

SCIENTOLOGY DEFINITIONS III

A lecture given on
13 December 1966

Thank you.

What's the date?

Audience: 13 December AD 16.

Thirteen Dec. AD 16, Saint Hill Special Briefing Course, and we've got some more definitions coming up today.

I would like to make a comment. Just before each lecture here for the last couple of Tuesdays, why, we've managed to have accumulated a flap—you know, one of the press flaps. Last Tuesday the minister of health was shooting his face off and this Tuesday, why, the local council was shooting its face off see? Trouble is they're very bad marksmen and they don't quite make the grade, so their faces don't entirely disappear. But the truth behind all this is—you should know; we're issuing it in a directive, just the rebuttal statement—the council has said, „Yes, the minister of health's statement that Scientology is potentially harmful; they'd better keep an eye on this.“ That's all it amounts to. See, they can't say anything or do anything. Now, where they go off the deep end is simply on this fact alone. Hubbard Association of Scientologists International since 1952, the very formation of Scientology, was a religious fellowship. That's one of the first and earliest lines in its charter in the state of Arizona. The current organization is the Church of Scientology of California, operating throughout organizations throughout the Commonwealth.

Very good. What is Scientology? How does it fit into the framework of man? This is not the counter statement that was issued; I will tell you what that is in a moment, and you will see it in full.

Truth of the matter is, is you are studying an extension of the work of Gautama Siddhartha begun about twenty—five hundred years ago. He sought to end the endless cycle of birth and death and birth. And this death—birth cycle led into an effort to show men that they were a spirit and did not *have* to be a body and did not have to go on being clay. Gautama Siddhartha perfected some work that we did in 1952, and we did it better How to exteriorize.

Now, the trouble he had with his work was how to stably exteriorize or continue somebody in an exterior condition. He did not know how to do this. Actually, Lamaism, which began in Tibet after Gautama Siddhartha was no longer around. He in actual fact went to Tibet and worked in Tibet and developed what is called Lamaism in an effort to produce a methodology to reach the basis of the mind and permit an individual to be spiritually free.

Now, that work too was relatively unsuccessful. We were more successful in that in 1952 in Scientology. We could more easily and more swiftly exteriorize an individual and show him that he was a human spirit than had been done.

Yet the work of Gautama Siddhartha, although looked upon [by] him as a failure, produced the—a sufficiency of wisdom on this planet to bring civilization to three—quarters of Asia. Buddhism is the oldest and most numerous religion on this planet at this moment. It is very numerous and it predates Christianity by 500 years. Probably the shreds of Buddhism, coming into the Middle East with the silk and spice merchants who, after the contact of Alexander in about 333 B.C., found out there was a Europe. The spice merchants and silk merchants of India and China

followed on back on the trail of his retreating conquest and made a trade contact with the—with Europe, and from there on supplied Europe with spices and silks and so on, on an overland route.

Well, along with them undoubtedly came Buddhism. It sparked a religious revival and a considerable amount of messianic activity in the Middle East. Now, regardless of any truths or prophecies or prophets or anything like that that happened as independent endeavors, this nevertheless was sparked off by Buddhism.

Buddha predicted that in twenty—five hundred years the entire job would be finished in the West. That's in the Pali canons. Well, we finished it. Now, were somebody to claim that Scientology were not a religion, that religion was a disguise, this would be about the most erroneous statement that a man could make, because it is an extension, a direct extension, of the work of Gautama Siddhartha Buddha.

It has very many peculiar facets. Buddha never pretended to be other than just a man. Everyone, anyone, race, color or creed, could be a member of the Buddhist church. It was not limited to one caste or class or race or nationality. It was the first international religious movement. And it has carried forward but it has moved actually in its technology not one inch further than it was pushed in Tibet, until 1952—the successful exteriorization of human beings by a very brief, swift technology.

Now, human beings do not stay exterior. You can demonstrate to them that they are a spiritual being and that in essence is the essence of religion. Man *is* a spiritual being. Now, where he came from and so forth are questions developed in religion.

But the spirituality of man is the basis of religion and is the one thing that all religions have in common. They have different creators, different gods, different altars of worship but in one thing they hold a common truth and that is that man is a spiritual being. only in Buddhism was this ever proven.

