DIANETICS: THE MODERN MIRACLE

A lecture given on
6 February 1952

The Race Against Man's "Savage Instinct"

Tonight I wish to make an announcement regarding this science and what it can now do.

You know, Dianetics has been in existence, actually, for fourteen years. It has been in a developmental stage for twenty-two years.

The goal of Dianetics was to be able to deliver an improved human being in a very few hours of work. That goal was attained this last month, in January. The amount of time required was cut down to somewhere between fifteen and thirty-five hours in processing.

This makes it possible to do a lot of things with Dianetics that were never done before — a lot of things. Let's take a pilot in the air forces: We know that the pilots are as vital as the planes. All right, we take a pilot and we find out that the split second of reaction time which he is allowed in making his decisions may be the important point between a battle lost or a number of passengers alive or dead. We can take a pilot's reaction time now and take any desire he has to fail and process them in such a way that we get an individual who has a much faster reaction time, who is much more positive in his decisions, whose nervousness about his job is zero. That is the goal of Dianetics.

Dianetics is a process based on certain axioms which make it possible to do things with the human mind to improve it in its operation. It isn't a belief or a cult or it isn't Ivory soap or Hadacol. It is simply a method by which, without any particular upset, an individual could be put into an optimum operating condition for that individual.

For instance, an infantryman in Korea in the last five minutes was killed. Why? Because he was too slow; because his judgment was slot quite good enough. Do you know, for instance, that it is the first few minutes of combat which make the casualty, not the first many hours? If a man is going to be killed or wounded, it happens quickly, immediately after he comes into the lines. Now, that is important. That is important.

Supposing you could take this boy and you could give him a stability so that he could stand up to enemy fire to such a degree that he would not get killed in those first fifteen minutes. You know, if a pilot is going to be killed in combat, in World War I they found out he was going to be killed in the first minute and a half of combat, and if he survived that he would go on.

Well, what was it in individuals which made them get killed in that first minute and a half? What happened to that infantryman five minutes ago who was killed in Korea? Why did he get killed? Why did the people on each side of him?

There is an element of luck in all wars, but what is it in the mind — the specific thing in the mind — that makes it possible for one human being to go through anything, remain stable, calm, in possession of himself, to face and fight down any situation he encounters, which another human being finds so dreadful, so antipathetic, finds him indecisive and unable? What is the difference between these two human beings? Well, that has been the search in Dianetics.

Perhaps Dianetics is not, today, a terrifically popular subject. There are probably only about 150 thousand people in the world today who are well acquainted with Dianetics, and that is not very many because there are billion human beings in the world.

Now, what is it, for instance, in the human mind that makes it not want to be as capable as it wants to be? What is this paradox? Well, tonight I wish to announce that Dianetics has attained

a milestone and a goal. This lecture tonight isn't being given just to drum up some interest or enthusiasm here in Wichita; this lecture tonight is given because there is something to talk about.

How long it takes the savant, how long it takes the government, to utilize this which has been discovered here in Wichita is a question someone else will have to answer. But it is certain that in five years — maybe three years, maybe twenty years — this will be routine; it will be routine, because the prisons are full of criminals and the institutions are full of insane and the world is full of hate and war. And man may or may not be able to utilize this before he wipes himself out, but the point is that man will take about as much as you can give him.

Now, this announcement tonight is going to be more or less widely circulated. Very possibly someone in the government will be interested in this; perhaps the pilots of the air force within the next year will be utilizing this, and perhaps not. But here is the subject.

Now, I don't wish to overestimate the accomplishment of my role in Dianetics or the accomplishment of Dianetics itself. And I don't want to understate the possible impact of these discoveries on society, because these impacts could be tremendous if society survives long enough. And it may be that man won't welcome any kind of a change in his being; maybe he would rather go down in rubble than do so. And it may be that these discoveries tonight may lie a long, long time neglected and maybe never be used at all. But I can't pretend, then, that these discoveries automatically mean a safer world — a world without criminals or a world without war — but I can hope, as an American, that these discoveries may play some part in bringing about the desirable goal of a world in fairly good condition.

For instance, Dr. Conant, Dr. Oppenheimer, Albert Einstein himself, have been saying — have been saying rather consistently — "Here is the atom bomb. It's too bad that we put it out the way we did, but here it is. And this world is not going to be safe with this atom bomb in it until somebody finds some method of changing the nature of man."

