

## REVIEW OF PROGRESS OF DIANETICS AND DIANETICS BUSINESS

A lecture given on  
25 February 1952

### The Bridge to Scientology

This is actually the first official talk from Hubbard College. I might give you a few words about that.

Things have a habit of happening too fast in Dianetics. You know, every once in a while I think I am up-to-date and it is all on the rails and it will go out in this direction smoothly now from here on, and it is all settled down and we have got the train sandbagged so it just can't jump the rails, you see? And then all of a sudden, boom! There it is on some other track with another railroad name on it. And I come along and I say, "What? Where are all these beautiful blue coaches that we had yesterday?" Well, they're red coaches today.

What has happened in the last two years in Dianetics is — well, back in the days when I was writing fiction I could have made it into a very wonderful story. The idea of something like this hitting a society at this time is in itself dramatic. I failed to sense any great drama in it at first.

Maybe three, four years ago I found out various strange things would happen. If I went into a town or a neighborhood, I would go up to somebody on the street — somebody who was limping along with a cane or something of the sort — and I would say, "Here's a card. Why don't you come up and see me, and we'll see what I can do about your leg." And the fellow would look at me kind of oddly, and then the next thing you know, why, there he would be. I would put him on the couch and do a little bit of Straightwire and fool around with the track and pick up his level of reality and a few other things and knock out a couple of engrams and he wouldn't need his cane. Well, he would go home then, and Aunt Bessie who had rheumatism and Uncle Oscar who had kidney stones would say, "I wonder, what's that guy doing? I wonder if he could do anything for me?" So I would get a knock on the door and here would be Aunt Bessie and Uncle Oscar. And the first thing you know, I would be having a hard time.

I wasn't calling it Dianetics; I wasn't calling it anything. It was just, they would come to see me and they would walk out without a crutch, or something.

Well, this in itself was interesting to a town. First thing you know, I would be walking along a street and people would glance in my direction — people in the neighborhood and so forth. "What is that guy doing?" Years later they are still asking the same question. Only in those days, I knew, and these days I don't.

Well, I was busy in this field. I have been busy in it, actually, for about twenty-two years. It was interesting. I thought people knew about the human mind, and then one day I found out that they didn't know, that there were all sorts of "ologies," and there was phrenology and astrology and everything, but people just didn't know. And I thought this was wonderful, because there were people walking around in big hospitals, and there were people here and there, and they all knew — obviously they must know, because they got paid for doing something about it. But a checkup demonstrated that they didn't know, and they were some of the first ones to tell me, actually, not only that they didn't know but that nobody would ever be able to know. I got redheaded at that point. That is how I got my red hair!

They got money for knowing, but they maintained they didn't know, and I merely maintained that somebody could find out. And this was like dropping a carload of railroad ties across somebody's freight-train track; this was terrifically objected to.

You think that objections that have been made to Dianetics since it came out in the first book form are wild: you should have heard some of the discussions which I have had in psychology departments in universities, in hospitals, in sanitariums, on the subject of "Could the problem be solved?" And that elicited a far greater battle than merely saying the problem has been solved, and the kickback against that. That is mild compared to this other.

Now, oddly enough, we receive these days oblique letters and statements from doctors, heads of psychology departments, saying things like this: "There is no slightest doubt that Dianetics works."

Well, two psychologists, for instance, were working in a big city, and an auditor went over to see them and he had a big discussion with them. And the only thing that was upsetting to them was the fact that they didn't know how it worked. And they evidently had been cut off a communication line and they couldn't find out how to work it because they wouldn't read the first book, because it wasn't complex enough. That is what they said. They didn't say it in that many words; they said it wasn't academically or authoritarily written or something like that. So they figured there must be more to the subject. It looked too simple to them again.

In short, the main fight in the old days was just trying to tell people that something could be done about the human mind and something could be done about psychosomatic illness and something could be done about the physical health of individuals and their efficiency and their capacity to work. Now, that created a furor.

