

Formative State of Scientology:

Definition of Logic

A Lecture given by L. Ron Hubbard
on the 6. December 1952

This is the second lecture hour on December the 6th. You know I could talk to you quite a bit about logic. Talked a lot about logic, logic is oh... interesting stuff uh... there's a lot of material. But possibly the best method of addressing this subject I would know of would be to go back over the formative steps which made Scientology and demonstrate it so that we could demonstrate at the same time the fundamentals of logic. And I won't put very much time in on this, and uh... give you something else in this hour.

I just want to mention the definition of logic. Logic is a gradient scale of data, related data. And logic could be said to be the aligning of data by gradient scale. And anyone who tells you that mathematics is logical is crossing up their definitions. mathematics is symbolical, and as a symbolism carries forward all manner of impossible relationships, or nearly impossible relationships, which can then be applied with some approximation to the real universe or to any other universe.

It is all very well to say one equals one, but till you ask, „One what?“ It's very nice to have an... have an abstract datum, „One“, and this abstract datum is a symbol that will represent another „One“, and that is the symbol which represents but... let's say one what? And we say one apple. And if we say one apple equals one apple – oh no. One apple does not even equal itself. I give you Korzybski on all of that. He's done good work on that, and we needn't labor it any further.

But at no time should an individual make the mistake of believing that a symbol is the thing. And people who insist that the symbol is the thing are not only badly aberrated; they are insane. That's just blunt. If you decide to hit a definition of insanity, the best definition of which I know would be: this person widely believes that the symbols are the things. And you would hit it. You could go into any insane asylum, you could have uh... manic depressive, schizoid tendencies, uh... or old-time dementia praecox, or any one of these things, and you could go straight across the boards on the thing, and you would find out this person thinks the symbol is the thing. I don't care what type of insanity this is, whether you're talking about a computing psychotic or a dramatizing psychotic or any other interesting thing. Because that is a characteristic of MEST, and MEST is itself insane. It is insane because it cannot determine

or align itself. It has to do it according to a pattern determined for it. And anytime anything has to have everything done for it, you get an insane object.

Sanity would be the ability to reason. Reason can be done in abstracts, and reason can be done by logic, but logic is not the thing. Logic is a method of extrapolating from one datum and building a bridge of tiny gradients to another datum.

When first Aristotle marched upon the field with his uh... logic, man was uh... man... man didn't have any logic. He had not codified logic to amount to anything, and so it was quite welcome to him. He was not so aberrated at that time but what he couldn't handle this and know its speciousness. But when you find somebody has... has achieved a syllogism as a perfection, you have somebody who is very close to passing in his chips at the nearest spin bin. The symbol is not the thing. The shadow is not the substance. That doesn't mean you can't work with symbols, but it does mean very definitely that you should never mistake these two things. The symbol apple is not an apple; you cannot eat the symbol apple. That is the best test of it.

Now in all of the lines of logic we have, then, therefore, this liability: that people can confuse an abstract with a reality. And when we say a reality, we could make it a reality for any universe. But the abstract is not the reality. Never.

We could say all sorts of things about logic. We could say a lot about mathematics. But we could spend our time a little bit better elsewhere.

Let's take the subject of Scientology and let's see if there's any logic involved with it at all. There isn't a mathematics that can embrace the subject of Scientology, because it is an invented mathematics. It's an invented mathematics that accepts gradient scales and „absolutes are unobtainable“. And it is a method of thinking about things. And is just as true as it is workable. And no truer. And is not, in itself, an arbitrary, fascistic uh... police force to make sure that we all think right thoughts. It's a servant of the mind, a servo-mechanism of the mind, it is not a master of the mind. Scientology will decline, and become useless to man, on the day when it becomes the master of thinking. Don't think it won't do that. It has every capability in it of doing that.

Contained in the knowable, workable portions before your eyes there are methods of controlling human beings and thetans which have never before been dreamed of in this universe. Control mechanism of such awesome and solid proportions that if the remedies were not so much easier to apply, one would be appalled at the dangerousness to beingness that exists in Scientology.

Fortunately, it was intelligently invented, and I say that without any possible bow; I say that because part of its logic was: the remedy should exist before the bullet. And that is just an arbitrary. There really is no reason for that, except for this: when you invent the bullet before the remedy, you have to invent the remedy under duress. It's very hard to kneel alongside of a patient who is suffering from a super radioactive burn, and try to figure out in that moment what is radioactivity and how does it affect the human flesh. That's not the time to figure the remedy. The time to figure the remedy is before the bullet.