I happen to be a nuclear physicist; I am not a psychologist nor a psychiatrist nor a medical doctor. To some degree, it was my responsibility that this world got itself an atom bomb, because there were only a handful of nuclear physicists in the thirties — only a handful. And we were all beating the desk and saying "How wonderful it will be if we discover atomic fission," because we decided that the thing to do with atomic fission was to go out and discover the stars, to make big passenger liners that would go ten times around the world on the same fuel. This was what we endeavored to do with atomic fission. The government stepped in and gave us three billion dollars. I had nothing to do with that program; I would not have had anything to do with the program. Three billion dollars to destroy all of man.

Well, these gentlemen realized that a world with man's nature as it is, is not safe with an atom bomb. All right. How do you go about changing the nature of man? That is a big, blunt question. Dr. Conant and several others were asking it not two months ago at a conference of atomic physicists. How do you go about changing the nature of man? They said it can't be done.

Those gentlemen are very good with their equations, but they were wrong on that one. It can be done. How fast it can be done, how broadly it can be done — this is something else. But man can now change the nature of man — can change it very basically and radically.

And it is that that I am announcing tonight. Because not even Dianetics two years ago could take enough time to change the nature of one individual man and make him better, freer, happier and capable of living in peace and harmony with his fellows. It just took too long. It doesn't take too long now. So I feel that that is worth announcing.

Now, you don't have to much take my word for it. When anything can be done that fast — fifteen, thirty-five hours — it is very susceptible of proof.

Whether or not this change is permanent in the individual is well established as far as we in Dianetics are concerned. It may take a little while for other fields to satisfy themselves that this has taken place, but they will satisfy themselves.

This work I have engaged on in the last twenty-two years, with this culmination which I tell you about now, isn't brand-new, fresh work. It has been going on for an awfully long time. For fifty thousand years man has been faced with the enigma of himself and his fellows. And man has been victimized by brutal instincts and impulses which have caused him to erect, in self-protection, prisons, legal codes and complex social systems. Man has not felt safe from man, and indeed, the conduct of man down the ages has not much justified belief or faith: wars, murder, arson, treachery and betrayals, cynicism and destruction have marred his progress, until history itself is a long montage of battles, murders and running blood.

You teach a little kid history: What are you teaching him? You are teaching him how this town killed that town, how this king was murdered by that woman, how this war changed the boundaries here and there. It is a pretty strange picture for a civilized being. Not even the apes are indulging in this sort of thing.

Confronted with this aspect in himself and his fellows, man has long searched for an answer to the riddle of his own behavior, for ways to remedy that behavior. Long before Diogenes, man was searching for such answers to his questions. In Babylon, Chaldea, India, and even in the distant primitive times, those men who could think found concern in the antisocial and unreasonable conduct of their fellows.

Throughout all these ages, little by little, bits of the answer have been forthcoming, and lost and unknown names gave us, thousands of years ago, the discoveries of hypnotism, faith healing, dream therapy and much of the humanities.

Man has not been ignorant nor has he neglected this search. Shock therapy, very similar to that practiced today in the institutions — in fact, the same therapy — was practiced by the Greeks two thousand and better years ago. They used hellebore to produce convulsive shock. And as far as psycho surgery is concerned, they were using it in Ecuador — oh, two thousand years ago or fifteen hundred years ago, something like that.

They have been very active in this field. They have been very concerned about the insanity amongst their fellows, about the criminals in their tribe, about the uncooperative and antisocial aspects of their people.

Man has been very deeply interested and he has accumulated an enormous amount of data. To start out clean and clear and say "Look, I've made a brand-new discovery, and this is all shiny new and it's mine" would be to deny the fact that man has been accumulating this same data for that long a period of time.

Now, no flashy and spectacular result in modern times can gainsay the brilliance of achievement of the early searchers in the field of the human mind, for these, out of the morass of superstition and taboo, sorted out the first phenomena that was vital to the solution of the problem. Any result which I announce tonight — any new discovery — must of necessity depend upon thousands of unknown workers in this field dead these many millennia. And it has more modern dependents.

Man's search for the answer to his own riddle was quickened during the last century by two things: the first was the energy and curiosity of Sigmund Freud, and the second was the mathematics of James Clerk Maxwell's and his studies of energy in the physical universe. These two things came up almost simultaneously.

Now, to talk of the faults of Freud, as do those who practice psychoanalysis today — they are quite bitter about their own master — is very ungenerous. This great pioneer, against the violent objections of medical doctors and the psychiatrists of his day, ventured to put forth the

theory that memory was connected with present-time behavior, and that by talk alone a patient could be made well.

Whatever the repute of the libido theory and whatever the disillusionment of this man himself (along about 1937 he was writing papers on "Psychoanalysis, Terminable and Interminable"), his work and method of address were a valuable step toward the eventual solution.