The furor that was created when the first book came out — that was in the spring of 1950 — lacked the concentrated kickback that I expected it to have. It actually did. There was quite a fuss. The press was rather sarcastic, but the general fields of practice at first tried to just ignore the whole thing, and then they sort of succumbed to it, and then once in a while they would lash back on a covert line.

But do you know that none of these people have ever written me a letter? Not one. I have not received one letter from a medical doctor or a psychiatrist challenging Dianetics in any slightest degree or in any way. That is very interesting. On the contrary, I have many letters from medical doctors and psychiatrists asking me for more information. And some 10 percent of the associate membership of the Foundation in 1950 consisted of medical doctors and psychiatrists. Their mail, however, was always to be sent to their home, not their office.

And today, after this great lapse of time of two years (Dianetically, that is two or three million years, it seems), the comments coming in from the field are, interestingly enough, "The trouble with this subject is that no book has been placed in the hands of a psychiatrist by which they can work with their patients." That was stupid of me. There hasn't been a book written to that effect. The Handbook for Preclears lacks the directions on how you administer it exactly. It should say in there "You take this book and you open it up to page one and you read on through for your own instruction until you get to Act Four. And then you ask your patient what is the meaning of this and that to him, and then you explain the meaning of this and that to him out of the first text, paragraph so-and-so, pages so-and-so. And then you go to Act Five and then you read off these various things and you write down his answers in these columns and you continue through to the end of the book, omitting only Act Ten." Now, actually, those directions are not in the Handbook for Preclears. And the Handbook for Preclears right now is too complex for these people to use. But, actually, this is a bad omission. We became so angry at what psychiatrists did to people with electric shock that we actually cut the main line of mental therapy off as a communication line. And it has been sharply cut.

Doctors, for instance, right here in Wichita, are astonishingly enough not in disfavor to Dianetics. There are some that actually mad-dog on it, but at their own staff conference meetings they are in a big split-off. They are not sure, and they argue with each other in their staff conference meetings.

They were watching quite alertly, I understand, the arthritis programs which went on here at the Foundation. They watched this very alertly, and I never did make a publication of the results. But there was a doctor here in town that actually put a line through — a very covert sort of a line — to me to get those results. He didn't come in openly and say "Please give me the results." This is an interesting thing.

That is Dianetics, more or less as I outline it, and the field of accepted or conservative medicine, psychology and so on.

Right here at Wichita University, the chair of psychology or some such post there will occasionally make very smart cracks to his class — so his class reports to me. But I have never met the gentleman. And his knowledge of the subject is not up to the first book. Now, that is again my fault: I haven't written Dianetics in a very complex, dry, horribly dull fashion. I haven't gone to the library and found out some big words to use. I thought one time we might put its terminology in Sanskrit or something; that would be abstruse enough and then, of course, they could understand it!

But the point I am making is that Dianetics has not paved the way for the conservative fields that are supposed to treat human beings to follow the track of Dianetics. And one of our first jobs in Hubbard College is to make this possible. I am going to write up a little book that a psychiatrist can open on his desk and read to a patient and watch the results he gets with the patient. Therefore, the psychiatrist will not have to study Dianetics to find out if it works for him. He will see the results in his patient, and then he will feel either uncomfortable or comfortable about it.

We should have there on the shelf — Scientific Press, the book-publishing company that handles Dianetic books — something about that thick; I think we could probably use pages maybe that thick. And if we got it nice and thick and then made the print very small on it — very hard to read — and then made the words very big, you would find out that there would be acceptance.

This is actually a literary form that is in criticism, not a science or a subject. I don't know how anyone could do that, but they do that. The only criticism from that field has been literary form, not the subject. Because you don't call criticism such things as Menninger rushing into print madly in Liberty magazine and saying, "Dianetics is only psychotherapy as it is utilized, and it only contains things in it which psychotherapy utilizes, and Dianetics doesn't work. And there is no difference between Dianetics and psychotherapy." Now, you think I'm just giving you a sarcastic quote, but I'm not. Actually, it wasn't just Menninger; it was about three of the leading psychiatrists of the country that came up with this same statement, one right after the other.

