

ORGANIZATIONAL OPERATION

A lecture given on
15 July 1964

Thank you.

See, I didn't even propitiate you by starting it early today. That's what's known as being strong willed.

What's the date?

Audience: 15th Of July.

Fifteenth of July AD 14, Saint Hill Special Briefing Course and a lecture on Wednesday. And that's partially because I have an appointment tomorrow afternoon and partially because I want you to hear yesterday's tape again before you're examined on it. And before you hear that tape tomorrow afternoon, particularly people who have just started on this, you understand, you go get that glossary bulletin and tomorrow afternoon, why, you burn some time on that glossary of Class VI terms so that there's no slightest quibble in your head about what these various words mean. Got it? And burn that, and then you'll find mysteriously that the lecture emerges clean and clear and isn't confusing at all. You already got enough in lecturing on that material in terms of restimulation not to add, you see, the other liabilities that could be connected with it, do you see? So, get your—get your nomenclature down before you rehear that tape.

All right. That's besides the point. I haven't anything to talk to you about today. I don't know why I had a Wednesday lecture. There isn't anything to talk about anyhow.

There were some things one could talk about offhand that I've been dealing with lately which are somewhat amusing; and amongst them is organizational operation and has to do with personnel operation and it has to do with a lot of things of that particular lineup. And it also has to do with the fact that you as a Scientologist very often find yourself in the sphere and realm of business activities and promotions. Whether you like it or not, your practice very often carries you into this perimeter.

Now, along at the Level of I, advice—and particularly the Level 0—advice is part and parcel of your stock in trade. Now you say don't evaluate for the preclear. Who's a preclear? You understand? Who's a preclear? Now, your perimeter of action goes out wider than simply sitting down and processing somebody. And if you go on and think of a Scientologist as somebody who only audits, then you have a very limited view of Scientology. Scientology is the science of life, and life is composed of lots of factors. And amongst these factors are the economic woof and warp which makes the trap and cage that keeps civilizations interiorized into themselves. Amongst these various factors of life are the other dynamic relationships besides the first. There are, after all, eight dynamics.

Now, we take one individual and he is being processed and we tell him what to think about a process—of course, we've had it. That's evaluation. But advice is not evaluation—I mean, it's not auditing evaluation. Now, because that is part of your auditing discipline, you very probably eschew it when you get into the other perimeters. But it's very difficult to audit a group and it's very difficult to audit mankind.

Now, the best way to approach the problem, of course, is the auditing of individuals, because a group is simply a collection of individuals and the basic building block of a group, as the communist and socialist has totally overlooked, is the individual. There is no such thing

as „the masses.“ The reason they go in for the masses—it’s a GPM end word. It doesn’t mean people at all. It means mest, so they make that exact mistake and they say then people are mest because they go in for the masses, don’t you see? Very simple how they make this particular mistake.

But there are eight dynamics. There are definitely eight dynamics and when you move off the first dynamic with regard to the pc—his eight dynamics now, you see—when you move off that first dynamic with regard to the pc, you’re into the remaining dynamics. And, of course, second dynamic isn’t just sex. That’s the creation of forms, bodies, that sort of thing and that includes the family. And you will find the roughest, roughest, roughest points in interpersonal relationships between this fellow’s first dynamic and other, and so forth, that occurs in the second dynamic.

A person can be ripped to pieces very easily because it’s so intimate to the first dynamic, you see. The second dynamic is very close there and it’s not close simply because it is—been named number two. It is—it is very close.

Now, of course, the next thing adjacent to the individual beyond that is the group. The individual joins a group and you have a group as something which is a collection of individuals. Now, this collection of individuals is again a more stressful thing than the remaining dynamics, once more, closer—and the loyalty to a group, the conflict of this group with other groups ... In this you have, of course, business, you have social activities which are of much less importance to the individual in this particular type of society, or even in a socialist society, than business.

In fact, the toughest dynamic to have anything to do with in Russia today is the business third dynamic and that’s because their basic premise is—is: „There ain’t no business nohow because you can’t make a profit, you bum.“ That’s their, I think, their more educated view of the subject. They’re a bunch of people that haven’t even got their shoes on with regard to this sort of thing. See, they’re all running around barefoot on the tacks.

So, they found out that some of their tractor factory boys were trying to expedite à la Henry J. Kaiser. Well, of course these birds had to expedite for the excellent reason that they would be shot up against a wall or something of the sort if they didn’t meet their quota of tractors. So, they knew which side their vodka was going to be pouring in on and they promptly—and which way their lifeblood was going to be pouring out of—so they probably got ahold of some Horatio Alger, Jr., textbook or something on the subject, and they heard of expediting. And they said, „Gee, that’s a good idea—expediting.“ The way you expedite is to pay a bonus or give a favor for getting the stuff you want in order to run the place.

They thought this was a marvelous idea—in other words, the introduction of the reward system which is unheard of. You’re not supposed to get any rewards in the communist system. That’s why it doesn’t work, you see? They’ve—they’ve taken 50 percent of Pavlov. If you ring the bell and beat the dog, why, that’s as far as they got in the textbook. If they’d gone down the rest of the paragraph they’d found out that you also had to feed the dog to train him to the other half of the reaction. And that’s not missing in Pavlov but it’s missing in their handling of people, see? The reward factor.

For instance, they can’t get anybody to produce in Cuba. Well, everybody’s trying to produce in Cuba just for one reason—they’re going to get shot if they don’t produce. You know, viva the state, you see? And therefore they’re supposed to produce. These thoughts just don’t even go together, see? The state is commonly thought of by somebody as a nonproduction type unit to such an extent that a government, trying to produce something—it can spend more money trying to produce something it could have bought at Woolworth’s ... It’s marvelous.

If General Motors or somebody exclusively was producing the space program, for instance, you’d find out it would fit well within their automotive manufacturing budget and nobody would ever hear about it. But the government get ahold of it, see, wow, see. One

rocket—one rocket, oh, man, that's—huh—oh, that'll be a 100 million dollars, that's per rocket, you know? It's typical, see?

So, people don't think easily in terms of government and production, see? But in these socialist, communist states they've got these two factors jammed together. And then they've neglected the other half of Pavlov: the reward system.

Now, the dog—the dog trained and reacted the way he was because when you showed him a circle and gave him food, he's being rewarded for seeing a circle, see? And he could only be driven crazy because he was being rewarded when he saw the circle. They think he was being driven crazy because he was punished when he saw the square. The way they were driving him psychotic—you know, they drive a dog psychotic. This was the high peak of Pavlovian act. They could actually create psychosis in a dog and have been doing it in Russia ever since.

And what they would do is show a dog a—this experiment's run both ways—but they'd show a dog a circle on a screen, a projected circle, you see, and give him some pork chops or something, you see, and he'd get all educated to the idea that when he saw a circle, he was going to be fed. And then they'd throw a square on the screen and beat him.

And the point I'm trying to make here is that the square finally equated to the dog, „I am now going to be beaten,“ see? And then they would continue to use these symbols in association and reduce the circle till it was more squarish, and make the square so that it was more circlish, and when these two things moved into a merger, then the dog couldn't tell whether he was going to be fed or going to be beaten and so he would go crazy. And he'd develop a real, first class psychosis. And of course, this destroyed his stable data—it gave him a stable data and then it destroyed it, see? And then it substituted the wrong stable data for each other, see, so that he couldn't then tell the difference and he got into a total identification of eating and being beaten and so he couldn't tell the difference, so he'd go screaming mad. And the dogs would howl and scream and so forth and go nuts and have to have prefrontal lobotomies. That's the only effective treatment for psychosis, you know. That's the only effective one. It's just to cut out the brain because that's, of course, what people think with. Everybody knows that. Joke.