Now, Freud worked under the terrible handicap of a superstitious world. The doctors had but recently stopped letting blood to make patients well; things were pretty well in their dark ages as far as medicine or anything else was concerned. And in his day it was very nearly unholy to touch a human mind — you just didn't do that. There is some of that feeling alive today — that you mustn't tamper with anybody's human mind; the mind is too complex and you are liable to damage it and so forth. A lot of people doing that work today ought to follow their own injunction, because you can injure the mind. That can be done.

Freud worked without knowledge of the physical universe, which was developed in the years which followed his initial efforts. Freud was not a physical scientist. Freud, if anything, was a mystic. He was a good doctor and he was a mystic.

Once upon a time man was chiefly concerned with his soul, not his mind, and faith healing often gave forth spectacular results. Somebody would come along and put his hands on a patient and suddenly this person would no longer be paralyzed, this person would no longer have ulcers or something would happen. Very interesting phenomena. Faith healing.

Freud was working with the idea that this faith healing sprung from something called a soul, and it had something to do with a transfer of feeling between the patient and the doctor and so on. He was up against that. He was dealing in the universe of the soul, or whatever you want to call it, and he did not deal with the physical universe. One of his people — Jung, for instance: enormous amount of data on the mystic side.

But here we have the physical universe. Now, we tie together Freud's knowledge with our modern knowledge of the physical universe, which has given us atomic fission. It was certain that somebody was going to tie these together and get these results, because the work had been done in both fields and they were ready to join up.

Freud said a lot of very important things. They were maybe good guesses or maybe they were very astute observations. But one of the things which Freud said was that man could do something about his own mind. And that is very interesting that just saying that was a big step forward, just all by itself.

Also according to Freud, man had buried within him certain brutal and sometimes overmastering instincts which caused him to act as he did. And Freud said that man's trouble stemmed from these instincts and the effort of man to repress them. I wish you to mark that theory very well. It was given without proof or the phenomena of observation necessary to prove it. It was given as a lucky guess, maybe, but it was given. Freud never handled or measured one of these instincts. He said they were there. That is all he said. That theory was added to the bulk of data already accumulated about the human mind.

And suppose I were to tell you tonight that the basic savage instincts of man — the instincts which make him kill and murder and engage in war — existed in such a state that they could be handled, measured, experienced, with a clarity and precision never before attained in this field. That would be a good science, wouldn't it?

Science is concerned with the measurement of forces and the prediction of results. That is all science is concerned with.

Supposing you could go out into the world or into your laboratories and, on instruments you already have available, measure the instincts and impulses from savage and brutal times, and

measure them with a precision enviable in physics itself. How many amperes does the urge to kill generate? What do you do about it? Supposing you could predict exactly what instincts would do to a human mind, do to a human being.

Now, I believe that techniques of application exist very adequate to handle these basic and savage instincts, because that is what they are.

Now, it's unfair to take any great credit for my discoveries in Dianetics, in view of much of the past work. With the work of Freud and Breuer and with the countless generations of workers in this field constantly amassing data and observation, it was utterly inevitable that between the data of mathematics and the physical universe and the observations of Freud, Adler, Jung, much earlier workers, the solution was going to turn up if a solution was there. And the probable reason why this solution to these discoveries did not earlier appear has to do with the knowledge we have gained in the last half century about the physical universe and its structure. You know that we have only just now begun to measure atoms, impulses, weights and masses of light particles and so forth. Well, what has this to do with the mind? It has a lot to do with the mind. Now, may I impose on your patience long enough to tell you the story of how Scientology — which is the basic and background knowledge from which Dianetics comes — came about, and how Dianetics came about, and how I came to be interested in this? It probably will tell you as much as anything else of the necessary coordination of information to this result.

In the twenties I was fortunate enough to know Commander Thompson of the Medical Corps of the United States Navy. He was a colorful man; he was very poised, was very traveled; he was curious in half a hundred sciences. And the United States Navy, having heard of the work of Freud, naturally, took ahold of Thompson and they sent him over to Vienna, and they had him soak up anything that Freud had to say and study very thoroughly under Freud himself. Commander Thompson came back to apply that information to the United States Navy. I was just a kid and Commander Thompson didn't have any boy of his own, and he and I just got along fine.

Why he took it into his head to start beating Freud into my head, I don't know. But he did. And I wanted very much to follow out this work — wanted very much to. I didn't get a chance. My father, a naval officer — a very fine officer but a very, very dogmatic officer about his own opinions — said, "Son, you're going to be an engineer." So I talked right back to him and I said, "Yes, Father," and went and took engineering.