Now I want to throw no aspersions or criticism or... or anything else at the field of nuclear physics and my very good friends in nuclear physics; there are very few nuclear physicists in the United States that are really nuclear physicists. There are a lot of professors of English and so forth who are employed by the government under the heading „nuclear physicist“. It was very amusing, by the way, I was down at one of the big companies not too long ago and I took... took occasion to ask the boys in charge of three or four departments what they had their degrees in. One of ‘em had it in English and one of ‘em had it in Arts and the other one had it in Drama. And I agreed with the last one, because I said there’s sure plenty of drama in it, whatever else there is. But here we have, here we had a flagrant case of inventing the bullet and then wondering what the remedy was. They invented, the dopes – I, pardon me, I... I... I didn’t mean to become overwrought about that. These... these noodleheads uh... invented and manufactured – can you imagine a central government doing this?! I mean, it would have to be a central government that was just scraping the bottom of the tone scale! A central government that needed... needed rocket guns to shoot anchors up high enough to grab on to hold bottom! They invented an unlimited weapon without inventing any defense for it. They didn’t invent a force screen and then invent an atom bomb. They didn’t invent a method of controlling the people who would use atom bombs and then invent atom bombs. No, they just said, „Gee, we can make a lot of explosion! What do you know! Let’s all run around and be... be very, very explosive!“ And what do you find? They... they... they didn’t even go and look up in their elementary textbooks on... on national uh... the... the... the art of running a national government, and didn’t even find out this following line: „In the presence of an unlimited weapon central government ceases to exist, and has always ceased to exist.“ That’s interesting, isn’t it? It’s right in the textbooks.

Any time there has been a weapon of unlimited scope and power against which there has been no adequate defense, the immediate result of the presence of that weapon on the national scene – not its use, but its continued presence on the national scene – has caused the disintegration of a culture and the central government. Uniform, it’s all through history.

The first example of this is the horse and the sword. He was the first unlimited weapon. He started coming out of the steppes of Russia in 1500 B.C., and he swept down upon a defenceless Europe which had only the most fragmentary type of infantry uh... formation. And the horse and the sword went through Europe like a lightning bolt. And there was nothing to stop him! Nothing! And the civilization which was Europe in those days – and it was that civilization on which the Phoenician civilization built, by the way – we know nothing of it today to amount to anything. Why? It was just swept away. For 200 years, from 1500 B.C. to 1300 B.C., we had a state of anarchy and chaos existing in central Europe which has never since been approached and it was done with a horse and a sword. And why did it stop? Because somebody sat down and did some real heavy thinking and came up with a brand-new idea: a wall. Came up with this brand-new datum: a wall. And they built walls around their towns, and walls around castles, and they built walls, walls, walls, and first thing you know you couldn’t have a cavalry detachment composed of bandits or militia or anything of the sort suddenly riding through every village and hamlet. There were always walls into which to retire. And the Phoenician then, with those walls, was able to push frontier posts out into the further reaches of a onetime civilization and reconquer it to some degree.

And Rome, itself, and Greece could come into existence because of what? Walls. And finally this was improved on to such an enormous degree that we have the Great Wall of China. The idea even got out there, which was finished uh, the third or fourth century A.D. Walls licked the cavalry men. Now there have been a few other imbalances, but there has never been an imbalance to the degree that exists today.

But what kind of a government and what kind of a weapon is really serious? Not a weapon which destroys mud. A weapon that destroys minds, that's serious. Out of the body of knowledge which lies before you a sufficient technology is to take over, seize and handle any government or people on the face of the Earth. You aren't of an ethical level, even, that permits you to observe this. You wouldn't think in these lines. And yet if only those principles were known, there would be people who could and would think in those lines.

You can control men like you would control robots with those techniques. The implantation, black Dianetics, pain-drug-hypnosis are very mild methods of control. Do you know that the Sufi Mohammedan cult under Hashshashin controlled Europe for 300 years with the rather thin gadget of throwing hashish into some young man, suddenly making him appear, wake up in a beautiful garden where there were forty black-eyed houries to serve his every desire, where there were rivers of milk and honey – real milk and honey, rivers and fountains. And he could stay there for about three or four days, and then he would suddenly be told, „Now you have had your taste of paradise. In order to return to paradise it is necessary for you to return down to earth and carry out the commands of this order.“ And this young man would then find himself suddenly in the middle of some large town, and he would know that all he had to do was to walk up and kill the sultan of that town, and if he himself were killed in the same act, he would immediately appear in the garden of paradise. Hence the Assassins, and the Assassins controlled practically every breath Europe took for almost 300 years. How simple it was.

All they had to do was write over the signature of the grand high assassin to the sultan of whatever they wanted to address and say, „Unless we receive certain camel loads of silk and so many slaves,“ and that sort of thing, „we are not going to be friendly.“ And believe me, those things arrived. Right now. Or, „We do not... Dear Royal Potentate Highness, we do not approve of your recent law uh... congress uh... Bill 862 uh... and we think it ought to be changed.“ Bang it was changed. Why? Because nobody could stop one of these young boys. Nobody could stop 'em. The fellow'd suddenly walk out of the crowd right straight into the drawn scimiters of the guard, and before anybody could even make him halt in his tracks he had stabbed the royal high sultan in the breast most expiringly.