Now, what is interesting about this is that any such forward push runs into the fellows who are sufficiently suppressive to not want anybody free. They are men who are essentially afraid. They are afraid if you got better, you would be able to knock them off. If they had been very evil chaps indeed, I should very well think you might gratify it—their ambition. There is something there for them to be afraid of. They could no longer carry on licentiously, suppressively, no longer dip both hands to the elbows in the public funds to support their private friends. They could no longer do a number of things. But the basic goal of psychiatry today is to wipe out religion. It does not have the goal of healing the sick or helping the insane. That is demonstrated by the rising statistic of insanity throughout the world during the duress of psychiatry. The longer they operate, the more insane they've got. Well, now that's what we would call a very bad statistic indeed.

The truth of the matter is, they inveigh against religion to this degree: They say anyone who is religious is psychotic. That's what they say.

Now, I think what they intend to do has very little to do with us, but I think by knocking us out of business and disqualifying the fact that we are a religion, they can then pick bigger game, can knock out a bigger church and a bigger one and a bigger one. Their sole interest is in the quick buck.

As far as these national mental health associations, and so forth, are concerned, you must realize that they are private organizations which have nothing to do with the government, which pretend that they are part and parcel of the government. They call themselves the *National* Mental Health Association. They have no right to the word, and it as a matter of fact is in controversion to the Companies Acts which passed, that said the word must express exactly what the organization is.

It might surprise you to know that the British Medical Association is simply a private company of doctors and has nothing to do with the government. Similarly these national mental health associations are only, solely and entirely private profit companies.

The one here in England runs mental homes that charge fees that would make us blush. They take care of nothing but the idiot children and the senile parents of the aristocracy. That is their role in life. They use their name to obtain, falsely, public funds. And in addition to that, one such association—and we have it signed—stated that in view of the fact that I was a millionaire I would not miss a hundred thousand pounds, and that unless I paid a hundred thousand pounds, every minister of health, every information service and every government in the world would be provided with information by which to crush us, and all I had to do was pay up a hundred thousand pounds. We have that, signed.

The Australian Inquiry would make the Profumo case look like a Sunday school picnic. They called all the hostile witnesses together, they arranged their testimony and then they went to the hearing and gave their testimony. Our witnesses were neither—either not heard or intimidated or discredited. Perjury was permitted by the QC. There isn't a legal crime that you could mention that was not committed in the (quote) 'Australian Inquiry,' instigated by psychiatry far enough away that they could make a splash because I was totally inhibited from appearing or testifying at that inquiry. It's very interesting. So, they've rolled through to their brother organization in England who is now kicking up the fuss.

This is what it is all about and this is really all it is all about. As long as religion brings solace to man in any way, shape or form, as long as churches stand in any way for the spiritual freedom of man, psychiatry will not really be able to progress, whatever its end goals are. Therefore, our rebuttal to any such attack is that psychiatry should not be permitted to wipe out a small church and then go on to a bigger church and then go on to a bigger church, and so take it all over. And also that the minister of health, as we have just told the press, has no right whatsoever to comment upon religious beliefs or practices. And in addition to that, that they are telling us that we must not do something we are not doing.

Now, this is the yickle-yackle that appears in the world. The public at large is in actual fact getting ready to turn. Much of it has already turned. They see something very rotten in this idea of attacking Scientology. They are sick of this, see, because it's gone on too long. And we hear cross comments of this particular character here and there. And they've gone too far and they've said too much! And they are now talking to an hostile public on the subject. It's up to us to make sure that this is the downfall of all suppressive practices in that line.

Well, the local council has been told that it has no objection to euthanasia in its local hospitals and that it should avail itself of our invitation to have a council—elected representative sit on our advisory board at Saint Hill. And then maybe they could learn that we were not doing what they say we are doing. Because they say that we are treating the sick and treating the insane. And we are not doing that, as you know, by policy.

So that is the total way this thing sums up. There are no other ramifications to it. Psychiatry is demanding its right to kill or maim any human being after it states that he's crazy. Now, if they can do that, they can control a planet politically. And it's quite a push. We don't say it's a total conspiracy, because it's a bunch of incompetent boobs trying to pull it off. But it is already in use politically, as in the case of Long, I think it was. They wanted to get rid of him as a political rival, so they had the psychiatrist pick him up and throw him in a hospital. They wanted to get rid of Walker, General Walker, and so they picked him up and said he was insane and threw him in hospital. In other words, this is a political mechanism which is being used, and I think it should be resisted. It's not too hard to resist it in view of the fact that the men are too suppressive to actually carry through.

There's two things that a suppressive cannot do: he cannot choose a right target and he cannot complete a cycle of action. But the one thing—when you are talked to about this—the one thing that you should give them back right in their teeth is that if you are not doing something, you cannot stop

doing it. And that there is no law or regulation of any kind which says that you cannot make people more intelligent or more able. And that's all we're doing.