All right, now, look at—look at this. There's a reward factor there, see? Everybody adjudicated it on the basis—and the adjudication was that it was the—mostly beatings, you see? But there was a reward factor there.

And that reward factor, destruction of, was more contributive to the psychosis than the punishment. That's something that you—that because it's a softer, quieter thing, it is something that people overlook. It's the carrot. See. It's not a study in punishment—not a study in crime and punishment. It's a study of rewards. So that in Cuba, it's all very well to try Pavlovian ... By the way, Pavlov was whistled up at the Kremlin by Stalin—this is not rumor I'm telling you; this is the truth—he was whistled up to the Kremlin by Stalin about 19—, I don't know when it was, think about 28, and he was put in a room and (I hope it didn't have a bell in it and a square screen, but ...) and he was told—I should say invited, I should be sarcastic about it and say invited—and to write everything he knew about dogs that could be applied to human beings. And he turned out about a 400 page manuscript which is—anybody knows—nobody has ever seen outside the Kremlin. And it is the textbook on which communism goes forward. Quite interesting, isn't it?

And so their love—hate cycles and a lot of things become immediately explained. You'll find out they'll go on a big pitch of love, love, love, you know, and how wonderful the United States is and how wonderful this outfit—, „Oh, I love you all. We are going to write big treaties and let's all be buddies and have another drink of vodka,“ and then the next thing you know it, the calendar loses a few sheets and it's „Hate, hate, hate, kill them. You mustn't do this; you must take your U—2 planes out of our soup and...“ you know? „And we hate you and you ought to all go die and you're capitalists and warmongers,“ and so forth and then a

few more pages of the calendar falls off and so forth and it's „Love, love, love—we love you,“ and so on.

And of course, the type of fairy that they employ in the State Department, of course, is completely unable to cope with either love or hate and he, of course, has never figured it out. It's in any textbook of anybody who knows anything about communism. But he never figured it out. So he always falls for the love cycles and resists the hate cycles, you see? Proper thing to do is just to start a love cycle, you see, when they start a hate cycle and drive them nuts. See, they'd go mad. They wouldn't know what to do. A handleable situation on the third dynamic—all you'd have to know is their textbook.

You had to know what they're trying to do and then reverse the effect and of course then you could create an effect on it and the West wouldn't be backing up and losing wars. And for a long time, you know, I expected the North Korean flag to be flying over the White House. After all, there were half a dozen soldiers there and they could all shoot guns and seemed like at any moment they were going to effect a landing on the western coast and march on the White House. At least that's the thing it looked. Here was the most powerfully armed nation on Earth, you see, being backed up by a few rifles, you know? That was the silliest thing anybody ever saw.

Well, how was such a thing as that engineered? Well, it's engineered by psychological warfare. It's engineered by mental tricks of one kind or another. They had everybody hypnotized into believing that they could fly bombers out of Chinese and Manchurian bases and bomb South Korea but nobody must touch that, and Truman was so hypnotized into believing this ... It was just propaganda, you see? Wasn't any reason why anybody couldn't do it.

Nobody would have gone to war. China was in no state to go to war with anybody. MacArthur said, „I've got to be able to attack those bases,“ so Truman sacked him instantly. You want to know the power of the mind and power of propaganda—here was the president of the United States busily fighting the war for Russia, see? That's the way wars are fought. They are fought mentally these days. Of course, a war isn't a war at all anymore. It'd be a twenty minute *sfugh*, see? So, nobody can fight a war so this only leaves the significance.

Now, you see there are two things—there are two things in a GPM that give you trouble, and naturally you can say well, one of these things is a product of the other thing, it's just an idea of it and all this sort of thing. You can rationalize it out of existence if you want to. But the truth of the matter is that they do exist and you do experience them, and that's significance and mass. And when a person is driven out of mass he has to go into , significance. This is your figure—figure type, see? He can never do anything or handle anything, touch anything or reach anything, but boy can he think. He thinks himself in lots of triangles and squares and battle royals, you see? This is—who was the character that was always so very, very timid but yet was going around dreaming up—some comic strip character ...

Audience: Walter Mitty.

Hm?

Audience: Walter Mitty.

Aw yeah, Mitty. That's the boy. And this is a Mitty, you know. He can figure—figure and dream—dream, you know, but—and so on. He has a ball. But if you ever had put a—well, actually—a lit firecracker in his hand, even a small one, you see, why, he would have turned gray overnight, you know? Well, he's fallen away from mass and force and he only has one refuge—idea. Now, they actually go—he has the refuge of ideas, don't you see. That's called an unbalanced character. He's all ideas and no do. He can think, yes. See. But do, no. See, he can't handle mass.

Now, there's the other side of the thing which is equally unbalanced and people think that this is the only side there is, and that is that a person is very beefy and very brawny, but

can't think, you know? And we hear of this character all the time. The football hero who can't pass any of his subjects, you know? And I know of one. I saw him come in here one time. He was bringing to me—in a new organ, a new Wurlitzer. And he carried it in the front door, and Bonwick was—Bonwick was sort of tagging along behind not carrying very much weight and this boy just packed this Wurlitzer organ in through the front door. He never even cracked or damaged—he set it down very easily and gently, don't you see? Very, very interesting. And he's a little bit on the dull side.

So, you very often see this but it is not necessarily the case, you see. That is not necessarily—because somebody can handle mass well does not mean he can't think. But you do see it overbalanced occasionally that the individual handles mass very well, and so forth, and yet can't think at all. So you see, these two factors of mass and significance do go together in the field of the mind and can become overbalanced so that a person can only think but can't handle mass or a person can only handle mass and can't think. And there is no reason why a person can't handle mass and can think, see? That's the ideal combination. You very often find this one to be the case.

Similarly, an occupational activity where an individual is only handling mass and doesn't have to think will bring him to a point where he has a little difficulty thinking. You see, you could occupationally move yourself into this perimeter, too. And the sedentary worker who does nothing but think eventually gets to believe that he can't have much to do with mass and mustn't handle mass, don't you see?

So, he can sort of professionally move himself into these things, not only by aberration but by practice and activity, see? He can sort of live that way. He's saying all the time, „Well, I have to sit up here in the office and do all these contracts so the workmen will have something to move. And there they are down there running those Caterpillars and big earth movers, and so forth, and I've got to keep those things moving and I sit up here in the office . . . „ And eventually he'll get the idea that he mustn't. Well, actually, he really—if he was going to keep the business running—he really couldn't go down there and also run those earth movers and so forth from the seats, you see? That would be too much of a split of attention; and that is the limitations of the society in which we live.

It's a doozy of a society for making you concentrate and specialize in something. Which means that it gives you an awful lot of things that it tells you you mustn't confront. And basically it is only telling yourself that there are certain things you mustn't handle and confront that moves you into any groove and lets you find yourself up some blind alley someplace.

Now, getting back to what we were talking about, in Cuba there, all they'd have to do is tell all the Cubans—all the Cuban guys, you see—that if they met their quotas' they'd all get a brand—new pair of high—heeled shoes or a wild—colored sport shirt and tell the girls they'd have a good—looking dress if they met their quota, see? All of a sudden they'd have production; because there's the reward side of the system, you see. See, the reward side of the system is actually more workable and functional than the punishment side of the system. Now, punishment, if it's strenuous enough and tough enough and certain enough, can occasionally seem to accomplish something.