What it is, is actually literary form.

They couldn't possibly understand it if they keep saying that they are not doing anything, because I say every place they are doing something and they ought to stop. And this is a big difference.

Now, as far as the subject itself is concerned, it has come forward through stage after stage of improvement and simplification. Any one of those stages accomplishes a consistency as far as the last stages are concerned. Any one of those stages works.

The earliest stages of Dianetics (it might amuse you) came when a study of general semantics indicated that there was some possibility that words themselves were very aberrative — just words. And the first effort of Dianetics, along the line of going back down the time track and so forth, was to clarify the definitions which people had of certain words, was to deemotionalize words. That was its first effort.

And by the way, to this day you can take a patient and work with a patient for many hours (maybe ten or fifteen hours), redefining words — just that — and then finding out where he heard this word first, where he learned it and so on, and then running him through the incident. And you will find out every word he gets wrong, or every word he fails to hear when you are talking to him, occurred in an emotional incident or occurred at a time when he was punished for having defined it or misdefined it, like in school and so on.

That is still a therapy; I mean, you can still work with this therapy.

However, one parted company very, very swiftly with semantics on this basis: Semantics believes that words are labels and that you must differentiate between the object and the label. That is all very well, but words are actually descriptive code phrases of existing states or states of change or potential states of change. There is not just the label.

There is something more to general semantics. They claim that words are undefined, that people cannot define certain words, and that when you talk in an undefinable term the other person can't understand what you are saying.

And again, this is not quite right; it is very close. But what happens is a person gets an emotional charge surrounding a word and then and thereafter is incapable of facing the word as a definition. It becomes an emotional state to him.

You take a Republican talking about a Democrat: Republicans back in the thirties, you used to say, "Well now, Franklin Delano Roosevelt..." You got no further than that with an industrialist, or something, up in Wall Street — no further than that — and he would say, "That blankety-blank Roosevelt!" and he would start to explode.

And you say, "Why don't you conduct a campaign to lick the Democrats along the line of the fact that this shouldn't be a socialism, that American freedom, way of life and so forth . . . And you can then demonstrate that the policies of Franklin Delano Roosevelt "

"That blankety-blank Roosevelt!" That is all you would get. And so the Republicans can't win. But it isn't because they don't know what Franklin Delano Roosevelt means — they know what that means — but the subject has been surrounded with so much emotion that they won't permit it to be used, even in their own minds, as a definition.

All undefinables have precision definitions. Every word in the English language is precisely defined, and every human being, if he is not terribly emotional about it, can get the definition for that word.

Voltaire, Thomas Paine, Thomas Jefferson, did a very good job of defining freedom, liberty, democracy. You go back through their letters, you find this definition repeated over and over and over. They are not undefinable words, but they are emotional words.

So, there is an old therapy in Dianetics.

Then let's come up to the line of running just locks, before we understood about moments of unconsciousness. And we find out that you can actually take a preclear today and you can run him through — over and over and over — that big fight he had with his wife, and just run it as a lock, and you will deintensify it. Some locks don't spring, so the therapy isn't 100 percent workable, but a quite remarkable therapy for all that.

For instance, your psychoanalyst faced this problem continually: The patient would walk away from his office feeling all right; he had had beautifully explained to him how his hatred of his brother was actually a libido theory in reverse on the left-hand cogwheel of the whatsit. And he was satisfied with this explanation, whatever the explanation was.

I am very satirical about this explanation because hardly anybody would believe me if I told you what the explanations really are. So I am giving you a more reasonable one. As a matter of fact, I wrote an article one time — just a gag article for a magazine — and I signed it Dr. Irving Cutsman. And I explained in it, throughout, how Dianetics didn't work because it was just like psychotherapy — same line that had been thrown at me continually. I explained it very learnedly, that it was just like psychotherapy and that it didn't work — big words and everything.