That was an unlimited weapon. But it was a weapon effected through using phenomena of the mind. If you release the remedy, and if the remedy is fast enough before the forces of evil can muster their machinations and use the overt act, it can't ever be used. There is only one thing that could happen to Scientology, and that is to say that it would be buried. The remedy would be buried. If it ever went out of sight, this world's done. All you've got to do is invalidate it and put it out of sight and hide it, and it'll come up in the wrong place doing the wrong thing, and mankind will find itself a slave.

So anybody that knows the remedy of this subject, anybody that knows these techniques, is himself actually under a certain responsibility – that's to make sure that he doesn't remain a sole proprietor. That's all it takes, just don't remain a sole proprietor. Don't ever think that a monopoly of this subject is a safe thing to have. It's not safe. It's not safe for man; it's not safe for this universe.

This universe has long been looking for new ways to make slaves. Well, we've got some new ways to make slaves here. Let's see that none are made.

Now it's fortunate that we are able to make Clears as fast as we can make them. It's very, very fortunate. Because black Dianetics, as most destructive things work in this universe, could work a lot faster than the old-time techniques – work really fast. Nowadays – get this – you can use creative processing; the process of using mock-ups will flip out a PDH without ever touching it or addressing it. Isn't that fascinating. You can knock a PDH to pieces with fifteen minutes of processing. And it takes longer than that to put one in.

Another condition could exist, a PDH could be so – a pain-drug- hypnosis – they knock the fellow out, they drug him – could be laid in with great rapidity. But it could be laid in so strongly that the individual is rendered dead. Or non compos mentis from there on and thus out of communication. That individual is no menace to anybody. He's either complete ravingly gone, out of communication, and look... or he's dead, and a bullet does the same thing. So it's not a good weapon, really. Because if he's able... if he suddenly starts acting peculiarly or doing things which completely alter any pattern he has had in the past, or if he is doing things which look like they are vaguely bad, then how easy it is. You can get ahold of him. You'll find almost any preclear can be given creative processing. And you could get ahold at him and flip the PDH out. That's interesting, isn't it? In other words, you can take 'em out as fast as they lay 'em down.

Therefore we really do have the remedy before the assault weapon is produced. Did you ever read poor old George Orwell's uh... 1984? Yes, yes, that's wonderful. That would be, could be, the palest imagined shadow of what a world would be like under the rule of the secret use of Scientology with no remedy in existence. Well it's all right in this offhand age to just brush things aside and say, „Well, it's of no importance, no importance, really, and... let's not be dramatic the way people are being about the atom bomb.“ Actually the atom bomb isn't as serious as this subject. It's just a MEST weapon. And, it's all right to be very offhand, and very cheerful and so on, and – like the little boy whistling in the dark says, „No ghosts or boogymen exist.“ – Well, this boogymen does exist.

It's a very simple remedy. And that's just make sure that the remedy is passed along. That's all. Don't hoard it. Don't hold it. And if you ever do use any black Dianetics, use it on the guy who pulled Scientology out of sight and made it so it wasn't available. Because he's the boy who would be electing himself „the new order“. We don't need any more new orders – all those orders as far as I'm concerned have been filled.

Now when it comes, then, to logic... when it comes to logic, the logic of putting this together had as its first criteria what? Application? What were we going to do? What were we trying to do? That was fairly well thought-out, we were trying to help beingness. What are we

going to do? Well, we're trying to help beingness. There's a good cause and effect definition. We sit down and we say, „Now, what, what's our purpose? What's this all about? What's the first statement made on that? Well, that was it.

And uh... it wasn't a slop-around of... well, let's be scientific and let's fool around and let's see if we can make a lot of money, or if I could only do...“ No, it was just a simple clear-cut statement. It presupposed one thing: that something could be done. A presupposition. And it had to assume, also, that the something which could be done would be, basically, simple. These were unwarranted assumptions. But it's a universe that's made by postulates. So we just postulated that before we began, and it's been going ever since. But uh... darned near, well, it's a little over twenty years' worth now. And for two-and-a-half years it's been under heavy duress and test.

I was the most stunned fellow in the world when I found out that the First Book did not work fast and uniformly in the hands of auditors. I couldn't figure out what I was doing that they weren't. I didn't learn that until a relatively short time ago. Very short time ago really. I was simply saying, „Now there will be light. Now there will be sonic. Now there will be somatics. Now there won't be an engram.“ And I was doing it by a gradient scale that made it stick. It was a very very important omission. But, getting a communication level on it. Furthermore, I didn't know how good it could get.