I think a classic example that always sticks in my mind when I looked at the Citadel de Christophe of Cap—Haïtien in Haiti and that thing was built over a period of years by Christophe, the great emperor of Haiti—and he was a tough boy. And they couldn't move a stone up the hill. There'd be a hundred man standing there—this is a fantastic structure; it's in the very best French siege—craft Tradition, and so forth. He surrendered. It's still full of powder and shot, by the way, and he surrendered it. He merely became dispirited. And he went up there; he was feeling kind of bad and he was retreating before the oncoming forces, don't you see, and he just sort of said, „Well, I can't hold out; the hell with it.“ The whole place full of powder and shot and he just threw in his chips.

It didn't matter how many stones had been put up there. It was, after all, the attitude of the man which surrendered the place, not the assault, and he didn't think it was worthwhile to go on living. He felt there was no reward in living anymore so he surrendered the whole citadel. He just gave it up, that's it. Blew his brains out and that was the end of it.

That was a very impressive structure and his method of building that is a classic. He'd have a hundred men trying to move one of these heavy stones up the hill and they couldn't move it, so he'd turn around to his guards and he'd say, „Shoot every tenth man.“ And they would. And he'd tell the remaining ninety, „Move that stone up the hill.“ And they would. See? Enough punishment, enough threat and so forth.

But then this has what? This is denying the person the reward of having a body and going on living and breathing. So, it's again not punishment but the denial of a reward. See, when you get it right down to that fundamental, it's the denial of life. You're not going to take life away from him; you're just going to deny him the rewards that life give him, whatever rewards they are.

And it's very funny that a slave or something like this will still hang on to life. He'll still go on living up to a point—under duress and so forth. But he's being rewarded to some degree all the time.

When the individual is no longer rewarded and when the individual is not in any way handled from a standpoint of reward and there's no reward figured into the setup of his existence, because if he's not getting anything out of it—an Americanization of this approach and that's a very crude materialistic, because rewards are many things, see—but if he wasn't getting anything out of it, why, he wouldn't play that game, see?

Now, that's a crude materialistic rendition of this which more or less gets this idea into trouble. The truth of the matter is there are many rewards and so on. There's the—just the satisfaction of having done your job okay, you see? That's a reward. It doesn't have to have somebody come up ... Now unions and that sort of thing go on the basis that reward is totally and only a paycheck, so they're raising hob with the societies at this particular time, you see, on reward of a paycheck.

I could get seven strikes started for every one they've got started right now using the same principles I'm talking about now in reverse. I would show them how there were certain things, rewards, which they probably could obtain from the work of being postman and postal workers which they were not obtaining. I could think of a brand—new series of rewards, you see, because I'm dealing with a basic equation, not how many bucks they got and what's the cost of living and how many pounds, shillings and pence this all amounts to. No, let's go on it on a fundamental. Let's say the reward is the thing which they're—the line which they would most easily travel. All right, very good.

Let's figure out some reasons for postmen to strike using it reverse. We'd wind up with some very interesting answers. We'd get such things as, well, large business houses and so forth aren't sufficiently respectful to the postman and they never thank him for the mail. See? So, you could—you could actually—let's put it—let's put this on this little, tiny basis. Now, you'd be surprised what a stir that would make amongst postmen.

I mean let's just take it to an almost ridiculous tininess, you see, and insist that part of their conditions of work and so forth, that they only delivered mail to people who thanked them for bringing it. You'd be surprised how many guys would sort of go overboard sideways for you on that one, see? Had nothing to do with pay; had nothing to do with anything, you see? All right, now let's just start adding to that and add some sensible ones, you see; add some sensible ones and so forth. And let's have the post office authorities, and so forth, providing better looking uniforms, easily carried packs, don't you see, have them providing more status for the postmen, better working quarters—did you ever see the back end of one of these post offices? You could start adding this up, don't you see, on the basis of status—this

is the way you'd figure it out, you see—status, and respect, you see, and acknowledgment. You start figuring it out in these particular directions and so forth, you got a ball now.

Postmen will walk around, drive around and so forth—shouldn't be working six days a week. They should go on different types of shifts. And you would find, however, that it isn't necessarily true that all strikes must occur on the basis of more pay and less work.

Now, I could as easily get a strike started on these bases for not being permitted to work enough, see? It's actually a dirty trick to play on a bunch of workmen—the idea that they are being overworked—because that's the sympathy line and that would be a very, very bad thing to pull on a group of workmen because it's a no—confront. Now, let's see where this no—confront leads.

You say this is a very wandering sort of lecture I'm giving you. No, I'm not. I've taken you up as far as the third dynamic. Well, people don't get much further.

You, someday, will get further up into the fourth—the fourth versus another fourth. Well, you say, „Yeah, this planet is the fourth dynamic—all men on this planet, that's the fourth dynamic.“ Yes, that's what I said, too, see. So, fourth versus a fourth. You, as operating as a Scientologist, you're going to see this. What's going to happen? What's going to happen when one race of beings comes in collision with another race of beings? I'm not trying to go space opera on you; I'm just being sensible about this, I mean ... Well, you say, „Well there must be some kind of an idea here where we're dropping back into groups.“ No, because culture would be so different—even body form, communication factors, technology, beliefs, ideas of what they should be doing and what was right and what was wrong and what was moral and immoral—would be so wildly different that you wouldn't even have a man, you see? He might even have a man's shape but he wouldn't be a man.

If you were to listen to a rocket jockey's morals and what's right and what's wrong for a rocket jockey from some other civilization, and listen to this for a while, your hair would stand on end. Now, we compare this to an airline pilot's ideas of what's right and what's wrong on this planet“ and we've got two widely, screamingly different approaches. We've got two cultures here. See, they're entirely different. What are the rights of one; what's the rights of the other? In other words, we've got too great a disparity.

And we get up into the fifth dynamic, we've got the plant world and I don't notice the plant world talking to man very much. Man sometimes talks to it, but it doesn't say much. And animals have very little to say and so forth. They aren't allowed to vote.

Now we get up into the sixth dynamic and we have mest and it doesn't talk at all. It never has anything to say. Some people hear voices coming out of it occasionally, but it really, in actual fact, hasn't got anything to say for itself. If you melt it up and put it in a crucible, why, it sizzles but it doesn't say „no,“ you see. Its resistances are plotted in terms of retaining its form or refusing to attain a form or refusing to condense or expand. It's just the resistances, don't you see?

Now, we get up into the seventh, as far as man is concerned today, he is so out of communication even with himself on the seventh dynamic that we frankly don't have to worry about that one at all in our present coverage.

And when we go into the idea of supreme beings or gods or big thetans or something like that, well, we've just taken the whole curve all the way around and the only thing we've got on this planet today is just pure nuttiness on this subject, see—the theory of the big thetan, see. Actually, the big thetan theory is simply one of the GPMs and it—there's end words that have to do with gods and things like this, you see. And there's one of the root words—several of the root words—have to do with worship and so forth and it's just goofiness, see? There isn't anybody—there isn't anybody, any big thetan around who's permeating everything, that just because you say, „Now, please give me cake and ice cream for my supper tonight,“ is going to suddenly go into a brown study and wonder how to get you cake and ice cream tonight, see. There just is no such being.

And if you're in trouble, you'd better not go out and think that some big thetan someplace is going to be interested, even if he existed, in some ant who couldn't bother—if he couldn't get his antennae out of a Crack of a rock. Believe me, he isn't going to give a second's thought to this. It would scare you within—to gray hairs if he did; all of a sudden huge hand scoops out of somewhere and ... Probably you'd die from shock if it occurred. Plot it yourself on your own attitude toward insects. You sometimes help an insect but mostly it's sort of amusing and—usually the devil with it.