And an editor picked this up and he was on the verge of running it; he thought it was a good idea. He knew who wrote it. And he read the last third of it and he put it in an envelope and rejected it! He sent it straight back to me. Why? Because the last third was too incredible. And I was unable to explain to him that the last third was a direct quote from Karen Horney. It was the only straight stuff in the whole article. I think it was page 224, 225 and 226 of Karen Horney's popular work on psychotherapy — direct quote. He didn't even look at the asterisk. Then he wouldn't believe me afterwards. Then he was down to the house one day and I tried to read him this and he said, "Oh, you're just gagging about the whole thing." He took the book away from me and he opened the book to those pages . . . and he started to shake. Now, the various therapies such as Lock Running — you just take an individual and you make him start in at the beginning of an incident and go on through — were workable, then, to a psychoanalyst.

Because this patient would leave the office and then he would come back for his Tuesday appointment a shaking, nervous wreck. Something had happened between Friday and Tuesday, let's say, and now the analyst would have the whole hour just reexplaining the whole thing to him again. And he would feel fine when he left the office but something would happen in between.

Now, to get rid of what happened in between was a major problem in psychoanalysis, and I showed three or four psychoanalysts in New York City how to run a lock and how to run all of the incidents between Friday and Tuesday. And these people actually started doing this, so that their patients would come in on Tuesday and they would have them go over everything that happened, as a lock, several times, and then they would find out they could work with them again with psychoanalysis. And they would give them an hour or half an hour remaining of psychoanalysis, you see? And they said, "Well now, this technique permits psychoanalysis to work," and they were quite happy about the whole thing. Of course, what was working was that technique, but one never explained this and these people were happy with it. That is Lock Running.

As far as engrams are concerned, for a very, very short space of time it was found out that you could run engrams out of almost any case. And then we suddenly found out you had to run the earliest engram, and you had to do a lot of other things if you were going to run perceptics out of engrams.

This engram was just a moment of unconsciousness. Its existence was learned from soldiers who had been treated by psychiatrists. And these soldiers would often go into a base hospital, would be given drugs, and under drugs would be returned back to the moment of battle when they were injured. And the psychiatrist would go through it like this: he would say, "Go to the moment when you're just charging the enemy. Now what are you thinking about? All right. Now — yeah, the bullet hit you there. Well, we'll just skip this next passage now, and we'll pick it up when you wake up. Now, where are you waking up from this wound?"

What happened when he did that? That, by the way, is just fabulous that they could keep doing this with narcosynthesis and never see this point. Here he is going into battle, there he goes unconscious and here he wakes up in the base hospital. And what the psychiatrist had him run was that assuming that all of this is just a blank period and it has nothing in it.

Now, the facts of the matter are that the mind never stops recording. And I was led into this by finding out that a good percentage of the soldiers treated for battle neurosis by narcosynthesis

— a good percentage of those treated — went mad in a very short space of time. They were made much worse; awful things happened to them after they had been treated by narcosynthesis. Why? Was it the drug? I tested people. I shot them full of sodium pentothal and I ran them through locks and nothing happened, which left this only variable: the area of unconsciousness.

So I began to explore areas of unconsciousness. The reason they had never been recovered before is because late areas of unconsciousness are tied down by earlier areas. Here is this battle damage: Well, let's come way back down the track and we find a moment when he fell off his bicycle when he was a little boy. And now we find him falling off his bicycle and he remembers — he feels, he sees, he hears — everything that happened to him during this period, but actually he was unconscious. The mind never stops recording until it is dead — and of course the mind never dies.

The point here is that here was phenomena and this war the first big, major pioneer phenomena of Dianetics — that moments of unconsciousness W actually are on full record; anything that happens to an individual is on record. Psychologists have tried to validate this — you see, it is easily validated in many ways — but they try to validate it wrong. They keep giving people narcosynthesis and running them into deep unconsciousness and then saying the alphabet to them, or something, backwards, and then trying to run them through this area after they wake up to recover the alphabet.