Now, we threaten—we threaten—the very fundamentals of the psychiatric push on this planet. It's not just psychiatric; there are a lot of people pushing on this planet. This planet is full of pressure groups, any one of which is trying to do in every other group on the planet.

We try to *ignore* this type of action all that we can and carry on. Actually we have completed our technology, we are well on the way out. We are just about as stoppable today as a juggernaut. You can't stop this much wisdom.

Now, there's another factor involved: is when anyone tries to cut a line of pure theta, it tends to blow them up. What would you think of somebody—you had just received information that you had won the raffle, and he got the piece of paper that said you had and he put it in his pocket and he didn't say anything about it to you. What would you say when you finally found out that he had done this? Well, now, that's just a minor example of what happens to somebody who tries to cut a theta line.

Scientology is a line of pure theta. There just aren't any pitches or curves in Scientology—it's trying to do exactly what it's trying to do. It's trying to secure the spiritual freedom of the individual.

Therefore, when they chop across that line and sit squarely on that line and try to stop that line, they'll blow up. You want to take out a few minutes sometime in argument or discussion as to why Scientology is attacked, and so forth? Why, help them blow up!

The whole situation, though, is it would not really matter very much what happened at this particular stage of the game. Three years ago it would have mattered. Not now. Too late! Too late! Do not send to find for whom the ax is falling.

You see, our victory was not in the suppression of a private group or a specialist group. That was not our victory. Our victory was a much greater victory than that: the victory of the individual over fate and the universe. Therefore, if we win everybody wins. The incidental crushing of the opposition en route is even hardly worth doing, because we're moving up to a position now where I can assure you anybody really opening his face on this subject to the public is to some degree damaging himself. The public is not in agreement with him.

Now, we will feed back and we will tell the press that we can't stop doing what we're not doing. And we have just got through telling the press that the local council was incompetent as observers, and that we could have bought the whole thing off for a hundred—thousand—pound bribe. And the press has just been told this.

Well, let's get on with some „daffynitions“ and so forth.

And I've one staring me in—I don't know if this is where I left off? Is this where I left off? Yes, where I left off. What do you know. Nobody has added any cards to this. You know, I ought to have all the simple words too, you know? You know, simple words like *idiot* and so forth. What is an idiot? It's someone who is on a council. It's not clever but bitter.

All right. The first word here is *inversion*: Now, *inversion* simply means it should go one way and it goes the other, basically. It inverts. It collapses in on itself downward. Now, when you take an inversion, when a person is *introverted*, why, he would look in on himself, you see? So you get an inversion—this means, it's going south of zero, or it's a reverse scale.

Now, this also is used in terms of inversion: This scale is going plus while this scale goes minus. Do you follow? As one factor progresses, the other factor degresses. Do you follow? So when we say it's an inversion on something, it means, actually, it's a go—downward about it. So that two plus three plus four plus five—that would be a plus scale, you see? But a four and a three and a two backwards would be the inversion scale. Do you under—stand? It's a reversion of what it is. There

are undoubtedly other meanings and connotations to this particular word, but that in essence covers what they are. It means it goes backwards.

All right. *Exteriorization*: This was an action which I have, by the way, just described to you as the history of Buddhism. It simply means a thetan walks out of his body, moves out of his body or exists out of his body, but it—in actual fact exteriorization would mean the action of moving out of a body.

Give you an idea how thoroughly psychiatry tries to booby—trap the whole field of the mind and so forth—they claim that the insane people can exteriorize. And you know, that is the most blasted lie I ever heard of in my life because I have actually exteriorized insane people and had them go suddenly sane. I've actually been talking vis-à-vis to an insane person and banged them out of their head—this is back in research times—and had them all of a sudden talk to me totally rationally and just perfect—could have passed anything, any board, discussed their problems and what they were into. Didn't last. When they get up to leave, they go back into their head again and start gibbering. But exteriorization is not a symptom of insanity, quite the reverse.

People who are interiorized—that means something else; it isn't the reverse of this. An interiorization means going into it too fixedly and becoming part of it too fixedly. It doesn't mean just going into your head. You could interiorize into work by which one would get so fixated and so surrounded by his work that he never got out of it. See, you could interiorize into most anything. But exteriorization is relegated in our terminology simply to an exteriorization or a moving out of the body by the spirit.