Well, the engineering course which I embraced, taken at George Washington University in Washington, D.C. — Washington, D.C. had a lot to offer, and one of the things the university had to offer was something that I suppose no one will ever see the like of again: It was the first course, as far as I know, of atomic and molecular physics. We called it at that time atomic molecular phenomena, and today they call it nuclear physics. And by the way, there are very few nuclear physicists who have ever studied nuclear physics. Most of them study just basic physics.

We had a lot of fun; we were trying to measure light and so on. It was all new; it was a brand-new world of Alice in Wonderland. Anything went, and amongst the things that went was the fact that I wanted to find out what is the smallest particle of energy in the physical universe? What is it? Now, is it ultraviolet light particles or what is it? The smallest particle of light, and where would I look for it?

Well, I looked for what I considered to be the smallest container of the "mostest," which is the human mind. Obviously the human mind had to have an awfully small order of energy in order to operate at all. Well, as a matter of fact, I had considerable encouragement to go ahead and research this. Nobody was against a boy researching this sort of thing in those days.

It was my idea that the brain was something like a very good electronic computing machine that ran on some kind of energy. That was an interesting study, and I found various things startling and unknown about the mind.

Here, all of a sudden, we had an engineer and he was looking at the mind, and he was not looking at the mind through anybody else's glasses; he was just looking at energy and phenomena.

One of the projects would amuse you very much: it was how to write poetry which invariably makes the mind respond — how to write poetry which invariably gets response — by the use of sounds; a study of the effect of sound on the mind itself, so that you can write nonsense poetry which will make the person sit down and cry. It is what sound does to the mind.

Interesting studies. They, of course, led to nothing very much.

But I found out, for instance, the brain operated on 2.4 watts. And I found the rate of nerve-impulses flow, the possible kind of energy that flows along nerves. Very interesting stuff.

And then one day I found out that no physical-universe energy known to man could be responsible for the operation of a human mind — just like that. It was impossible. There was no order of energy that small. And I looked at it and looked at it and scratched my head and tried to figure. And then I figured out, if this memory that we get was stored in punched protein molecules — oh, just lots of memory stored in one molecule, maybe a thousand memories stored in a molecule . . . There are ten to the twenty-first power binary digits of neurons in the human brain. That is an awful lot of them. And there are an awful lot of molecules in the human brain. I sat down and figured out how much a person observed for how long in order to answer up this problem; I found out a man had enough memory to last him three months. Every three months we inevitably must get amnesia. We can't possibly remember earlier than three months if the mind runs on energy as we know it, because there is no place to store it.

It was interesting to me that one of the boys out at Ma Bell (you know, the big Bell Laboratories) — we know quite a few of those boys and we have a lot of fun sitting around shooting the breeze about what might be and what might not be — had just repeated this same experiment. He didn't know I had done it already. And he found out that, obviously, if the mind runs on energy, the human brain does not function any longer than three months. In other words, you couldn't possibly remember who you married or if you were married, if you were married more than three months ago. It is as ridiculous as that.

Well, puppy to the root, I thought, "Oh my, this is wonderful. This is wonderful. Now I'll go to the man who knows." Well, there was Dr. William Alanson White, a very fine man. He was head of the big St. Elizabeth's, the big mental institution there in Washington, D.C., and he had been a friend of mine for quite a while. I had met him through other friends of Dr. Thompson's. And I went over there and very proudly I said, "Now, look what I've done."

He took a look at it and — "It doesn't run on energy, huh?" I hadn't realized it, but he hadn't ever considered that it even ran on energy. He had just never looked at it from this viewpoint, that it was a machine, that it was an electronic computer, that it was any of these things.

And he was very, very nice about the whole thing and he told me the sky is the limit, and he said, "If you carry out these researches, if you've got nerve enough to do it, then one of these fine days," he said, "you'll certainly, undoubtedly wind up with something. Bad or good, you'll certainly come up with an answer." After that he used to see me every once in a while, and he would smile at me and we would have a talk about the subject. We were in different worlds as far as that was concerned, because he was a Jungian and he believed in the soul and basic instincts.

Well, it was his belief in instincts that got me very curious. What is an instinct? You know, an engineer just won't admit that something exists unless you can sense, measure and experience

it. That is what he wants to do. And somebody says "Why, it's nothing to be sensed, measured or experienced; it's an instinct," you say, "Hm-hm. If it's there and if it has influence on the human body and if it has bearing on the problem of the human mind and if it motivates a man to move here and there and do certain things, there is some kind of a switch, and it is it. It is an entity; it exists; there is something about it that we can sense, measure or experience. Therefore, it is on phi.