There are two things wrong with it: There is no pain there; there is no shock there; there is nothing to alert this person's mind. How many things go on around you, for instance, that go on around you all the time which you don't notice? Well, that's just because something has to get your attention. You have to get somebody's attention when he is doing that. There is something else that they don't do: It is way up the track, and this area of unconsciousness they are trying to penetrate is miles, in terms of time, from the basic areas they could penetrate.

And yet there is a very simple thing: The last time you hit your thumb with a hammer will demonstrate to you conclusively that recordings are made during unconsciousness. Because if you go back to the moment when you struck yourself with a hammer and you go through it several times, at first you think that you struck yourself with a hammer and the hammer was then laid down by you. And then you suddenly get the consciousness that you struck yourself with a hammer, and then you hit it here again and then laid it down. And then you go through it again and you find out you hit yourself with a hammer, and it hit here, and it hit here, and then you laid it down. And then you find out that when you hit yourself with a hammer, somebody in your vicinity said "Watch out!" You didn't even know that before. And then you find out when you hit yourself with a hammer, that you actually picked up your hand and shook it before you put it back down again. In other words, more and more data will come out of this one little area of pain. Analytically you were not aware of it. It became buried. Buried by what? Buried by pain — simple.

And so, this technique is, more or less, the basic on the technique that came out in the first book; it is still a very workable technique. You go early in anybody's life and you find areas of unconsciousness — and the person has their perceptions and so forth, which are quite aberrated, and later on his environment reactivates them and he gets sick because of it — and you run them out. That is very valid.

But from there we have gone on and on and on and on — all in the interest of getting the mostest the fastest, shooting for techniques which would clean up a whole lifetime, not in hundreds of hours with expert auditing, but let's say scores of hours with indifferent auditing. And then let's start nailing it down to a point where we can get fifty hours, forty hours, thirty hours, and each time find that technique so additionally effective that you have a much greater resurgence for having done what you did — fighting all the time the fact that the environment, to an individual, is restimulative.

Now, a restimulative environment on an individual will actually undo an auditor's work as fast as he does it. Let's take a little kid I was treating once. I would work out something that would make his sinusitis better, and then he would go home and he would come back to me as sick as before. They were laying locks into this kid and abusing him faster than I could pick him up, and it became a foot race. So I finally connived to get him sent to his aunt's during the period I processed him, and in the space of four days I got him wiped up to a point where he thereafter didn't sag.

It was a race between his environment holding him down and my trying to lift him up. And if I could have done it, for instance, in four hours, I could have gotten him in the morning, cleaned him up by noon; he could have gone home and faced that environment. But if I had only been able to clean him halfway up, he would have dropped right back down again like the frog trying to crawl out of a well.

So, this fight was a fight being fought by auditors all over the country and was a tough fight. Now we have got techniques that are too fast for restimulation to be very effective. A preclear can come in and they can actually go up in tone to a point where people won't bother them after they go home. In other words, you shoot the curve up on them fast enough, they will stay there. And that has been the main struggle.

What do you have to do to a preclear to raise his tone markedly and swiftly? What do you have to do to him? Now, what you have to do to him is finally buttoned up in what we call the second echelon of Dianetics. The second echelon of Dianetics is thought as it applies to the MEST universe. It includes self-determinism....

[At this point a gap occurs in all recordings of this lecture that we have been able to locate, and no transcript has been found to supply the missing text.]

. . . starting technique of Dianetics. It would have a better chance of winning than it did two years ago, because there you had this sag, you had a long time, auditors had to work hard to do it, they had to know too much to do it and so forth.

Now you could take the Handbook for Preclears and just read it to a fellow and produce results fast enough with him so his environment can't keep kicking him down again. So we won, in terms of technique; we definitely have won. This battle has been won, now, for weeks really. We are just rearranging emphasis on what you run. Sometimes one incident is more effective than another. We have begun to use electronics in locating incidents — very simple stuff.

Now, those are two phases of Dianetics that I have outlined to you. Now there is another one. It happens to do with the business of Dianetics. I never had any trouble with Dianetic business in 1938, 1947, 1950 — early '50. I never had a bit of trouble with business in Dianetics, for a good reason: I never charged anybody anything, there were no books to keep, and once in a while my secretary — that I had as a writer — would keep appointments for me, and that was about all there was to it. That was the business of Dianetics.