And you get into this idea of the big thetan and all that sort of thing. You're not into the field of religion; you're just into the field of the GPMs again. That doesn't mean that there couldn't be big thetans. That doesn't mean that there couldn't be godlike beings. But let me assure you, that man's idea of them is so laughable as to cause you to roll on the floor for a half an hour and hold in your sides.

I think one of the best commentaries on this—Mark Twain did some very interesting commentaries on it—and I think Ingersoll was the great atheist. He had a lot to say about it. The only thing I find very amusing about Mark Twain—the second that you begin to read about god and holiness, you're just reading one of the longest parades of end words and root words I think I have ever laid my eyes on. His essays on this subject are just absolutely planted. If they're just—they just run consecutively, you see—end word, end word, end word, root words, root words, root words, end words, you see? And gets quite interesting because he must have been keyed in like crazy on that particular subject. He was mostly mad at it and making fun of it. He wasn't taking really a very rational view of it. Some of the things he had to say were quite amusing.

But it—the people say, „Well, Ron is against God.“ No, Ron is against people making a fool out of God, if God exists. I think if there's any god around who single-handedly built this universe, he's probably so plowed into it by this time that it's probably it's him that needs help, not us. And you could find—you could probably found a whole church on the basis of „help God, he needs your help,“ you know?

But you see how interiorized people are on this particular dynamic or scope of action which is the superior life being, you see, is all that it's the dynamic of And there are always going to be superior life beings around so that it is a dynamic and a definite dynamic, and it's been muddled up by GPMs, but it's definitely there, don't you see? There is something there, but it's simply in a psychotic state. Look how interiorized it is if everybody thinks *it* is going to help them. They say God, well therefore they worship it—it's somehow or other going to do something for them, and so forth.

Well, I want to show you the common denominator all the way up the line on all of this is simply understanding and communication. And where you run into difficulty—where you run into difficulty on any dynamic including the first difficulty of the first dynamic, which is the inability to know self, you see, from that period right on up dynamic after dynamic, the only reason you have trouble inside a dynamic, or one dynamic with another dynamic, is communication factor, and the less communication is feasible the more trouble you actually would have in doing something with it, not necessarily the more trouble you would have with it, because it might be so out of communication, you're unaware of it. But the breakdown is in the field of communication and then once communication has been established—understanding.

Now, the rocket jockey from some other technology appearing here, if he could speak our language, compared with what an airline pilot here would think was right and wrong and what he should do about his job, even though he spoke English, this rocket jockey would not be understood by most. Do you see? He'd not be understood by most. He would say, „Well, the pilot of a plane is expendable.“ That's his first duty: to be expendable. And you'd say, „Well what's the matter, I thought he was supposed to protect the equipment.“ Oh, he wouldn't protect equipment. That's very cheap, see. And right away you'd sort of hang up.

„Well, where does he get the idea that he’s—that his first duty is to be expendable? Must be a very dangerous business and they’ve hypnotized him into believing something or other about it so there’d be any rocket jockeys at all.“ But you just—you understand, I’m not trying to give you an answer to that, I’m just trying to say you’d be figuring, you see. You would be in a noncomprehension even if you had the understand. See, you’d have the affinity and reality would therefore breakdown.

So, you have the English culture and the German culture. The language is different so they had basic difficulties in talking to each other, but even the slight difference of the cultures was such that even when they spoke the same language they still didn’t understand each other well enough to do anything but go to war. And they periodically been going to war for a very long time. See. And they’ll go to war again. Germans sitting over there saying, „We’ve got to get them damned Englishers,“ and so forth, and ... Sunday Times pictorial up here, it’s stuck in 1914, man. Every few issues, why, here’s this 1914—18 war cropping back up again, and so forth.

You go out and try to sell Germans to Englishmen and you’re not going to make much progress. The only reason they’re standing there politely is because the English believe that every man should have his say. This fools a lot of people. They believe this implicitly. It isn’t necessarily true because he says it, but certainly every man should be permitted to say it and so forth. You can often get into trouble by interrupting an Englishman before he’s finished talking. He thinks you’re ungentlemanly. That is really more important than what’s being discussed. That’s right.

German doesn’t operate that way. I’m just giving you the idea. The German’s approach even to communication is entirely different. If a corporal in the army is three days superior in rank—you know, he got his corporalship three days before the next corporal—and he is speaking and the other corporal even looks like he’s going to change his expression, see they just chop him to pieces. And if the junior corporal is talking, it doesn’t matter where he has progressed to, the fact that he is the junior corporal makes him fair game to be cut off at once—loudly, harshly and instantly.

Whereas in England, you’d see the Lord of the Manor sitting there patiently, patiently, man, while the fifth gardener is telling him all about his marital affairs and how he is in trouble down in the cottage. So he’d just sit there and listen to it all the way through till the man is finished talking. He’s liable now to say something rather rude and curt to him, but he has heard him. You understand?

The German superiority is the right not to hear. „I’m your superior so I don’t have to listen to you.“ See?

All right. Let’s take those two little things and look at the number of wars. The reason I don’t throw America into that particular thing is because America is so muddled up with Germans and so muddled up with English, and so forth, that it is about as easy to trace the antecedents of—as one of these dogs you see running down the street of East Grinstead. Can’t do it, see. But you have two races here which are—have a definite similarity. They carry back to some degree. They’re mixed, of course, in many ways. But they have developed different cultures and there have been a number of wars and they’ve been very savage wars. And they were all about nothing.

The British no more would have let—knocked off that war with Hitler than anything, see? They just wouldn’t have knocked it out. The only thing Hitler wanted, as far as I can tell from the historical records, is try to knock the war off, see? He was holding up, holding up, holding up trying not to fight that war on this front. He was thinking, „Boy if I could just not fight this war I could lick the Russians,“ see. And he couldn’t get anybody to listen to him. See. And the English on their side says, „Well, we have no idea whatsoever what the devil Hitler’s trying to do, but we know one thing—Germans.“ See?

Now, the British didn't even feel bad about any of the various atrocities that Hitler was involved in. You try to trace why and there is no good reason. It's kept historians busy for a long time trying to figure out exactly what is the causes of this war. Well, that's why so many words have been written on it. They're not isolatable, see, as little pinpoint causes of this, that, or the other thing. No, there's these basic causes of no communication and the basic causes of no understanding.

Of course, our sympathies in this, of course, go with the British. I fought by their side throughout that war and so forth, but I just—using these as two rather pure examples. And here they sit within a stone's throw of each other.

You don't drive a Jaguar very, very fast, see—you don't drive a Jaguar fast into the southeast. You find yourself almost instantly on a boat and you're almost instantly off the boat. There's not enough water there to get your feet very wet, and then, if you kept on driving that Jaguar for just a few minutes, see, you would find yourself in Germany. I mean, there is no distance involved. You could hitchhike it, you see? It's not the distance between Rhode Island and Delaware, see. There's no distance involved from here over to Germany and yet hardly anybody goes over to Germany. You think it's a long way away. It is not a long way away.