Now, Freud came along and he said, "There are basic instincts that are savage, that are carried over from ancient times," and then just threw the whole problem aside.

"Well, if they're carried over from ancient times, if there are brutal and savage instincts," I said, "why, you measure them. They should be as visible as a plate of potatoes." And I couldn't ever argue anybody over to my side of the reasoning in the early days, because I couldn't pick up an instinct and say "Look, here's an instinct. It registers 1.2 amperes and it is worn on Sundays."

So, one of the things that I did when I continued these studies was to keep a close lookout for myself that I didn't wander off into any byroads, that I didn't go off into any mysticism.

I wrote a lot of stories and did a lot of other things to support myself in the meantime. Any nuclear physicists in the old days, rocket engineers, something of the sort (I am still a member of the American Rocketry Society), were known as "Buck Rogers boys." (You know, Buck Rogers was a comic-strip character that was always going off to Mars or Venus.)

Well, they said, "There's no use for this nuclear physics. You fellows can produce an interesting lot of results on the laboratory bench, but you'll never have anything else. You're just sort of lost cats." We felt that way; we were Buck Rogers boys. Then one day Hiroshima went boom! and we stopped being Buck Rogers boys, and nuclear physicists, responsible for that, almost became pariahs in the society. If they aren't today, they will be, because something had an awful lot more force than anybody expected it had.

This research in the mind up to that time was almost a Buck Rogers sort of a research. Here, obviously, the mind couldn't store the memory, and it demonstrably ran on brutal and savage instincts, and you couldn't find the energy and the instincts were not to be located anyplace. Now, this posed quite a problem.

Well, the problem has been pretty well licked.

Living with the beasts of the jungle and caught at every hand by death and terror, early man couldn't do anything else but develop a brutal reaction. Maybe he might have been good before he started to hit the physical universe, but by the time he hit that, he hit tooth and claw, and murder and war were commonplace. He had to kill to live, and he kept on killing.

Man hasn't learned to control his environment to this day like he should, but he controls it an awful lot better than he did when he was hanging in trees.

Well now, here he has a civilization all laid out that should run according to plan and everybody ought to be free and happy and we shouldn't have any laws, and the prisons ought to be empty and there shouldn't be any insanity and there ought to be plenty to eat. This would be a real control of the environment and man, and we don't have that.

What is standing in the road? These brutal and savage instincts, maybe? Something man picked up when he was swinging from trees or hiding in caves or even earlier. Kill, tooth and claw — these instincts, perhaps, he has carried forward with him into his modern, civilized world, until you can actually get a man to consent to go out and be trained to have a rifle put in his hand and shoot another man in the name of something or other.

Here is your brutal, savage instinct of yesterday. Freud said it was there. Jung said it was there. Adler said it was there. Everybody agrees it is there. But what is it and where is it?

Man hasn't been able to escape his heritage. We found that out. He is grasping wildly today for some method of restraining the brutality of his fellows or even himself. He looks toward government — community government, state government, city, national and even an international government — to restrain the brutality of his fellows and maybe even himself.

Perhaps he is motivated in all that brutality by all the crimes which lie back in the yesterdays, which remain, somehow, as built-in instincts.

Now, Freud spoke of primitive instincts and he spoke of a censor necessary to repress them. And to an engineer, when you mention that something exists, he wants to measure that something and get it down in yards or cubic inches or amperes every time. Freud said brutal instincts exist. He said that man had to fight them down and repress them, that this conflict caused human and social illness. Well, what are the instincts? Where are they? How brutal are they? How does one go about getting rid of them? For, logically, if something exists, one can certainly do something about it. Further, how would man react if he d id get rid of these instincts? Would all of his ambitions, his freedom, his forces, his imagination — would all these things be gone? Or would they be better? Would he have more imagination and more freedom and more power and strength and better health if these instincts were gone? That question has to be answered too.

It is all very well to have a lot of theories. Theories are wonderful things. As long as you don't have phenomena, you can have all the theories you want to. That is a rule in engineering. You get a theory and then you try to apply the thing, and if it doesn't apply to the physical universe you throw it out and get another theory.

Unfortunately, the field of the mind has been able to accumulate a terrific number of theories without running into any phenomena to prove or disprove them.

Now, if we have a theory about this brutal instinct and so forth, we had certainly better find out if it is a good theory or a bad theory, if it is provable, if the phenomena is there.