Restimulate: Well, restimulation, that means the reactivation of an existing incident. If you restimulate it, you reactivate it, some approximation of the original incident causes *it* to go into play, and you get a *point* where it was restimulated. Here's an example: A fellow was out here and he gets run into by a truck and he has then an engram, a mental image picture of pain and unconsciousness. And he has this, and it's—has got a truck in it and it's associated with a truck and so forth. Now, there is the engram. And a few days later he walks by a similar kind of truck, and he feels afraid and upset and he doesn't know why. Now, what he has done is restimulate the incident of being hit by the truck. It remains unseen to him and the restimulation is usually unknown to a person. If it were known to the person, he would immediately recover from it. But if it remains unknown, why, it tends to be buried and have an effect upon the individual.

Restimulate. This is very, very, very interesting because by picking up restimulations you can knock out of action an engram without running it. It's sort of as if the engram sat over in locker A undisturbed and not troubling the individual. But one day he passes by a truck, and this engram comes out of locker A and drops in his lap and he doesn't know what it is, and he becomes the effect of it. Now, if you picked up the moment it went into restimulation—not the original engram—if you picked up the moment of its restimulation, it would drop back into locker A and cease to trouble the individual. It is upon this fact that the whole subject of releasing depends. You're dropping the bank back into locker A; it isn't really troubling somebody. The erasure that occurs is erasure of these points of restimulation.

Now, restimulate has an opposite word, *destimulate*, which means to take away the restimulation. Now, destimulate does not mean the erasure of the original incident; it means simply the knockout of the point of restimulation. Got it?

Now we have *GE*—*genetic entity* Now, what is a genetic entity? Theoretically this is the world and science of cytology which has to do with the field of biology and so forth. It's the science of cells. Cytology. And cytology conceives that there is an unending stream of protoplasm passing through time which has branch tracks known as bodies. And that is the basic theory of cytology. It is not a well—constructed science because it does not follow thoroughly its basic theory. So that the

body which you have is supposed, in the field of cytology, to have originated at some dim point in the past from a sea of ammonia or something—and in earlier times, in pagan worship and that sort of thing, from—full armed from the brain of Jove or something like this—and then by the process of reproduction keeps passing itself through time over and over and over and over So that this gives your unending stream of protoplasm. Now, obviously, if that were the case then, if an unending—supposing man were not a spiritual being, or if he were, somewhere along the line there must be some kind of a pattern arranged for a body. Otherwise, it wouldn't be able to make a body. Quite obvious. If you have no blueprint in the planning room for a ship, it's highly unlikely that anyone would build a ship. Do you see?

They haven't got any blueprints for a ship, so they don't build a ship. If they knocked one together, it would be pretty slipshod. But the body is a pretty complete entity.

Now, back in the days of Dianetics (and this is a Dianetic term), when the thetan had not been particularly regarded as part of it, the only way we could account for past lives—and a good way to account for them now, if somebody is wondering about what they are (but it's not correct)—would be to say, „Well, they are incidents which happened on the genetic line.“

Now, the Darwin theory is in actual fact, although Darwin did not know it, an explanation of this unending stream of protoplasm. Now, he studied the evolution of bodies. Now, I assure you, if there was no unending stream of protoplasm making bodies one after the other up through time, there would have been nothing to have evolved, right? So if the Darwinian theory was correct, then someplace there, there must have been a blueprint. And someplace there, there must have been adventures which were recorded as experience which then modified the blueprint of that body. Do you follow the logic that's involved here? Well, that was what a genetic entity is.

Now, when we find, however, the theory of evolution does not in actual fact hold good for various reasons—when we find out that man *is* a spiritual being and a lot of other factors surround it, the genetic entity ceases to be very important. We have the actual explanation of what a past life amounts to and we don't have to blame it on the genetic entity. But theoretically you would be able to find the blueprint if you looked in the body and you went backtrack; obviously, the body must have a time recording of some kind or another Matter of fact it's—we used to think it showed up on the E-Meter, but it never has. Only you have.

I've just described what general blueprint. That would be the „Where do you put the ears?“ you know?