In a racing car, and so forth, Suzie and I had an awful hard time trying to get the brakes on. We did! We got the brakes on in time to stop in Germany, and so forth. We might have gone right on through into the Balkans too, because these are all rather postage stamp. And we did insult the whole duchy of Luxembourg. It was touch and go for a few minutes one time down in Luxembourg whether or not we would be let out of the country or arrested on sight or something of the sort, because we'd insulted the whole Grand Duchy of Luxembourg at one fell swoop with—so much so that I even feel guilty sometimes listening to their Radio Luxembourg down there enjoying its program. I should write through and ask for a royal pardon or something. But I'd just gotten—I'd just gotten myself oriented in Luxembourg and I was stopped, see, and the guard—the guard asked me all about it and I started answering the questions about entering Luxembourg and he told me I was leaving Luxembourg and I wouldn't believe it because I hadn't gotten into Luxembourg yet, see? So, of course, he had a wonderful ease staring him in the face of illegal entry. It must be illegal entry. The man doesn't even know he's leaving Luxembourg! Very confusing.

Anyway, you look over this situation: what then causes, on each one of these dynamics, trouble? We're not wondering what causes them to be different dynamics, you see, but what causes—what causes the trouble. You've got dynamic one. What causes the dynamic one? Fellow's out of communication with himself and his own bank and can't understand himself. All right, that's trouble on unit one.

On unit two he's gotten all out of communic—I mean on dynamic two—on dynamic two he's gotten all out of communication with the second dynamic and he doesn't understand the second dynamic.

Third dynamic; He's gotten all out of communication on the—subject of the third dynamic and he doesn't understand the third dynamic.

On the fourth dynamic he's gotten all out of communication, very out of communication, with all other fourth dynamics. And he doesn't understand the point of where most people hearing me say something about it say, „Well, of course, he used to write science fiction, naturally.“ You know, they wouldn't even—here's this universe expanding to infinity as far as everybody's concerned and man pronounces this idiocy that we are the only race and technology alive in it anywhere. You even read in the field of science fiction, how all life spread out from Earth. Oh, come off of it. I was so amused about this I once wrote—read a story about this marvelous civilization that these fellows were exploring and that they were mining, and so forth, and they were simply mining the liver of a worm in a larger apple, but the—just to sort of sneer at them, see, the vast importance of this civilization, you see. The

highest peak of its space travel eventually was able to mine the liver of a worm in an apple in a larger civilization, see?

Now, no other fourth exists! Well, how out of communication can you get? You'll find the similar situation if you go out and look very hard today into some back desert some place or another. You're going to find some tribe some place or some bushman some place or some Pygmy some place or something like that who won't believe that any other races exist. They won't believe that such a thing exists as white men, and that you're telling them fancy stories because you say there are white men. They're liable to get very nasty to you when you insist you're just another race and not a god. They'll instantly put you on another dynamic like they put Columbus much to their dismay eventually. Motors often act like gods but seldom are.

Now, you get into this and there's just a total breakdown on the subject of communication so, of course, there's no understanding even attempted on the subject. But we do have this little thread of science fiction literature that runs through the society that attempts it but it's mostly full of menace. And science fiction editors are to a point if an author sends them a story which has to do with invasion from the men from Mars, they will reject it instantly just because it is a story of an invasion. They're so tired of these stories, in other words, a cliché. It's no longer an original story.

We must assume that if there is another culture we would be at war with it. Hey, there's a wild assumption. If another culture existed we would be at war with it and they would be attacking us. Well, that's a wild stable datum to have. You haven't met the other culture. You don't know anything about their intentions at all. But the instant assumption is that it would be they're angry at you and ready to attack you and eat you all up. I think that's a fascinating point of no communication, see—they can't communicate with them at all—and no understanding and then also that no understanding would be necessary because, of course, we'd just fight them. These are interesting assumptions.

Now we get out into the fifth and you're talking to dogs and that's fairly easy. And dogs are often trying to talk to you and cats try to talk to you and you talk to cats, and people run off at the mouth most remarkably talking to animals. And animals do fine though as long as you talk to them. They expect you to communicate and they're very happy about it and they actually lack vocal chords more than they lack ideas to say back, see?

And Vixie out here, she's gotten up to a point of where she's trying hard to—I don't know where—she must have some—these Welsh dogs must have been unthinkably careless. She must have some cat in her ancestry, you know, because she purrs, little corgi dwarf, you know, and she purrs. She's gotten so she purrs. That's her effort to communicate with me, see. She doesn't purr to anybody else that I've ever listened to. Maybe she's doing it now, but she tries to purr. Sounds very funny to hear a dog purring. But she's picked up to the fact I talk to her so she tries to talk back, don't you see, trying to make a communication. Well, there's a lot of understanding there, don't you see? So here is an understanding that really is not dependent on communication because the communication exists only in the crudest form of contact and awareness. It doesn't exist in the form of significance and meaning to amount to anything, you see? So understanding in that particular case can exist, you see?

Understanding can exist independent of the significant communication. That's an interesting thing. So you don't always have to have perfect communication, see, as long as you've got understanding. Your reality and affinity will go on right on up without the significance of the communication expressing itself at all and that continues on out through the fifth dynamic. And we automatically assume that certain things in the fifth dynamic and so forth—but we can look around and we can see them functioning between certain parts and kinds of men and the fifth dynamic, but if we look into the fifth dynamic we find out it internally is consistently and continually at war with itself. There's creepers up choking trees and there's wasps having a ball with caterpillars and there's warfare so there's not much mutual understanding inside the fifth dynamic.

And just because man can speak to the fifth dynamic often puts him into some odd state of high affinity—perfectly all right—of high affinity, don't you see—this isn't what makes it odd—high understanding, you see, high reality and so forth with regard to other parts of the fifth dynamic. Because you see, man has also made himself part of the fifth dynamic, and he has a feeling in this direction.

Every once in a while you'll notice some being or another who has gone completely overboard on this thing and they'll only talk about the gorgeousness of the birds and bees and how nice and sweet it is and how sweet everything is and how nice nature is and how beastly man is. This person must have rocks in his head. I don't have to hate nature because it's vicious but believe me it's not very theetie-weetie. All you have to do sometime is wound a shark in a pack of sharks and you're not watching very much. Just because this shark is bleeding even slightly causes him to be attacked by his own brother sharks, you see?

And nature can go completely daffy inside of one of its own little subdivisions on the fifth dynamic and can be intensely noncommunicative and nonunderstanding inside of one of those little subdivisions of the fifth dynamic. That's a pretty wild one. That's a wild one. You don't have to hate it for it. You don't have to be in awe because of it but you should have at least the sense to recognize what you're looking at.

You go out here and you see these beautiful vines. Well, here at Saint Hill, if I let these beautiful vines—when I first came here somebody had been talking about these beautiful vines just about long enough and they practically—well, if it had been left gone another three or four years this ... I don't know what the totality of trees and so forth here are at Saint Hill, there are quite a few of them, and I'd say about 75 percent of them would have been dead if they'd been let go another three—four years. Somebody had been careless enough to let ivy grow around the trees and two or three of the big firs up here at the top of the hill, and so forth, are gone. But boy, that ivy. It isn't just parasitic and that sort of thing, it has murder in its eye, man. It grows big ropes of stuff and it goes right around in the exact method necessary to shut off all the circulation of a tree, you see? And the next thing you know it just chokes all the circulation of the tree and the tree dies. Pretty! So, I guess somebody thought it was so pretty that they'd better not do anything about it or something of that sort. But it would have been the end of all the trees here.