With this series and with this training which we have now we have passed by the level where this could be more damaging than it could be beneficial. We have unbalanced the scale in the opposite direction. And when anybody did that, it was certain that it would do what? It would take this universe with it. I'm afraid that's possibly happened. I've been very careful not to think of...

Wrote a ghost story one time, used to have a lot of fun writing stories, I love to write stories – uh... I walk around the circle every once in a while now, I... I think to myself, „Gee, I... I really ought to be doing something interesting like writing stories.“ Little fellow, Professor Mudge, Professor Mudge – all he had to do, he was supposed to have found in Spinoza the way to teleport automatically. And all he had to do was think of a place and he would be there. And if he thought of a place he would be somewhere else, and if he thought of another place he would be there, but he couldn't get it under control. And he was having one horrible time; he was just having a dreadful time because he knew there was one place he mustn't think of – one place above all others of which he must not think, under no circumstances, and he was just gritting his teeth for fear he would think of it before he found the remedy by which he could control this. And when it came all the way through to the end, he at last could think the thought: the sun. He musn't think of the sun.

Now, so it's sort of like that in Scientology. I've often wondered if we aren't playing tag with that thought we dare not think, because there would be a sudden creaking and cracking of the walls, and there it would go. But, we have done a very good crawl up the line, here, to a proximity to that point that isn't dangerous. And I think we could possibly think of that thing, now, because we've got the bridge built to the back.

What's all this got to do with... with logic and processing? It doesn't help an auditor too much to be logical. Because logic is a rather specious thing. Sometimes it helps an auditor to be most dreadfully intuitive. I used to do horrible things, I used to sit and process a preclear, and I'd... I'd look at him and see his... I'd look at his engrams and say, „Hey.“ And I was making a little demonstration not too long ago, and a fellow was running a DED-DEDEX, he was getting his own head knocked off, and he'd knock somebody else's head off, and then a couple of other fellows'd knock their heads off, and we were doing these 1-2-3, 1-2-3, running brackets on it in each one in turn, and what do you know? The somatic he had wasn't reducing very well. So I said, „Well, all right, get ahold of the girl.“ And he says, „What girl?“ And I said, „That girl in the cave.“ And he says, „What cave?“ And I said, „Why, the cave, of course, let's get ahold of the girl in the cave,“ and he says, „Oh I, I think I'd better keep on running this other thing here.“ And I said, „No, no let's get ahold of this girl.“ And he said, „Well, get ahold of her how?“ And I said, „Well go ahead, get ahold of her, now, now, bash her head in against the rocks.“ And he said, „Oh no, no, no.“ And he began to get rather ill. There was where it was, of course. But the trouble was is he was sitting there with his eyes sort of turned or his energy beams sort of turned away from the front ridge, which was right in front of his face, and which looked like a small motion picture going on. And all the time he was running the other he kept actually holding this facsimile off. And there it sat, him with his hands wrapped around a girl's ankles, about to bash her head in against the wall. Well it's pretty hard for an auditor to resist the temptation of auditing that way. But it's very startling to the preclear. Too startling. An E-Meter does a better job than that. And you start looking at too many ridges, you'll start going into communication with too much enttheta or too much energy, so that's kind of bad. But you can get a feel about a preclear. And the more you work with him, why the stronger you can get these hunches about him. As long as you can be certain about them, work with them. If you can't be certain about them, don't bother with them. Hit your own level of certainty with regard to preclears.

It doesn't do much good to be logical about a preclear. We know in Scientology there are so many things that can be wrong with him in this universe. We know he has so many can'ts on create, and so many can'ts on destroy, and so many can'ts on change in this universe on eight dynamics. And we know he's got these various compartments of eight dynamics, and he can't do some of these things. That's that. You run mock-ups on these things, and your preclear'll come out all right. There's no sense in trying to be logical.

Never bother to ask him, „Why? Now why was that aberrative to you?“ Never ask him to evaluate, because the silliest trick of this universe is: beyond the progressive line of agreement there is no logic in this universe. That IS the logic of this universe. Therefore engineering, mathematics and electronics seem to be so certain and so true. But they are only the track of agreement – there is no logic beyond that agreement. You can make any kind of a logical series of exercises you want to make, and have a wonderful time with them, and amuse yourself no end. But logic was not used to work out Scientology. Logic was not used.

If this had been the simple job of putting together how do you make a universe, that job was done in 1938, and it was written about in a book called EXCALIBUR. But it didn't work because everybody was in agreement with the MEST universe so you had to find out

what this universe was all about, and you had to find out how it was put together and what all these agreements were and what the progressive scale of agreement was, and what happened on the whole line. And then you could make Scientology work. So it became a study of agreement, progressive agreement. But progressive agreement doesn't really fall within the... the framework of logic. Logic is a progressive similarity.