And then the letters started to arrive hot and heavy. Somebody out in California would hear something was happening, and somebody up in Washington would hear about it, and somebody in Chicago would hear about it, and I'd start to get mail — more mail than I could handle — without ever having published a book or made an announcement. It began to go by word of mouth. All right, what do you do?

Six people — really, five particular key ones — came to me and said, "Let's form a foundation for you." One of them was a lawyer; one of them was a psychiatric-textbook publisher; one of them was an editor of a national magazine; another one of them was a medical doctor, an endocrinologist — a very representative group of the various fields. They came to me and they said, "Let's form a foundation for you and you can be president and we will handle the business concerns of this foundation." And that was back in the spring of 1950. The personnel amongst those trustees has varied considerably.

The Foundation tried to do its work. It tried fairly honestly to do its work, but it was something like standing in the middle of a bargain-counter rush in Macy's basement on a Saturday afternoon. There was just too much, too fast. Too much mail. People would come in for treatment — we hadn't trained people fast enough to treat the number of people that were turning up. People would turn up for training.

Do you know that during the early months of the Foundation, I laid off of a fairly remunerative hammering a typewriter. I was giving my first lecture at 8:00 in the morning; I lectured until 10:30; I took care of business affairs (did such things as buying furniture, paying off secretaries, planning, arranging, talking to newspapermen and so forth). I would work on through, do some processing of people in the afternoon and give a lecture to the Professional Course people, or something of the sort, again that day usually, and then give a lecture to the evening classes from 8:00 until 11:00 at night. And that was my day. And that went on every day except Sunday. And on Sunday all that happened was everybody interested in Dianetics used to come over to my house and keep me talking about it all day.

There were some pretty good boys that could help out on this. But it was too much; nobody could keep tabs on anything. In the first place, the demand was very great out across the country, and foolishly or otherwise, Foundations were put in in other areas. And then they couldn't be held down in those areas; the same things were happening there. Then I couldn't be in all these Foundations at once to lecture. We didn't even have taped lectures.

And I found out something very horrible in October of 1950. We had taken in hundreds of thousands of dollars, all told, and it was running on an accounting system of dumping it all in a barrel outside the door and hauling the barrel down to a bank every once in a while — just grim: The accounting was just horrible!

More important to me was the fact that by October of 1950 I had not written a second book bringing anyone up-to-date, I had not done any broad writing of the subject and my advance work in research was suffering. What I was doing was a lot of business management.

It was obviously leading nowhere because nobody could keep track of it anyhow, and everybody was trying like mad to keep everything on the straight and narrow but everybody was riding off in all different directions. It was a scramble; it was grim. And I simply pulled out of the Foundations, and I began to research and work as best I could.

My first effort at this was in Palm Springs. I went down to Palm Springs, I got a modest little house down on the edge of the desert and I sat down there and I figured out and wrote down the chart notes on the Hubbard Chart of Human Evaluation. I severed connections actually, actively with the Foundations, and using some royalty money and so forth, worked out the chart you find in Science of Survival.

Then a great many sorrowful things happened to me in a rapid-fire order — I had neglected everything, everywhere practically — a lot of unfortunate incidents of one sort or another.

Finally, to get some peace and quiet, I went down to Cuba. And I sat down in Cuba with a recording Sound scribe and I dictated in a space of three weeks the book Science of Survival, which brought up the techniques and gave the evaluation of human behavior and so on, and then came back up here to Wichita. I was pretty tired by that time. I hadn't been getting much processing; a lot of things had been happening to me. And when I got here to Wichita, on April 15, 1951, a man here very kindly took it upon himself to arrange the affairs of Dianetics and square them around in some fashion so that Dianetics could go on as a foundation.

The affairs of the old Foundations were not cleaned up, however, and this local Foundation, while perfectly solvent and carrying on as best it could, was nevertheless being consistently and continually hit by slopovers from the old Foundations, where the bookkeeping was bad. To this day I don't know if there is a set of books for the old Foundations.