You go around and you look at things like this in nature and you recognize that it is at war. Now, the scientist who then makes a whole total crash out of one philosophy—the *law of the tooth and claw*, the *law of the jungle is the only law which governs* so forth—ought to come around sometime or another and get off of his ivory tower and look out in the real world and find out that it isn't uniformly anything. See, it isn't uniformly bad, see? See, he could find—he could learn a lot if he'd just look. You'll find all sorts of wild things. You'll find that there are many assistive factors and there are many points of high communication between two different branches and high points of understanding.

You point to obvious ones—the scientists' remarks such as, I think, the hippos get their ticks picked off by tick birds or something like this and there's various things like this. And they say that's symbiosis and so forth. No, it isn't. I don't think hippos need ticks picked off particularly by tick birds—probably doesn't do them any harm at all. And they probably—I don't think probably tick birds are very efficient at it. I've seen various types of fish and so forth that clean the teeth of other fish and all kinds of things like this and I've noticed they very often don't do a good job, you know? You see, you got to look a little closer and you find out that it isn't all that practical. It must be something about a hippopotamus sort of finds life more interesting with tick birds crawling around on him, you know?

There isn't just that one crude reward. There's probably some other rewards involved. You find a lot of these things. You start looking for them; you find the rewards of livingness are many and they are picked up on various lines. But you get too concentrated on how bad it all is and, of course, there doesn't appear to be any reward of living and that's why people

commit suicide when they commit suicide: there's no more reward to living. Not life is too dreadful to live; there's no reward in it anymore. And now they go on down to a point of where they add up all the punishment factors, too, and that's enough to tip it over and they could blow their brains out or something of this sort, don't you see? This is almost a secondary consideration—I assure you, almost a secondary consideration.

What men will go through to hang on to a body is so astonishing that I am very often gawping at the subject, see. Well, they'd go through modern medicine. Can I say more? Wildest stuff you ever had anything to do with. In the old days, it's much simpler; they said, well there's nothing we can do for it. And he kicked the bucket and goes and picks up another body, see? But what they'll go through today to go on living. Well, there's a reward in life; there's a reward in all of this.

Now, when we add this up as a Scientologist, we aren't just and solely and only in the field of processing. We're in the field of advice. We're in the field of looking over the situation on these various dynamics. We're looking over these various things. And what you're looking for—what you're looking for then is the reward and punishment balances. But that doesn't really lead you to an immediate conclusion for this reason: that you'll find it's as far out as the communication is out or—or the understanding is out. And you can treat these things as slightly separate. Some communication of one form or another has to be there. But understanding is not totally dependent on the communication. Understanding can exist for other reasons rather than communication. You might have divined what is going on with that person and understood it therefore, see? So you didn't have to have much communication about it, see? You didn't have to have much information on the subject.

Now, if you're trying to settle up or square around somebody in life or set him right, the easiest way to do it is by processing him. I assure you that that is the easiest way to do it because you're going to get a failure on most of your advices when they're directed at one individual. Nevertheless, I don't say don't do it. You very often find out it's necessary to give somebody some advice so he can get some processing. Quite often you have to approach this with advice first, and you mustn't leave that out of your bunch of tricks here because it's very vital even on the first dynamic. Well, how about it—before you start processing somebody, you really are saying I advise you to get some processing. So actually advice comes first, if even in that ridiculous form, you see.

You say, „Well, the best thing for you to do, Mr. Jones, you keep talking about this lumbosis you got, if I were you Mr. Jones, if I'm going to do anything for you at all, in fact, not only if I were you but you better—I'd sort of square it up and I'd check into a hotel for the next week or so while you're being processed.“ And don't have anything more to do with those problems for that period of time and then approach it with a fresh look afterwards.

Well, that's a very limited piece of advice but it's certainly advice, isn't it? Well you should never feel yourself constrained about issuing such advice. Realize however, that their problems—to them—are very, very complex and therefore require a very complex solution. Sometimes you have to issue a little more complicated advice than you would ordinarily issue to get it understood. Sometimes it has to be very complicated.

„Yes, I know your business is going to suffer. What you do is write your brother a letter who is out in Des Moines, Iowa, and you have him come in and you train him on the job here for ten days in order to get this, so that you can have this week off and then you so—and—so.“

You get the idea, see? You sometimes give them this terrifically involved piece of advice and they will take it. Then it seems that you're acknowledging how complicated their lives are.

Well, the first dynamic, we understand that pretty well, but advice definitely fits in it. And then, why, as soon as you move up into the other dynamics and you are unable by various reasons to carry out a program of processing on each individual, let us say on the

second dynamic—you face that very often—or the third dynamic. You can't, at this moment—wouldn't at this moment be able to do anything but advise the Republican convention. You couldn't process them all, don't you see. You could advise them to have some processing, maybe run some Group Processing on them. That might work and is a very—a very workable activity in actual fact. But you'll find yourself seldom with both sides of the third dynamic under your control or understood or in communication. You could talk to the British, you see, but not to the Germans, don't you see? See, that'd be that—you'd be that monosided about it.

So therefore, in settling any third dynamic activity you do have Group Processing, you should use such tools and so forth but you'll find yourself more and more operating in the field of advice and I assure you in two or three years if there was any communication with other life in space, the first one that they would think of talking to probably would be a Scientologist. So that, again, we were on the advice side of the picture and it's advice, advice, advice. And advice is, after all, instruction isn't it? And there's no real difference in what I'm saying between advice and instruction.

So when you depart from the first dynamic you then have instruction as your dominant activity. You have advice, in other words. But advice easily slides over into the „this is it“ of instruction, see?

So training, instilling cultural patterns, figuring out how it ought to be and squaring it up that way becomes very much a part of a Scientologist's livingness. Couldn't be otherwise. So he has these two things: he has advice and he has processing. When you move off the individual or when you move away from being able to collect the group together and process it collectively—when you move away from that building block, the individual—you're sure dealing with much better ground if you're dealing in the field of advice, see. And if that advice is just casual advice, it's still advice, you see? Now, when it becomes less casual and more directed, that becomes instruction. And on seven of the dynamics, those that are not the first dynamic, you'll find out that's the one which you basically use. Well, in view of the fact they aren't all seven highly operative, why, it doesn't give you a ratio of seven to one, see. But it does give you an overbalanced ratio, that you're apt to use advice and instruction more often, really, than processing. New look, see? Because there's more of it, if you were being totally active in the handling of the society, that you certainly would be using advice and instruction far more frequently than processing; far, far more frequently.

So the conduct and practice of Scientology is slightly more advice and instruction than it is processing. But before you have any, any right whatsoever to advise anybody, you certainly better be able to do something in the field of processing, right? So, actually it starts with being a good auditor and not evaluating for your pc and telling him what to think about what he's just dreamed up.

Now, evaluation is really—pc says he doesn't know what kind of an answer you'd expect on this so you tell him the right answer and you say, „All right, you answered the question.“ It's answering his auditing questions for him that you're shying off for there, telling him what to think about the auditing question or something like this. But evaluation has nothing to do with instruction.

We use the word evaluation roughly and not technically—I would say to—well—I just evaluate day after day, hour after hour as long as I'm in communication with people. They expect to give me—they expect to give me—well, they expect me to give them some kind of an answer to their situation, so I do. I don't mess around with it.

Fellow says, „What will I do about my wife?“ See, „What will I do about my wife?“

„Well, how's she been acting lately?“ So—and—so and so—and—so and so—and—so. You instantly realize that it's not a processing problem. In the first place you can't do anything in this particular team. There couldn't be any co—audit possible on this team. We wouldn't get all unreal about the situation then and say, „Well, she better be audited and you

better go into a co—audit on it.“ Well, my God, the girl is climbing a wall and nobody can keep her down for three minutes and she’s gone totally loopy over some other guy somewhere or another and she’s racing off and gone till 2:00 A.m. every morning, you know. That’s this sort of thing and it’s completely out of control, see?