Well, now I'm going to give you something which is a little less on the opinion level and a little less more in the sky, and I'm going to talk to you about something very specific in the line of processing, and make your Saturday night a little more worthwhile than it has been so far. And I'm going to show you about difference, association and identification. We're going to look over here at the tone scale, and we're going to have here... and then we're going to have minus scale. And we're going to work here with difference, association and identification. $A=A=A=A$. This is the behavior of the reactive mind. Everything is identified with everything on a certain subject. A spelling might be different, the word would be the same, the fellow would have it confused. The literal command value of an engram. That's identification in the line of thought.

Fellow walks down the street, and he sees a garden hose, he trips over the garden hose and he's very upset about it. He's got it identified, you'd think, with a snake. No, we didn't say he was a Freudian psychoanalyst. Uh... he has that garden hose identified with what? Well, with the Battleship Missouri. And why has he got it identified with the Battleship Missouri? Well, it's because he comes from Oklahoma. That's not sensible, is it? Well, it's sensible to this preclear! $A=A=A=A$, everything equals everything.

Now this person is disassociating, and it is a strange thing about this tone scale, that the bottom of it is a mockery of the top. Things which are at the extreme bottom of the tone scale actually mock the capabilities of theta in a little tiny, tiny bit down there at the bottom. No, no, no force, no power to it. So on. For instance, there's love and uh... good fellowship, protection, brotherhood, and so forth, is down just before the fellow's dead, clear down here to 0.0. The nicest anybody is, is to a dead man. They say, „Look at the poor fellow,“ and all that sort of thing.

Sympathy is a mockery of actual assistance. It's actually a mockery of good communication. It's a perversion. So we get to the bottom of the tone scale, we find the great party of „let's all bow down and worship Uncle Joe“ uh... is running around like mad using a group and is calling it brotherhood and yet each man there is using the group in which to hide. No man there will take responsibility for anything. They're trying to say, „Five morons make a genius,“ they're trying to say, „Because this is a big group we have the masses, we are therefore bright and we are therefore powerful and we are therefore wonderful.“

This is nothing against communism as a teaching. Actually that can be a very high-level teaching, but there's plenty about communism as a practice. It's a bad practice where it is used to enslave Man. Any practice that enslaves Man ought to be shot down in its tracks. And that's all that ought to be shot down. The men who do it are insane; they can be salvaged.

But here we have a brotherhood feeling just before you get to zero. And it's a mockery of a feeling of very expansive uh... beingness with. One can be a terrifically high individual

and yet feel an enormous, embractive feeling toward his fellow beings. One can do that, but he's not MEST.

The MEST guy down at the bottom doesn't love his fellow beings. He's Just mocking it up in a last dog hanged effort to say, „Look, I'm a thetan! I'm a real being! I actually exist! I have life in me! Look, I feel this brotherhood! Please, please, please don't kill me! Save... hide me, because I... I... I... I'm really alive.“ And so they take the highest capabilities there are and mock them down here. The MEST itself is sort of impersonating a brotherhood of life. But that's not living, that's dying.

So way up at the top here you don't have this A=A=A=A as a differentiation, but you DO have a level where a fellow can say, where a fellow can say, „The chrysanthemums are no submarine and somebody let the air out of the spokes.“ And he knows what he's talking about. Actually it's quite a trick, talking non sequitur. Uh... sometimes you'll sit down and you'll start talking to a little kid, and you'll tell him something like that, and the little kid will look at you very intelligently and say, „Yes, but no shoes.“ And somebody down at the identification band almost goes mad. They look at them and then they try to creak these things together. They... they're... they're dealing in these inanities all the time, but they never notice it. So, there you have that level of mockery.

So up here we have differentiation. Now you could have enough differentiation to have a complete universe, a complete universe, a complete universe, a complete universe and then have these complete universes segregated or in communication with each other without destroying them. That'd be quite a trick.

Now. That's spelled different because it's supposed to be different. Now. Down here, we have what? We have association. And, as association – uh... fellows can link up and say, „Look. We're all members of this team, and we're good guys. But they're all members of that team and they're bad guys. So therefore all our actions are good and all their actions are bad. And we're going to go through these strategy and tactics in order to lick them fellers.“ Something like that. Or, somebody comes along and says, „Now let's see... water boils and this boils or that boils and it does something or other and you divide that by 212 and you get the square root of gophers.“ And uh... you... you... he says that's very associative and it's very logical. 'Course, what is the most associative we've got? The most associative we've got is tracking the agreements, the gradient scale of agreement which is known as the MEST universe. So, we've got association; that's linking this and that.