Well, *the first overt* would be the first overt on a chain of overts. And if you were trying to get a fellow over an impulse to hit every girl he saw—which I should think would be a rather healthy thing to get somebody over He complains to you that he wants to hit every girl. And you don't handle these impulses and obsessions and so forth. Any time you process one, and so on, you generally go a cropper. But I would show—I'll show you how you go about it. He has this impulse to hit girls, so what you would do would be to trace back all the times he wanted to hit girls and you would find him back at his first overt on the chain on the subject of hitting girls. And at that moment when he saw that, why, it would release, and he theoretically would not have any more impulse to hit girls. I say „theoretically“ for the reason that the ability to sort out through the hundred thousand other impulses which he also has, and choose this one selectively and alone as the auditor—or preclear's particular hidden standard—“Have I gotten over hitting girls yet?“—is fraught with many adventures and they're all bad ones. You should not try to process a specific type of aberration. If we processed a specific type of aberration, we of course would be in the field of mental healing, and so forth. But long ago we actually discovered that we must *not* process specific aberrations, which takes us out of the field of mental healing.

It is quite fatal to do this because in the first place it's an evaluation for the case. In the second place, it's a negative type process; you're condemning the individual for hitting girls. Doesn't validate the individual at all. Do you follow? And if carried on very long, does not result in the betterment of an individual. All we're interested in is the spiritual betterment of the individual, and you don't achieve that by finding these little bits and pieces and nasty habits and throwing bottles and things like that—by selectively picking those up and processing them. Now, if any auditor were to go along this line, he would soon learn the truth of what I am saying: that when you try to process the specific aberrations of a human being, you are now going to take on an endless task which probably won't resolve.

So, therefore, there is—not only are we *not* in the field of mental healing—you see, that would be *mental healing*: He has an impulse that should be healed, so you process him on something to heal that impulse. Do you understand? Well, completely aside from not being in the field of mental healing, mental healing, if any claim is made for it of any kind whatsoever, would be the biggest fraud of the centuries. Because I can tell you by experience that the percentiles of successes when specific aberrations are directly addressed by the practitioner is too low to be considered. It's not successful, because that isn't what's—what's right with the person. You have to validate what's right with the person. It's an entirely different field. Do we follow? You don't have to find out what's wrong with a person, for instance, in modern processing to make him right. You don't.

You know what can go wrong with human beings, or what he's having trouble with anyway, but they are not things that need healing. There's no wounds present. The individual simply isn't talking very much and he isn't communicating very much and he can't reach very much. And so you bring him up into communication level. Then the individual can't handle his problems because he can't recognize what they are. And you bring him up there and then you find out that he's been resolving his problems by committing overts. And you get him over doing this. And then you find out he's very ARC broke with life, and life is very cruel to him. And you get him over his ARC breaks and so forth. And then you bring him up to a point of where hell find out that he has a good solution. He's got a marvelous solution for every—thing. And any time he has a bad break, he goes and lies down and be—is a horse or something, I don't know. But we're not interested in what his solution is and we're not treating him for that reason.

Now we move up into the higher grades, and so on. And all of these things are simply increasing the abilities of a spirit, not healing what's wrong with it.

Now, the *entrance point to this universe*: Now, that comes under classified information and is in actual fact a misnomer. Many times on the track one has been told that he has just entered this universe. It's a big swindle. You're already in the room; somebody says...

And here's one: *OT activities*: What are OT activities? OT activities would be those programs conducted by OTs to assist Scientology. Simple.

And here's one. This has to do with old anchor points and so forth. It's the *gold balls*. Well, a body is constructed in a space framework, and you can actually see these things. And actually as you look around, some people can perceive these. And when an individual has dark hollows under his eyes, it's all these little gold balls—they all grouped together underneath the eyes and caved in and gone black, and that gives him... It's very interesting. If you could in actual fact shift this golden—ball framework of the body and so forth, you could probably bend the joints in the wrong places and that sort of thing. It's quite remarkable. Every once in a while somebody's face is out of shape or something, and you get him to pick up the ball and put it back where it belongs or put a bunch of balls out there to remedy his havingness of that particular ball. And this is anchor—point processing way back when, and you all of a sudden—the ball, instead of lying against his face, goes back where it belongs, and he reasserts his sense of balance and so on. His face will actually change shape. It's

quite remarkable. But this has to do with the structure of bodies. What is the space in which the body is formed? What is that space? The body has to be held in certain rigid form in space. And apparently the system which is used in mocking up bodies, or one of the systems used, is to put gold balls out here, balanced left and right and back and around and so forth. I wouldn't look for them if I were you; it's rather fraught with disaster in some cases.

First and second postulate: This is a first postulate situation and the second postulate situation is, „What is the first postulate made on any existing situation?“ Now, if you get the first postulate made on any existing situation, you can actually ignore the second postulate that's made on the situation. That's the general thing. Now, actually, one tried to make an end all out of this back about 52 and so on: What was the first postulate on the track? What's the first postulate that one ever made and so forth. Now—we now find out it's not necessary to have that.