Well, maybe they could have been processed years ago, see, but nothing you can do about it far as processing is concerned. Well, see, you better just get into the advice business right away.

„What I do about it?“

„Well, let her go away with the other man, of course.“

And take a bunch of responsibility for—worry about taking responsibility for her actions! Actually you’re being irresponsible if you—supposed to be the person who knows and are informed about life and livingness and that sort of thing—sit there with a dumb look on your face. Now you’re being irresponsible. Guy wants to know what to do. All right, tell him what to do, see? First thing you think of, well, let’s see if we could get you some processing, get her some processing, that’s obviously the best answer, see. And you figure out is this possible in any way even by any stretch of the imagination or even by an heroic action, is this possible? Well, you find out, this isn’t possible and so forth and isn’t feasible.

Don’t also be a fool and say, „Well, of course, if all I’ve—I’ve got all this, I’ve got all my auditing time all taken care of here for the next ten and a half weeks. Somehow or another I’ll fit this fellow into my schedule,“ and so forth. You’re just being a fool; you’re being irresponsible. You know you won’t get around to processing this guy. You got more pcs than you can shake a stick at. Something like that. You *won’t* get around to processing this guy. Let’s be real.

All right, the thing to do is say, well, that’s advice: „Oh, the thing I’d do if I were you I’d just let her go. You say she’s running off every night and that sort of thing. Well, I’ll tell you—I’ll tell you what. Here’s a—here’s a piece of paper here that you have typed and get her signature on, it’ll keep you from getting into any trouble. It says, ‘I, having been unfaithful to my husband, so forth, hereby grant him divorce and full custody of the children without further upset. ‘And get it—here it is. All right, get it typed and see if she can sign.“

So you know this will catalyze something, man, because you’ve put the end product of what this girl is heading for right in front of her face. Now, she’s either going to jump one way or the other way, isn’t she? See. You catalyze the situation and maybe the guy who’s asking you for the advice is hell to live with, remember that. And maybe the other guy is a real dream, see. You don’t know about this, see.

So you just give, you just give as close as you can give to a solution which is practical on all dynamics that you can think of in the next two or three seconds. You understand? Don’t go taking these things under advisement. So, all right, within the reality of that—of the data you’ve got—then give the best solution that you can give which fits all the way around without pretending that you’re not on his side but also not exclusively being on his side. Do you understand? You actually—there’s a big trick in this. I’ll give you the trick in giving advice: is the advice you give should not be partisan.

Now, this is the other thing I’m trying to arrive in talking about the dynamics so long that maybe overstressed it. You only get in trouble when you get partisan, when you cease to be pan—determined, because that brings you down into self—determinism and brings you down into one—sided specialization and moves you right on downstairs into all the specializations and economic traps there are. You cease to be pan—determined in the advice you give.

You say, „Well, I’m not going to process this or that or the other thing or this type of individual because I don’t like him.“ You’ve already become specialized. You should never make a limit on what kind of a person you’ll process in actual fact, see? If you don’t enjoy processing this kind of person, well, also don’t be masochistic. But don’t say, well, „I’m

never going to process any blondes, see, because I'm liable to get in trouble with blondes and figure it all out," see. That's for the birds, see. That's silly—to get an end—all category, see. And similarly, it's very silly to give partisan advice.

But remember this, it is also unacceptable to give advice which isn't partisan. And that's where the most of the argument comes against the savants. They put the pose of detachment and disinterest in with it, and you mustn't do that either. Don't go around—this is really the way to exteriorize out of everything and become zero—determined in all directions—is just pretend you're never part of anything and never interested in anything, you see?

But somebody comes up to you and they want you to get real mad at their mother—in-law. They're asking you for a bunch of advice. Well, you don't have to get mad at their mother—in-law. This is what I'm saying, see? You don't have to get mad at the men from Mars to advise Earthmen how to handle the men from Mars, you understand. You don't have to get mad or partisan or upset about some other side in order to issue advice about it. But neither do you have to sit around and say, „Well, I'm really no part of this conflict. I'm just an agitated, I mean a detached individual. I'm being calm, yeah, and I'm being *da—da—da—bluuh*.“ Delete that from your histrionics.

Just look at the guy interestedly and say, „Oh, there are men from Mars in Washington, yeah, they need advice over there. Oh, yeah. And you're wondering what to do and so forth. Well, instantly see if you can't set up a communications network. See if there isn't some common exchange of communication and make that your sole concentration. See, see if we can't set up some kind of a communication thing.“

„Well,“ he says, „it's impossible. They're just flying around in the air and we haven't got any radio.“

„All right. Abandon the city.“

Well, the guy says, „That's more like it; we'll abandon the city.“ He's off, see? That's the other piece of advice he'd take.

All right. Now, look at this. You say, „Well, see if we can't arrange a co—audit between you and your wife,“ you see. You look this over. That's communication. And then estimate the degree of no understanding that will occur and advise accordingly. If he can't do that, then estimate the degree of no understanding that will occur or the understanding—estimate the understanding that can occur and advise it. Advise something on that basis. You say, well if they're flying around overhead, and this guy says he can't get into communication with it anyway, and they probably tried something in this direction, they're all scared stiff. Realize there are some other factors you haven't been told always in giving advice. You've never been told all. You don't really know very much about the situation. Don't make a—be a fool to think you have.

Where you make mistakes in giving advice is to think you know about it and have the perfect solution. One: you don't know all about it ever and two: you can't give them the perfect solution and they probably aren't going to take it. They'll take as much of it as they can apply. So, the best thing to do is give them something they can apply right now and do. What'll they take off of you.

„Oh, well, I've been talking to—I've been talking to the Scientologist up in Fairfax and he says we ought to abandon the city.“

„Oh, is that what he says. Well, let's get the city abandoned.“

And at least they're doing something, see? And the Martians say, „Well, they aren't going to fight us because they're running. Look at them run. They're scared of us. Hey, you see, we've been scared of them; they're scared of us. Maybe we ought to try to get into communication with them.“ Maybe a communication factor would get established after all, see.

See, what's the best advice you can give them that will be taken. That's the equation you're operating by. What's the best advice you can give them that will be taken—that *will be taken*! Now you can give them the perfect solution that won't be taken. But what's the solution that will be taken? Well, let's find out. And you sometimes have to plow around for a while to find out what advice will be taken.

The fellow says, „Oh, I just can't stand it anymore, Ron. Yeah, I just have asthma. I wheeze and so on. I can't take off any time for processing and that sort of thing and you say you've got too much of a schedule to process me anyway, and there isn't any way I can do this anyway because I, after all, have an awful hard time in processing and so forth and so on. But I really got to do something about this eoooh—this asthma, and so forth, and I don't know, and so forth.“

„Well, you ever been down to lower altitudes?“ you're at high altitudes, see. If you're in a high altitude, figure out it must be high altitude. Just give him change. Change his environment. That's one of your first old—time rules and so forth. But give him a piece of advice he takes. So you say, „Well, how about, how about getting some blankets and sleeping warmly and getting some . . .“

„Well, I can't do that because you see I'm too agitated.“ And so on.

He's refusing all this. All of a sudden you finally work your way down some channel and you say, „Why don't you go down to a lower altitude.“

He says, „Yes, I'll go to a lower altitude,“ and so on.