There are some bank accounts and canceled checks. Accountants will go round and round for a week or two, and then they will suddenly come out and say, "I can't do anything about it." People will look at those books and they just practically faint. The U.S. government looks at it and says, "Hm, it would be very interesting if . . ." but they can't even make enough sense out of it to get a suit on their hands. It is very grim.

These affairs were not wound up, and the windup of them kicked back this last August into this local Foundation here. A \$189 bill was leveled at the local Foundation and a receivership for this local Foundation was demanded. It was not prepared or contested in court by the officers of the current Foundation. And the receivership was planted just like that, and then this Foundation had to give a bond.

They appealed it. January 7, 1952, an appeal was supposed to be filed at the Court of Appeals in Topeka. There was ample time to prepare it — clear from August to January — but it was not prepared and it was not filed. I did not even know it was the closing date until the eighth of January. It was too late. As a consequence, a receivership on this Foundation was confirmed. A bond was posted again. And several lawyers around town, evidently fed suits by Dun and Bradstreet (which interested itself in collecting suits against the Foundation, according to a report I get from one of Dun and Bradstreet's lawyers), evidently did this very interesting trick: they leveled at this Foundation all the eastern Foundation debts.

One man came through very nobly and he paid off all those debts; there was some \$11,000 outstanding, I think. When he had them all paid and they had a journal entry ready to go into court dismissing the receivership — the Foundation was going to be in the clear — this Dun and Bradstreet lawyer, without any turning around on his agreement, reportedly said, "We have another suit here for \$5,000, and you have to pay up or shut up. Now, we've held up the journal entry." Having already pulled \$11,000 out, he mysteriously thought that the Foundation could produce another \$5,000. And so it went by the boards, because it was obvious that he would keep finding debts here and there where debts had never been listed and just keep knocking this Foundation to pieces.

However, watching the operation of the local Foundation and seeing that it was terribly enturbulated most of the time about its indebtednesses, and finding out that I could not put an adequate school into existence there, on February 12 I resigned from this Foundation. I sold them back my stock in this Foundation and severed connections with it completely. And then just a few days ago — this was quite surprising to me — the local Foundation filed voluntary bankruptcy in order to shut off this line of suits that were continuing to come in. I don't know whether the local Foundation is going to continue to operate under its own name or not. This I don't know. I no longer have any interest in this local Foundation at all.

But when I resigned February the twelfth, it was to establish Hubbard College, a graduate school for auditors. And the plan of Hubbard College is to teach Dianetics the best that it can be taught and issue degrees in the subject, which we have a perfect right to do. It is a plan to make a film school, so that a Bachelor of Dianetics will be able to view some fifty hours of lectures and demonstrations on sixteen-millimeter sound film. And as you can see, this would be quite a course of instruction.

Now, this organization has several associates out across the country that it is enfranchising, and its business is going along very happily and very cheerfully. As a matter of fact, it is not even vaguely influenced or impinged upon by Foundation affairs, for an excellent reason: Nobody ever challenged my right to teach Dianetics.

The Foundation control was in my hands for, I think, three minutes once. That was the estimated time that it took for me to sign six stock certificates as having received them and sign them as having given them back to the local Foundation on February 12 this year. They had not issued me any stock, and in order for me to resign I had to accept my stock and turn it back. So I had never even owned any stock in the Foundation until that moment.

Well, nobody has ever challenged my right to teach Dianetics; it exists in the minute books of all the old Foundations. And I have often talked to groups about someday putting together a university. Someday, somehow, on whatever shoestring or whatever ten billion dollars — it didn't matter — someday there was going to be a university of Dianetics. Only it was going to be more than a university of Dianetics: it was going to be a university of arts and science, whereby we were going to try to coordinate and correlate science and get it out of its specialized categories into a correlated category.

This goal goes back to 1950. In the fall of 1950 I was talking about this. I have had projects on with the army, for instance, trying to get old campsites from them and so forth, in order to form this university.