I've told you that story about the three fellows, one of them... they're all riding in the subway train and the subway train's making a lot of noise, so one of them says, „Oh... I have to get off at Wimbley.“ And the next one of 'em says, „Uh... no it's not, it's Thursday.“ And the next one of them says, „I'm thirsty too, let's get off and have a drink.“ Now that... that's too differentiative or it's too identified. It's not associative. And of course that's just nonsense, it's non sequitur uh... and it... it's just missing a few steps to be logical. And the logical thing is for the fellow to say, „Um, I'm getting off at Wim... at Wimbley.“ And the fellow says, „I don't have to go there till Thursday,“ and the fellow says, „Oh, is... is tomorrow Thursday? Well I thought that uh... today was Thursday. I can't have a drink.“ And you depend on that as being a sequitur situation. That would make it associative.

Now some people believe you have to be logical. Those people who think you have to be logical are more or less located in that band. But those people only become militant and very, very ornery about all of this when they get way down here, and then the fellow... you're going along in steps and you say, „Now you see, it's this way.“ And you skip about eight steps in your logic, and you say, „Now there's... that's how we're going to get the copper down that mountain.“ And the fellow says, „Yeah, but you said... now just a minute, how about this? How about that? How about something else? And how about something else? And how about something else?“ And you say, „Well that's all included in there.“ And you explain it to him very patiently. „Yeah, but,“ he says, „how about this?“ And then he says, „And then there's the tax on the sacks.“ And you say, „Well that... that only... that's only one... one milreis and... and...“ He says, „Yeah but,“ he says, „you haven't added that in,“ you say, „It's not necessary to add that in, we're working on a gross of 50% of the cost of the thing, and we've allowed for that.“ And he says, „Well you've got to figure these things out, you've got to be very careful, you got to be very cautious, you've got to figure all these things out and you've got to figure...“

It's like the ensign goes out and he shoots the sun and then he... he gets a sextant that has an index error of 25 degrees, and he goes out and he shoots the sun and he figures it all out and he comes back in. And then he gets his tables and he figures the position of the ship out against that sight, he figures the position of the ship out to one-eighth of an inch. Taking the Pacific Ocean, he figures the ship out to one-eighth of an inch. And you got... you go in there and you find all the chart tables just covered, there's masses of, just, oh boy, figures, and the guy has really got his position. And you say, „How about the index error of the sextant?“ „Well,“ he says, „that's normally so-and-so and so-and-so. Well I haven't paid any attention to that, of course,“ he says, „that is just the... that's just taking the observation,“ he says, „we don't worry about that.“ And you say, „Well just why are we sailing three miles north of Kansas City, then?“ Now he's done a typical stunt down here. He's become too thoroughly associative without being even vaguely logical. And just below that level the whole chain breaks up, and the fellow starts to disassociate.

Every once in a while you'll get a preclear and she'll be... she'll come in and talk to you, or he'll come in... he'll be saying to you, „And, and all up and down the street, and when I parked it uh... the cows aren't any on two sides, and I know that's why they're after me.“ And you... you say, „What did you say?“ He says, „Well I'll get 'em off of me in a minute, but...“ That's dissociation.

Now down here is a dent... and this, oddly enough, is exactly what it says: it's identification. There isn't a one of you sitting in the audience that doesn't have a card or something on him which says that he has such and such an identity. That is a identification. It relates two completely contrary things together. It says your name is so and so and that you are a human being. Isn't that weird? One of the reasons you pack a body around is because it's a good identification card. But I don't think it's a good identification card. You have to... it, it weighs a lot of pounds and it gets on buses and off of buses, and you need all sorts of things to cart the thing around. But nobody would recognize you if you didn't have it. Now that's an awful lot of poundage to carry around just to have some fingerprints.

Well when I say identify, I mean identification. I mean that badly logical in every sense that Count Korzybski meant it. And it's... it's just horrible. The most terrible things stem out of that. Now when I say, „I am something“ well „I am something“ is up here in association – it says, „I am associated with.“ But when you get identification, you've got you, a producer of universes and a regulator and changer of all things, mixed up with being a piece of MEST. And the most identified a guy can get is buried. He's been put into MEST, he is MEST and he has been slid into the MEST and covered up. And that's identification.

So, if this is identification, is there any lower level than that? Yes there is. There are the levels of „I am not“, „I am... I, I am a body and I am less than me“ by -8.0. Because below that level an individual so thoroughly believes he is a body, he's living the lie that he is something else than what he is to such a degree, that he is no longer himself – and what do you know? – he is even anxious about being something he is not.