„Yeah,“ you say, „all right.“ Put the pressure in right at that point, see. „All right, you go right down to a lower altitude and you'll feel better at once,“ and so forth. Put the hope factor in, see? „Go down to the lower altitude. You'll undoubtedly feel better at once. Very good. Fine, fine.“

He writes you back couple of weeks later and he appears, „Yeah, I went down to vacation and I'm feeling fine now and no asthma.“ See.

The point I'm trying to make with you here, what I'm trying to teach you is handle it! See, handle it!

And you don't have to say, „Well, I can't process him for 8,645 hours so therefore I can't help him out.“ Oh, hell no. You got a lot of more strings to your bow. You've got advice.

What's advice? Anything you can deal off the cuff that he'll accept and do that is more beneficial to him than what he's doing—more beneficial to him than he's doing right now, that's for sure. If he doesn't change the way he's going, he's going to crash. That's usually the moment they're asking for advice; it's just before they go over the cliff, you know? So it's all usually over—the—cliff type of advice you have to give him. Don't sit down and give him a five hour lecture on his problems or something like this. Find out what he'll accept. Hunt and punch around. Generally in giving advice you can develop a sensitivity—you can get that sensitivity pretty good. And you notice this guy has got a reservation about what you're saying, well, you gave him the wrong piece of advice, see. Why, shift your gears.

„Now, a lot of you—you have some reservation about doing this with regard to your boss. What's the matter?“

„Well, you see, I—I really don't go to work anymore. That's why I can't do it.“ „All right, fine, fine. Well, what's—what is your trouble then? Maybe I didn't understand you completely and so forth.“

„Well, I—I want to handle him so I can get back to work.“

Oh—he didn't tell you in the first place, see. He didn't give you all the data. There, you are—you're being foolish if you ever assume you're ever given all of the data or that all the data that's given you is true. You're actually being a fool if you work on this premise that every word that you're told is the gospel truth and you've become partisan and so forth. That is what gets wrong with giving advice. You become instantly partisan; you believe everything

you're told is true; you take sides against the mythical person. You always will, to some slight degree, emotionally. You'll say, „Well, she did, my God!“ You know. Of course, we're not listening to what he did.

And the situation is that you don't want to give a wild piece of advice that will wind up as a total destruction on all fronts. But don't mind giving slightly destructive advice either, see. Don't mind—don't give the type of advice of, well, the best thing to do is shoot her. Don't give the type of device of something or other. Just from as far as you can tell at this particular instant this seems to be a workable, feasible thing and so forth. She wants to go off with the other man. Well, let her go.

„Oh, I never thought of that.“

„Well, you know, if she did go, you know, you could sue him for a loss of her services.“

„Well, you know, I give her eleven—eleven pounds a week right now and I think a maid only costs me about six pounds a week, I think I'd make money on the deal.“

You say, „All right, then, the best advice is get her to sign this paper and so forth.“ Gives him something to do; takes his mind off his trouble.

You're answering out of your experiential line. Don't mind doing that either. Don't be self-conscious about it is what I'm trying to say. So, you all of a sudden feel like a pontifical ass saying these things, pontificating to this degree and so forth. Well, laugh at yourself if you want to but don't cease to give advice because of that, see. Give them something. Handle it! That's the thing. And the way you handle it is try to bring about auditing. If you can't bring about auditing, try to bring about communication; if you can't bring about communication and so forth, why, bring about understanding. But, of course, the communication and understanding are all under the heading of advice. If you can't audit them, advise them.

And it just doesn't matter what you advise them. Because you're people of good heart and you'll listen to this and you'll say, „And you say your mother—in—law has been living with you for the last thirteen years and now won't let you sleep anymore in your wife's bedroom. Your mother—in—law won't let you sleep anymore in your wife's bedroom. You want to know what to do about this. Huh?“ Well, you're just stonied, see. What you're stonied by is that a situation like this can exist. You're not stonied about what advice to give him, you see. You're just slightly stunned, see.

Well, the upshot of the thing is that you can deal one off the cuff and you say, „The old lady's been living with you for thirteen years, and now she says so—and—so and so—and—so. What's your house like?“ You know, you've got a clue now what to do.

„Oh, there's only two bedrooms.“

„Hers and you and your wife. Where are you going to sleep then? You have to sleep in the living room. You got a big back yard or something like that? Or you got anything like that? Oh, why don't you—what—what do you—let's see—what's your—what's your business—what's your business? You're a commercial artist. Why don't you tell them you got to have a studio out in the back yard. Immediately start building yourself a studio out in the back yard. They'll try anything they can to get you back in the house again.“

The guy say, „That's a good idea—a studio out in the back yard with a door opening on the alley. Yeah, that's a good idea.“

In short, it doesn't much matter what you advise him, see. But the system of your advice—the system of your advice would be in the direction of handling something. So, you don't let a lot of human problems walk into your perimeter and sort of drop, see. Guy's coming to you for help. All right. Give him help. And help isn't just what processing you can give him or actually what formal training you can give him. You can also give him advice and as a very informal type of information, don't you see. And that's yours.

You'll find you'll do it very often; you'll find out you do very well if you pursue that. And you'll find out that the world has very badly fallen apart one from another; and you'll

find out the dynamics are very badly separated from one from another; and you'll find out there's enough warfare going around to please most anybody. You'll find out that life amongst the wogs is pretty confounded grim as a matter of fact. I was looking at it recently and I couldn't believe the number of catastrophes which I found per square cubit of thetan—see, of enturbulated thetan. I just couldn't believe it. It's fantastic. You can't audit all of it that comes your way, but you can advise it and you can handle it. And you're only really doing your job as addition to other things as an auditor if people who come to you with trouble and people who are having trouble in life and so forth, if you don't try to help them handle their situation. And just go ahead and try to handle it. Help them handle it and give them some advice as to what to do and so forth. It's all part of it.

And you'll find out that they very normally don't do what you told them to do, but you find out that you got them to thinking in some forward line and they will do something else along the line, but you will have catalyzed the situation in the direction of a better smoothness or solution. Life will become smoother in that particular quarter. If you would simply and only acted as a catalyst in your immediate environment, you would be doing your job in that particular field and area. That's all, that's all you expect out of it. See.

The guy comes back two weeks later, „I got a better idea after I left you,“ and so forth. „I built a house in the back yard for her and she's going to live in it now and so I got the idea.“ But he knows that you helped him. It doesn't matter whether he says your idea worked. You're not listening for that.

So, there is an entirely different field that an auditor works in all the time he is auditing and if you feel forbidden to do it because of the Auditor's Code, remember that's evaluation with relationship to a session and has nothing to do with giving people advice. And you give people advice all the time. And you'll find out that anytime somebody comes to you and tells you their troubles, if you give them something to do about it, it's practical, you tell them about a Touch Assist ... I don't care what you tell them in advice' you see, give them something practical, give them something they can do and that sort of thing and you'll find out that you're just aces up and your life will start running very, very smoothly indeed. And you'll listen to lots less problems because he actually will tell you only up to the time you give him some advice or something of that sort, don't you see. You've shortened the amount of upset, in other words, of people telling you endlessly their troubles and only their troubles and so forth.

One of two things will happen: they either solve their troubles or they don't want them solved and so won't keep handing them to you. See. But you have again done something about it. And the fact that you are helping people handle their environment in your immediate vicinity does put you kingpin and aces up and you're actually occupying a role that whether I said you would or whether anybody tailor—made you to do so or not, that you very certainly will—are occupying and will increasingly occupy as you go forward in life and Scientology rolls along.

Thank you very much.