The engineer is interested in a fact: the fact is the thing, the item is the thing. An engineer wants to get his hands on things to find out what they weigh and how they behave and how many you can make of this and do with that. When an engineer starts to build a bridge across a river, he had certainly better have a bridge across the river. He can't stand on the side of the river bank and, to everybody who comes along and wants to cross, say "Well, I got a good theory. There's a bridge there." The fellow goes on, falls in, comes back and he says, "There is no bridge there." Well, there is no arguing with it; there is no bridge. So the engineer gets fired and you hire somebody else.

When you start to drive a tunnel through a mountain, you want to have a mountain and then drive a tunnel, and then you want the tunnel to stay there.

Unless you have phenomena to back this up, unless you can weigh and measure these things — and measure them accurately — they still remain in a big state of "up in the air." Who has any authority to say what theory is valid? Nobody has any authority to say what theory is valid.

Here is a trick to prove this: If you could get Einstein to say "No more atom bombs will now explode. I have a new theory: no atom bombs are going to explode" — you try to convince the boys out at Nevada that their atom bombs don't explode — they will; they will go on exploding. Now, there would be a case of somebody injecting a theory into the field of atomic physics which did not match up with the physical universe.

And that is what we are trying to do. We are trying to make the mind match up with the physical universe.

What is this thing that we observe? We are here; we are part of the physical universe — at least part of us is part of the physical universe. We are not wholly physical universe, but if anything can influence our conduct in the physical universe, we sure should be able to measure it. That is the argument. And sure enough.

Right now man is subjugated, he is afraid, he is made brutal and wicked, let's say, by basic instincts. In order to be civilized he must repress these instincts, and the moment he represses them he becomes sick as an individual. The instinct has to operate or he becomes sick. That is Freudian theory. The solution is impossible, then, isn't it? If the guy has an instinct and you repress it, the fellow becomes sick.

They have theories about abreacting hostilities, and by the way, you can observe this one. You take some individual who is sort of driven down in life and you put him in a job where he can bawl people out and raise the dickens with them — you know, a sergeant, traffic cop, something like that — and right away he starts picking up and getting well. What can he do? "He can abreact his hostility," they say. In other words, he can dramatize this instinct. He doesn't have to repress it so thoroughly. So if he doesn't have to repress it, he gets better.

If man were found to be good and free when the instinct was lifted, and if he could reach inside of himself and lift this instinct to kill and to be brutal and savage and so forth, then you could solve the problem.

I hate such words as instincts because they are a big indefiniteness. Can you measure an instinct with amperes and watts? And can you feel one and see one and so forth? Yes, you can. It hasn't been very long that we have been able to do that even in Dianetics, but we can now measure them in amperes and watts, look at them, sort them, tell you how long they are and how wide they are and how thick they are. And can we eradicate them from the mind? Yes, just like you would burn up a piece of cloth or something like that. Yes, they are gone. All right.

Now, is man healthier and better with them gone? Is he then able to cope with the universe better? Is he able to act better? Is he able to handle himself better? Is he more social? Is he happier? Is he freer? Is he more individualistic? Because, you see, you would lose if he weren't those things. You don't want prefrontal-lobotomied slaves — not in man; you want man to be as free as you can possibly make him.

Fortunately — no credit to anybody — when you pick up the instinct he becomes free and he becomes social and he is able to cope with his environment and he no longer wants to go around and steal, murder, burn or engage in war and so forth. Fortunately.

Repression of savages makes for illness, and thus a man repressing antisocial tendencies is likely to become ill. He does. He realizes that if he let himself go and let himself do these things which he had an impulse to do, he would be in trouble and society would be in trouble and so forth. So, actually, your civilized man is a terrifically repressed man. He is holding on to these things; he won't let himself go. He won't let himself win, because any time he wins somebody else might die. Because the way you won in the old days was tooth and claw. You mustn't win that way now, so he represses these things.

Would you believe that he would go to the extent of paralyzing his right arm rather than hit somebody? Yet we can demonstrate it. Yes, he is repressing an impulse to hit somebody. And how does he repress it? Well, he represses it mentally and physically. He will actually incapacitate himself. It sounds incredible, but the proof of the pudding is, when you pick up the repression and the instinct to do it — and by the way, he will let the instinct to do it go first and then let the repression go — why, he will recover the use of his right arm. This is demonstrable. I don't know how long it takes to make a full paralytic recover, for instance, in terms of hours with these new processes, but it isn't terribly long.

Now, he is basically good, and between him and this goodness lies a savage and twisted past. He inherited it from centuries of being, centuries of savageness, and the instincts he had to wear as a primitive and as a savage. And he's still got them, and they are there and they are fully and wholly on record.

