forehead. Ask him to put a pressor beam against it and push himself out the back of his head. Supplement this by asking him to reach out through the back of his head and grab the wall with a pulling beam and pull himself out. Ask him to steady himself outside and then, by means of beams, to raise and lower himself while outside and to move to various parts of the room while still outside. By orientation as a thetan, placing himself as a thetan in time and space, he becomes sure of his whereabouts. Have him find these lines wherever they are and attach them to radiators and water taps, as the energy will drain out of him. The III ordinarily has enough lines to cause him to snap back in the head when he releases beams. Failing this, go to Step IV.

Step IV—Ridge Running: Ask the preclear to give himself a command to walk. Let him locate the white flow line which results inside his head. When this goes dark, have him locate the tiny inside-the-skull ridge that stopped it. Have him run the flow from this barrier (these barriers—they are tiny ridges—each have a thought with them such as "can't walk" or "too bored to walk") back toward the spot where he told himself to walk. It will run white for a moment, then go black. Have him give himself the command to walk again and "watch" this flow line. It may run through two or three tiny barriers and then stop. Again, have him run the "objection" to walling. Have him watch this "objection" flow until it goes black. Then have him give himself the command to walk again, and so on and so on. He will wind up at some outside point. Now have him give himself the command "listen" and have him run this and its black flows on "black and white" until he is exterior on the subject of "listen." Then use the command "talk" similarly. Then the command "nod," then the command "move," etc. Give "look" last, for it may "blind" his perception of black and white. He may each time get out to a distance in another quarter. If he can do all this, start with Step I again. Failing this step, failing to "see" black-and-white-energy manifestations, go to Step V.

Step V—Creative Processing: Audit the preclear very heavily on Creative Processing (Self Analysis, British Edition). Then go through the steps again. If pc is immediately perceived to have little or no reality on any incident, go to Step VI.

Step VI—ARC Straightwire: Drill, by direct questioning, on locks until the pc can remember something really "real" to him, something which he "really loved," something with which he was in communication. Then drill him on creating illusions until he is certain he has created one which really isn't real, which he is certain he put the emotion and perceptions into. (See Self Analysis, British Edition, with attention to End-of-Session Processing) Then go through steps again. Failing Step VI, after a quick test, go to Step VII.

Step VII—Present Time Body Orientation: Have preclear locate a part of his body and recognise it as such. Have him locate furniture, fixtures, auditor in room. Have him locate the town and country he is in. Get him to find something in present time which is really real to him, with which he can communicate. Work on this until he can do this. Then go to Step VI. Then go to Step I.

THE BIBLIOGRAPHY FOR SOP THETA CLEARING IS AS FOLLOWS:

Dianetics: The Modern Science of Mental Health; Science of Survival; Self Analysis (British Edition as revised Fall, 1952); Course Books of Professional Course; Scientology 8-8008.