And we have *energy*: Energy would simply mean a potential of motion or power. And energy is normally conceived of in modern physics as being made up of small waves which are flowing from point A to B, or potentially can flow from point A to B. And there's a lot of explanations in modern physics, but we know they still haven't got an efficient engine, so they probably haven't got the right definition of energy either.

But energy would be a potential; it would be the force or flow, or the potential force or flow, from something to something, or the ability to accomplish work or the ability to make motion or movement and so on. I'm giving you all—all the possible things. We're taught in physics that if something moves from A to B, then there is some energy necessary to move it and probably some energy developed in the movement of it. When you move something, you develop energy; and when you move something, you also need energy to move it. We are taught this very carefully. It is highly doubtful.

Well, look, look. If somebody knows all about something, he can do some remarkable things with it, can't he? And you don't need to fill an Empire State Building full of fuel at a cost of a hundred million dollars and touch a fire to it and send it into space to burn for a few seconds, to land a half—ton capsule out into orbit if you knew the whole system of energy. Because I assure you that they some day will find that this is not that energy—consuming a process and that it's not quite that necessary to carry out that vast expense of the public purse. I think if they'd worked in the field of pure mathematics for a long time before they started buying all those Empire State Buildings full of liquid gases, they might have saved the taxpayer some money. But that was not the point, was it?

What is energy? This is in actual fact—is something that is above modern physics considerably. But they can define it, and I've given you a working definition: It's potential or actual motion or force—potential or actual motion or force. Sloppy definition. I know certain fellows who would call me down for saying so, but there it is.

Flow: That means the progress of particles or impulses or waves from point A to point B, or point C to point D, or in any direction, but rather outlaws the idea of a dispersal.

Something that splatters all over the place is not a flow. Flow has the connotation of being somewhat directional. So that if something is flowing down off a mountain, it could be flowing awfully wide and on a considerable front which could be widening. And at some point that would cease to be a flow and become a flood or something.

Flow is looked upon as something moving from A to B, and once more we get back to what is energy. Well, energy is a particle in progress, or energy is a motion or a wave vibration or a bunch of other things. But it would be flowing in some direction. And when we say „Joe talks to Bill,“ then Joe is flowing words and impulses toward Bill. And when Bill talks to Joe, why, he's flowing impulses or words back to Joe. And it has a connotation of a limited and directional progress of particles or wave motions through space.

Thought: Thought. Well, that is a very wide subject. That is a very, very wide subject indeed. What is thought? Now, every philosopher since the beginning of time has tried to answer this question of „What is thought?“ and they have gone from the idiotic to the stupid and back again many times on this particular subject, because if they had understood what thought was, why, then they wouldn't have confused it with life and they wouldn't have confused it with the spirit.

Modern psychology confuses thought with life. It says where thought occurs there is life, so therefore a computer is alive. That's one of the first mistakes you can make. Fact! They can—they sort of tend in that direction, see?

Now, thought would simply be a spaceless, positionless product of a thetan containing meaning. That's all. It's something a thetan produces that doesn't have space or energy or location or so forth. It is a thought. And we can say what it is not. It is not life. And we can also say that a thought is not a spirit. They are different. The mistake is originally in the word *theta*. The Greek said that the word *theta*, if I remember rightly, stood for life or thought—stood for either one. Well, actually, for us it stands only for a thetan. Even life has a connotation. Life is something that is being lived. And do you know a thetan has a perfect choice not to live it.

Now, *lambda*: I have forgotten what that symbol was but it occurs in the Axioms and so on. And I think it is life in the Axioms but I won't go down on record with regard to it. It's an unused symbol. There's phi for the physical universe, and then I think there was lambda for life. I've forgotten what it is.

And *not-issness*: These are contained in the Axioms and nothing is better expressed than those Axioms. Not—issness implies that the thing is but is being „not—ed.“ You couldn't not—is something that wasn't in the first place. Do you see? Here's an E-Meter. I can not—is the E-Meter. I can say it isn't there. I can actually push beams against it and say it doesn't exist, and so forth. It's actually an assertion against fact.

Now, *counter-emotion* would be the emotion which greets the emotion. You have point A exerting an emotion. An emotion is normally something which has flow and quite normally has a wavelength and has meaning, and it's got concept all mixed up with it and so on. It's quite a packaged affair, emotion is. And it would be the counter—emotion to any emotion.