You know, the unconscious and subconscious mind and the super-strata subconscious that the censor sat over and all this sort of thing: People had it figured out that man had installed a little man or something on top of his subconscious mind to keep these savage instincts from rising up and doing something to him. Well, he has practically done as bad as that.

What is the content of this subconscious mind? What is the content of this unconscious mind? What is the content of these things? Because if you say something has content, well, you had certainly better be prepared to measure it in amperes and watts, and how many yards and cubic inches.

Let's not be mystic and say "Well, all that stems from the unconscious mind and therefore nobody can do anything about it." No, let's find out what the unconscious mind is and what it has got in it. Well, we found it. You can take the cap off of it and look. You can show a fellow and he says, "My God!" He says, "Let's do something about that one" — bang!

Sometimes you start to work on him and he is not going to let you have any part of it; he knows they are there. He won't even let himself know they are there. He won't let you have a single glimpse unless all of a sudden he gets security in the fact that that stuff is all going to be gone. And the second you demonstrate to him it can all go, he is right there; he will work with you right straight through. Funny, isn't it? He knows what it takes to survive in this society.

Oddly enough, his basic instinct is to protect and help his fellows, himself. He is not a single, all-out-for-number-one character. But he gets these instincts, and they get in his road and they make him act like he is all out for himself. There isn't a person here tonight who hasn't tried very, very hard to help their fellow man — not one. And also, there isn't one here tonight who hasn't been cuffed for doing it. You know, you try to help them, they don't want help and you fail at it and so on.

That is a funny thing. Here we have a creature who wants to help, who wants to be unified with his fellows, who wants to be loved, who wants to be secure and at the same time adventurous, who wants to be a unified civilization. And here we have him all torn apart inside himself and amongst his groups so that all he does about it, really, is nag and rave and commit war. All sorts of strange things here.

Now, you take the savage, antisocial impulse of man — any man, woman or child — take that away and he is freer to act, because now he can act. Before, every time he acted he said, "Well — gulp! Maybe this is the time I killed Ug." Here is this impulse that he developed somewhere back on the track: It is some kind of an instinct that he has carried along his protoplasm line, genetic line and so forth. You take these instincts up — you can find them — and a man's intelligence sometimes as much as doubles.

He can't even let himself think as clearly as he could because think what he might think about. There is something there that he shouldn't think about and so he limits his own thinking capacity.

We have found the instincts and the lid on the unconscious mind — the subconscious, whatever you want to call it — and the content of that subconscious mind. That is interesting, but it is even more interesting that when one takes away the force and power of a brutal self, the individual's nature is changed so that he is much more successful than he was before. He is the same person he always was, but he is the person who isn't any longer repressed, held down, unsuccessful, unhappy. He is safe to trust something to. You could go out and give such a man an atom bomb and you could say "Here." He would say, "My golly, somebody is

liable to do something with this. I'd better take awful good care that this thing doesn't get loose anyplace. "

You hand this atom bomb to a group of individuals today in this society, they are liable to say "Oh, good! Now we can rule the whole world; now we can put collars and chains on everybody." That is the horrible truth of the matter. Of course, they will do this for man's good! They will say, "We have to do this because man is so wicked he has to be controlled, and we're the boys that are going to control him."

There is a set of those fellows over in the Kremlin right now. They are "helping" Russia. They are really "helping her out." They are really "helping out" the rest of the world. To themselves, they have all sorts of twisted purposes and reasons why they have to operate this way, and so on. They are mad!

Now, to be very precise and give you definitions: Dianetics is the field of knowledge which pertains to the treatment of the human mind. It comes out of the parent science I evolved in 1938 which is called Scientology, which is a study of science, or a study of knowledge. According to Funk and Wagnalls New Standard Dictionary, Supplement Number Five, Dianetics is "a system for the analysis, control and development of human thought evolved from a set of coordinated axioms which also provide techniques for the treatment of a wide range of mental disorders and organic diseases: term and doctrines introduced by L. Ron Hubbard, American engineer. (Greek dianoetikos — dia. through, plus noos, mind.)" So we have the science of epistemology, which is knowledge itself as it exists, and then when we apply it through the human mind, this becomes Dianetics. And Dianetics is what we know it by.

Over two hundred axioms comprise this body of knowledge of Scientology, and the most of these are applicable in Dianetics — the larger number of them.

Over two hundred new phenomena, previously observed indifferently or not observed at all, have been discovered in these researches on Dianetics. That is quite a few. They are sure there; they are sure there. They would show up on anybody.