Well, it is formed; it is here in Wichita. It is just on its trembling, stumbling small feet right now, but it undoubtedly can progress. One of the things it will do is make widely available instruction in Dianetics as has not been made available before — probably make available correspondence courses and so forth, in it.

Now, I only did this at a time when Dianetics became a complete package.

This school down here, for instance — the university, the college — is going to teach an extended course, a nightly course. That is, a person can go five nights a week, and they emerge at the other end of this with a certification and so on.

Now, in about a week I will be starting out a series, probably, of twenty hours of lectures. They will probably be given in ten consecutive nights — that is, five days a week — to this night course (and also the day students will be in on that), in order to make what we call a summary course of Dianetics. Let's do a rundown and a summation, complete and so forth, as it exists as a package today.

There is a course which is going forward right now at the College (college — we've got four rooms!). But that will be expanded to take care of these various lines.

We have got a subject now at the end of all this time which can be taught in a relatively short space of time, which is a complete subject, which has very specific, precise processes which do very specific, precise things. And it is a very happy thought that we were already going out on the track, with red cars this time, by the time somebody dumped over those blue cars.

This has been under contemplation for a long time. I was going to open up an office a short time ago and call it just "My Office" — that much style — just put my name on the door and go back to work on the basis of meeting a fellow in the street and handing him a card.... Things look very bright for Dianetics right now.

Now, one of the things that is going to happen in the next few months: you will probably see, increasingly, the word Scientology occurring. And that is in order to give doctors of medicine and psychiatrists and psychologists an out. It is pretty hard, after a man has made a pronouncement about which he knows nothing, to convince him that he ought to say something else about it now that he knows something about it, because he will lose face with the people he has said this to. So if we just give him another word for a similar package and we say "Now it's Scientology, and Scientology embraces the Axioms," why, then, two things will happen: he can say, "Well, Dianetics was no good and Hubbard was really crazy when he threw that one. But Scientology — now, that's different. scientifically done. It has a great many things to recommend it. Well organized, and it works! (Dianetics didn't!)"

And as the students who are going to graduate out of Hubbard College will discover, their degrees are in Scientology, not in Dianetics. It says that they are professional Scientologists and that they are capable of understanding mental and physical stress and are eligible for further

degree work in Scientology. So I hope these graduates will feel themselves capable of understanding physical and mental stress!

That phrasing, by the way, bypasses such state laws as Texas' which has a basic science law. Do you know that in an awful lot of the states of the union you can go to prison for about twenty-five years for telling anybody that you can cure arthritis? It doesn't matter whether you can cure it or not; the law specifically states that what is penalizable is telling somebody you can cure it. I think that is gorgeous! In other words, medicine itself, if it produced some gadget by which they could dose a fellow up or give him some pills, or something would actually rid him of arthritis, if they said it cured arthritis or if they said it finished off arthritis specifically, anybody using this drug could be sent to prison for about twenty-five years. In other words, "You're not going to cure nobody around here!" And whereas we can see that this is an attitude which may keep an awful lot of state employees in state sanitarium jobs, taking care of patients suffering from this and that, it certainly doesn't help the race very much.

There are twenty-five specific ills, by the way, that you are specifically enjoined in California not to cure; it is against the law to cure them.

Every once in a while there is a big flurry goes up out in California — they are going to pass a big law that says nobody can practice Dianetics anymore, but every time it comes up it fades away. People have been writing me letters and getting excited about this now for two years, really. They have been telling me about this state law that is going to come up. But I have the edge on people telling me about this: I know state legislatures. I am very well acquainted with politics as it is done on a state or national level. It takes a long time to do anything, and if it gets started it will take a longer time, and when they get all through, it will be indefinite and it will have riders on it and somebody else will have gotten something into it so that the whole law will be ineffective and canceled. And that is usually the history of militant legislation in government. You don't have to do anything about it; it just collapses of its own boredom. So nobody has been able to worry me about this.

Now, in the second half of this talk tonight (take a little breather now) maybe I will tell you something of interest and something important.