Well, now, *any* emotion could counter *any* emotion. Love can counter anger and hate can counter boredom and so forth. It's just any emotion that is countering an existing emotion. When you start to take apart the energy in a bank on the subject of a fight, let us say, you could actually—you don't have to—but you could actually pick out of it—the fellow is raving—and you could pick out his heavy antagonism, you see, and you could differentiate that with a victim's total apathy. And the counter-emotion to the antagonism is apathy. It's the emotion which is used to meet a situation or which does meet it.

Quite an interesting study, by the way. It is a study which has even reached into the field of politics and control of human beings, the advertising world also, and so on. They're very interested in this subject. They want to know what emotion people will counter emotions with. Hitler, for instance, raving and screaming and so forth, was actually greeted by the Germans with enthusiasm. You remember? You ever hear that raving, screaming voice? You probably heard it, and the waves of „Heil“ going on in the background. Everybody going to town on the subject. In other words, the counter—emotion to hate and rage in that particular case was enthusiasm.

If you just knew this much about it, why, you probably could make a very, very, very successful advertising executive. If you merely knew that one emotion gave another emotion, and if you studied what emotion you had to produce in order to get another emotion, and that that other emotion is supposed to be desirable, or supposed to be something of the sort, why, you would make quite an advertising executive.

Of course, what emotion produces want? Well, the funny part of it is, want isn't an emotion. See, that is a desire or a postulate or a pull-in or something of the sort. Now, wanting something because you like it, the „like it“ is the emotion. But it doesn't have to be there at all. People very often want things that they neither like nor hate nor feel emotional about in any way, shape or form.

So you see, the advertising executive, when he's trying to handle emotion and counter-emotion, is rather going up against it, because what he's trying to bring about is to get the people to want something. He's dealing with want and not-want, and he's trying to generate want on certain subjects and not-want on competitors' products. And when he tries to handle these things emotionally, why, he starts laying an egg.

You'll see in beer ads. They handle this very directly without emotion in beer ads, it's—and so forth. They know that in—that fellows love beautiful girls, see, or like beautiful girls. So, I think it was Rheingold beer was the one that started this, and they never had beer associated with anything in any of their ads but beautiful girls. So the people would look at the beautiful girl and immediately want Rheingold beer, which—I think the guy must have been bats! Makes no sense at all.

Memory and recall: Well, actually, there is no difference between these two terms that's significant to the auditor. Memory means some—remembering something, and recalling means remembering something and so forth.

Now, recall, however, implies that you bring it up to present and look at it. It has that connotation. Whereas memory would have the connotation of you simply knew it had happened. Now, there's two different connotations to these things, but actually they are very, very easily interchanged—very easily interchanged—because one doesn't have to bring it up. When he's Clear, he doesn't any longer; there's a lot of things he doesn't bring up to present time to recall them. He can recall them in detail and tell you exactly where they are without having them brought up into the present to review. Do you follow?

To that extent Clear is actually far, far in advance of the Book One definition of Clear.

The reason might amuse you. The reason one can't recall is totally contained in the fact that his memory is surrounded by mass which prevents him from recalling. It's quite—obviously—that if you got rid of all of your—all of the mass of the mind, why, you obviously wouldn't have anything to recall, correct? Doesn't work that way at all, which is one of the most astonishing things. Undue duress prevents recall. For instance, if you just—if you were in a lion's cage and the lion jumped at you and you got out through the bars and you got about ten, fifteen feet away, the mental energy contained in drawing back from the lion and squeezing out through the bars and running that ten feet would in actual fact—not because it's a dangerous area—but prevent you from remembering that you had been in the lion's cage.

And that's basically the mechanics of amnesia, of how an individual ceases to remember. The track, you might say, gets too charged. Not that it gets too dangerous, but his recalls fold up on him because he's protecting himself against so many dangers and actions on the track that that very amount of charge or energy or mass, and so forth, prevents his easy penetration into it. So what he actually starts doing is bringing up the pictures to look at them. He can't just say „My license number in Rome...“ Do you see? He sort of has to get a picture of it in order to read it. You got it? Well, that would only be when his track was very heavily charged and he was mocking up all kinds of charge with relationship to it. Anyway, that's the way it is.

And *confidence*: Confidence is an expression of trust. One could make some witticisms on the subject of money is an idea and it's value is proportional to the confidence in the government. Whose money is inflating? Inflation actually is an expression of no confidence in the government. Just as nasty as that. Now, we're talking about philosophic money; we're not talking about economics. The basic ideas which underlie money are simply it's an idea and a degree of confidence.