Four years ago I wrote a thesis on the elementary technique and practice of Dianetics — a very mild little thesis, very elementary — and submitted it to the American Medical Association and American Psychiatric Association for their consideration and use. Neither one of these organizations have any sub organization which can care for such a thing; they both told me so. In that day there was no antagonism on the matter; they just merely neglected it. I tried in various ways to find an outlet for this because it was becoming dangerous to have it around — because, believe me, when you know how the human mind works, you can use it in subversive lines and you can drive a man mad as quick as you can make him well. So this material, if alive, should be widely spread.

A publisher insisted on my writing a popular book; he would not publish a scientific work. I wrote a popular book. That book still works. Its techniques, perhaps, are more difficult. That was Dianetics. The Modern Science of Mental Health.

The techniques of Dianetics: The Modern Science of Mental Health still work, but they are more difficult to learn and more difficult to apply and a little less certain, in the hands of relatively unskilled people, of results than what followed in the book called Science of Survival.

Science of Survival presents an array of techniques which, themselves, give a good rundown of Dianetics. And these techniques are quite workable, but still a little bit too much study required. Until today we have a subject which is very simple. But two years of trying to beat this into people's heads has given an awful lot of experience, and in addition to that, we have the substratum responsible — the substratum which was under this strata which was recounted in earlier works and books.

Now, the Foundation itself is an organization which is merely organized as a service unit for Dianetics. Dianetics is essentially a research. At this time the Foundation can organize a very competent school; there is a day school, a night school. This is to train practitioners, people who can do this. It doesn't take too long to train an individual, particularly if you fix him up before you train him, because he learns awfully fast. And the Foundation today exists still as a service unit. Dianetics isn't a business, it is not a crusade; it is something that nobody has quite ever had a category for before.

The goal of a sane world wouldn't be possible on a long-term process. You would have to have a short-term process. Before you could go out to an institution and say "We will empty this institution of criminals," you would have to be able to say how long it would take to do so. Well, it takes twenty-five hours a criminal, which is pretty good. Maybe it will get shorter than that, but that is still pretty good.

The address of Dianetics in general, however, isn't to the ill. It isn't, really, the ill that we are trying to reach; it is not the insane or the criminal. These things — the ill, the insane and the criminal — are actually liabilities to the society. What we are trying to reach is the goal of the improvement of the able. How much better can an engineer work if an engineer doesn't have to stop himself from thinking? How much better can a politician work if he himself isn't burdened down with various paranoid tendencies which cause him to go out and try to batter the rest of the world down?

Now, the improvement of the able: How much better can a pilot be? How much better could he fly, and how much longer will he live? You notice all these airline crashes? Planes coming down like so much volcanic ash all over the place — lots of crashes. Two things are responsible for those crashes: disturbed operations officers and dispatchers; disturbed pilots. As far as mechanical failures on these planes are concerned, maybe the ground crews aren't as efficient as they could be, and maybe they need something. You are dealing here with human minds; you are dealing here with a necessity.

Now, processing itself has become very simple. The practitioner first must understand the basic axioms of the subject and their meaning in processing. He must have a good grasp of his essential tools, and he can gain this understanding in a few weeks if he is quick and intelligent. Then he has to be able to handle the techniques of application themselves.

Dianetics was very complicated, maybe, to discover, but it has gotten very simple in its application now. It is no more than reason joining research in the humanities and research in the fields of energy and the physical sciences. That is all — just these two fields coming together, and what is known in one joined up with what is known in the other and the whole thing coordinated.

For instance, if you could remove all the pain from a person's lifetime, you would say he felt pretty good. Well, you can do that with Dianetics too; that is the long process, but essentially that is what you are doing. You can take all the pain out of a person's lifetime, and he will certainly be easier to get along with. Perhaps, now, it may be possible in an overwrought world to do something about the criminals, the insane, about war, the antisocial hatred man feels for man. But it is something of a race, too. It is a race with something my classmates invented — a something called an atom bomb.

The way to make man reasonable should have preceded atomic fission. It has come up concurrently with it. Thus it is a vital race. One does not know who will win. Can we do something for the savage in civilized garb before he ruins this world and all man? That is a question which the future must answer. I cannot do more than the work I have done and to publish and make available what has been done.

It may be that this answer in Dianetics will never have a chance to be used. That depends upon you, the universities of America and the world, and the public in general.

Every facility which I have and every knowledge which we have gained is at your disposal. It is at your disposal to treat your crippled, your ill, your infirm, to improve you, to make crime a thing of yesterday, to banish war forever. But it is up to you.