He's even afraid he can't be that. He... he... he's already conceded that HE doesn't exist, that he is a body. That's at 0.0 on the tone scale, that's „being a body“. And then we go below that and he says, „I'm not even able to be a body. I'm so much lower than this that I'm not even a good body. I have to own a body. Or I have to control a body, or I'm very excited about a body, or I have to hide. I even have to hide the body.“

Now it's just a lowered level of „I am“ at the top here above 40.0, then „I am something“ – you could say down about 20.0 „I am a member of the team and I am doing so and so.“ And then down below that you could say, uh... „I am and I run a body.“ And then it gets down to zero, „I am a body. I am a body named Jones.“ Something like that: „And I don't know anything else than that. And if somebody walks up to me and says... says I am something else than this body named Jones, I can prove to him completely that I am Jones. I am only Jones. I even carry identi... I carry fingerprints, and I carry identification cards in my pocket, and I can prove to anybody that comes along that my name is Jones, that I am Jones, and that's that. And that's wonderful, and it's very cute of me to be able to do that trick.“

And down here, why the guy even isn't... isn't able to be a Jones when he gets below this level. These are the thetans you find hanging around the morgue who have been there for a number of years because they haven't got any place to go and they couldn't even be a body. They don't even know they're there, it's very, very... it... it's amusing or heartbreaking, whichever way you want to look at it. You go along and put your... put a... put a communication line on one of these characters and he sort of looks at the communication line, he's already in apathy and he says... he says, „Look, a line.“ And you say, „Hey, what are you doing?“ And he says, „I guess something's disturbing me.“ That's about as alive as he is.

So, what's all this about? This is a related experience, then. So, we get something else. We've already noticed that we had cycles of Action. Cycles of action begin with creation and end with destruction. All right, if those things are the case, then let's take a look at the cycle of differentiation. And as we look in this, we find the cycle of differentiation begins here with... the cycle of differentiation begins with „differentiation“, continues through „association“, and passes on through to „identification“. And that is the cycle of havingness, it starts here and it ends there. And it's the cycle of reason, it's the cycle of having (which is time itself) and it is the cycle of being. And that is the cycle of all things which measure cycle.

Now. It tells you that if these three conditions exist on this line that you have to reverse the cycle on the preclear. Now let's look up along here and let's find out if there's any other cycles involved. Yes sir, there sure is, here's your second cycle of action, which is „Start-change-stop“, and up above that level here's another cycle, which is „Creation uh... alteration and destruction“. And up above that level you have, over here, „Space, Energy and Time“. And down below this level, monitoring all of these things, we have in human experience, we have „Be, Do and Have“. And those things are all related, and these are all related, and these are all related, and this is 40.0 on the scale, and this is 20.0 on the scale or thereabouts, and this is 0.0 on the scale. Interrelationships of reason, of experience, of the MEST universe – interrelationship of all the laws of motion, and of the law of the cycle of the universe itself are postulated, then, on this tone scale, and in order to raise an individual up the tone scale you only have to get him to reverse any one of these cycles and the others will reverse. Reverse any one of those cycles, the other cycles will reverse. In order to bring an individual up the tone scale, then, from the infinity of the MEST universe back up to the zero of the MEST universe, you would have to work him then from the low part of the scale up the scale.

Now there are many intermediate steps on each one of these scales, but these steps are each one of them a gradient scale of logic, and it is undone by tracing the sequence of agreement which came about and resulted in 0.0 and below 0.0. So it is in essence a workout of disagreement; it is a method of making an individual disagree with the MEST universe. And a man who can finally disagree more and more with the MEST universe and do it on a gradient scale so he is not grossly upset, is, of course, going upscale continually. But if you force your preclear to agree with the MEST universe you are in each case going over from differentiation toward identification because the MEST universe itself in the furthest reaches, is an identification of such chaos and confusion that it divides actually only into two halves, and that's positive and negative, and the positive is have, and the negative is have not. This have and have not in terms of human experience makes positive and negative experience.

So, what's the best way to get this preclear up tone scale? Well, there's an awful lot of ways to do it, because there's another cycle right here. And this cycle here is from serenity through sensation down to the emotional scale, and that again has your three points. So you run the emotional scale backwards. You run the emotional scale backwards and you'll find your emotional scale fits exactly across that scale of differentiation- association-identification. Sympathy, low on the tone scale, is „I am being my fellow man,“ for instance. Anger is... is „I am holding again and with, thank you, my fellow man“.

Now. Whenever we have emotional-sensational-serenity, we've got down here a tone scale with which we're very thoroughly familiar. That tone scale goes from enthusiasm at 4.0, down to conservatism, down to boredom, to antagonism, to anger, to fear, to grief and to apathy. And therefore we know this little band in here very, very intimately, we are very, very sure of this little band in here between those two. But actually there are some emotions and conditions which are below that which are listed, of course, in our textbook and which we will have to cover later.

But uh... to bring your individual up the level, then, just this far, has been quite a trick with old techniques -4.0 to 0.0. But look at how you bring him up tone scale now. All you

have to do is use creative processing to start making him associate and differentiate. „First let’s mock up Momma. All right. Let’s mock up Momma again. Okay, let’s change one of those mock-ups to the wife. What’s the difference between the two mock-ups? Oh – ya mean... you mean you’ve both got ‘em wearing the same dress? And they’re both wearing the same shoes? And they’re talking both in the same – now wait a minute, you’ve got to change one of these until we get some kind of a difference between them.“ And the fellow’ll say, „For heaven’s sake, I never recognized it before, but I DO have my mother and my wife slightly confused.“

You just create mock-ups until they can create mock-ups for mom and mock-ups for wife which are instinctively very different. You create mock-ups, then, on identification of various actions that they would tend to take in their life – what is the difference between driving here and driving someplace else? What is the difference between driving a car and driving a wagon? You’ll be surprised how some guys are fouled up like a fire drill, they’re stuck in something back in 1776, and every time they take the car out they wreck it or something of the sort. And uh... there weren’t any automobiles back then.

You... you’ll get some of the most amazing identifications out of your preclear, and all you have to do is give him one mock-up of one, and one mock-up of another one and let him look at the two mock-ups. And if he can’t get up the scale to where he can do that kind of a mock-up let’s get the first basic elementary differentiation, and that is the difference between black and white. You get the difference between grey and very grey. Now get the... get him to handle and control at will grey and very grey, and then finally get him to handle and control at will black and white and turn them off and turn them on. Not only turn them off and turn them on, be able to locate them all over the place, and put ‘em in time, and put ‘em this way and that way – he’s got two things differentiated, he’s got black and white differentiated. Good, he’s got them differentiated? Now let’s break ‘em down and get various colors, and let’s handle those colors, because that’s breaking white down. And now let’s get the black and blacker, and get him to differentiate amongst the various shadings of black. The kind of blackness there is that has something in it, the kind of blackness there is that doesn’t have anything in it, what are the difference between these two things?

We get him to differentiate and differentiate, and we’ll find out, what are we doing? We’re coming right on up the tone scale toward 40.0. Now, he can’t do that very well, we have a bad time with that, let’s get him to stop and change things. Let’s get him used to being able to stop things and then change them. All right, now, for instance, there’s... there’s... there’s an example of that little drill now, „Mock up an automobile, have it passing from the right to the left. Stop it. Now. Change it into the Eiffel Tower. Okay. Now, as the Eiffel Tower have it move from the right to the left. Stop it. Now, change it into a human being.“ I mean, just a simple drill. You’d be surprised how many people it just keeps right on going, and when it comes to... They can’t stop anything. All right, they have stop, and back here to change.

Now we get somebody in destruction, and we find out this fellow, oh boy! Yeah, he can sure destroy things. In fact, it’s all so destroyed he has nothing but a black visio. Well let’s encourage him, then, on the destruction of things. Let’s figure it out, let’s get him so he can really destroy these things real good. „Now, you got that tower? Well blow the tower half

down. You got tower half down now? That's good. Remake it into a school house.“ You're backing up the scale on him. You're making him half destroy things and then alter then, half destroy things and alter them, half destroy 'em and alter 'em and so on and so on and so on. So, you're getting destruction back to alteration.

Or making him destroy them. Destroy anything he's got. He says, „I'm haunted by this visio that so-and-so and so-and-so, I'm haunted by this completely black visio. I am sure it is a black visio of my basement, but I'm not sure – it might be a black visio of the sky.“ And you say, „Well that's just dandy, let's take and throw a big black cloth over this black visio.“ And he thinks for a long time, and he finally throws a black cloth over the black visio, and he knows it's a black cloth because it has a little feel to it. And you say, „You got that black cloth over that visio? Now... now be very careful, now, but close a great big cone of blackness down on the top of the black cloth. You got that now? Now, change it from a cloth to a carpet.“ Guy'll think for a long time. Sometimes he can do it. Alteration of blackness. You'd be astonished how much you can alter and vary blackness. Don't quit or give up because your preclear can't do anything else. Or maybe he can put a black spot up on something with his eyes wide open, and then finally be able to shift that black spot an inch. Or turn it white, or do something or other with it. So, you've got him again, backing up towards 40.0.

All right, now we... this business of trying to handle time in human experience has been almost impossible. But we come to a very interesting series of processes when we come to the handling of energy, because his rehabilitation of force must be good, he must be able to handle force and generate force and receive force in all categories. And, more important than that, he must be able to handle and control space in all categories in order to back this up.

All right, those are the various scales. They are the scales of logic, they're the scales of experience, and they're the scales of processing in Scientology. Thank you very much.

(TAPE ENDS)