Money is an idea. Now, we have to bolster that idea up and give it substance and give it mass and give it reason and give it economics and give it idiocy and give it ideology, and when we get all through, why, we're having a ball. But it's basically just those two things. It's as valuable as one has confidence, and it is originally an idea.

Now, if you work with those two things in relationship to money, you can understand more about money than reading a thousand texts on economics. You see, when money goes bad is when people cease to have confidence in the issuer, and therefore money is considered that much less valuable. So on Tuesday the public likes dictator Benzene, and on Wednesday they hate him. Well, you'll find out that on Tuesday the country's money is worth whatever it was worth on the exchange, and on Wednesday is valueless. See?

That's why they put pictures of kings and presidents and prime ministers and things of this character on money. They try to associate these facts.

So confidence is just degree of trust in. Confidence is no absolute term. It's degree of trust.

Trust, of course, is composed of past experience. People who don't trust anyone have just had too many past experiences and so forth. Total trust is looked on by people as being total idiocy. And, as a matter of fact, it happens to be the only condition under which you can exist. That's interesting—exist on a line of total trust. Somebody says, „Well, the thing wrong with Ron is he just trusted everybody, and he always trusts people. And he trusts, you see? And it's all very bad and so forth.“ It may be very bad, but look where we are today. We didn't arrive there being suspicious of everybody.

Certainty would mean the degree of willingness to accept the awareness of an isness. Isn't that pretty good? This is what's known as juggling with words to make more words. I know, you'll have to play it back—I can't remember it myself.

Now, if there is a potato masher in front of you—as an example—if there is a potato masher in front of you, and if this potato masher *is*, and if you're willing to accept the fact that it is and are willing to be aware of it, then you have certainty in it. Certainty is one of the most conditional things that anybody ever had anything to do with, because there's a question in the first place to begin with that any mass has mass. The physicist plays on this all the time. He's not at all sure that mass has mass.

This brings up something else. A Scientologist actually takes off philosophically in this particular direction with relationship to the universe. If he does this, why, he's perfectly safe and it's all very rational. This is one of the basic problems, by the way, of most philosophers. Is somewhere in his texts there will be this discussion of reality. Now, when we're getting down to reality, we're getting down to the subject of certainty, and we're on the subject of nothing else but certainty, see?

Now, there is a wall. There is a wall. And now, certain philosophers would have you believe that before you can accept the fact that there is a wall there, you have to know from where the wall came. But that is silly. Do you see? So a Scientologist simply starts out, not on the basis of „Is there a wall there because it came from someplace?“ or „how long the wall is going to be there“ or anything else. His sole question with regard to reality: „Is the wall there?“ The wall is, so therefore he is then certain the wall is. What is he certain of? He is simply certain that the wall is. See, he doesn't have to be certain of anything else. And this is a reduction to simplicity of one of the greatest philosophic conundrums that philosophers have ever boxed the ears of students with. You have to ask the question „What is?“ to make people uncertain. That would be the greatest mechanism in the world, of the generation of uncertainty. „Is the world really?“ And you start asking questions about it, you shake people's certainty.

Now, brainwashing simply is the trick of mixing up certainties. All you have to do if you want to know and extrapolate or develop the entire field of brainwashing as developed by Pavlov, is

simply to make somebody certain that the wall is black and then certain that the wall is white and make it less black and less white and have it eventually become gray. But not have him certain that it is gray at all; leave him with the two certainties that it is white and that it is black. And with those two certainties merged and confused one with the other, he gets into a confused or hypnotic state in which he can believe anything.

So to unconfuse somebody, it is only necessary to let them regain some certainties. Therefore, you ask somebody to pat his foot against the floor as we used to do. Well, he becomes certain that the floor is there. He doesn't have to become certain where it came from, what it's composed of or how much money is still owed on the mortgage. The only thing you're asking him to do is just to make sure that it is there. And so you get the increase of certainty which is attended in processes such as CCHs and spotting processes and so forth.

It's quite remarkable. An individual is displaced after he's been in an accident. Because of his mental image pictures made at the time of the accident, he tends to remain at the moment of the accident and in that moment of time and in that location in space. Now, he dimly sees the room around him. So he can't be certain, because he sees dimly the accident around him and he sees dimly the room around him. So he really cannot be certain that he is in the room or in the accident. Now, by asking him to spot the room, gradually we increase his certainty so that he becomes unconfused. Then he feels straighter and more comfortable. His certainty is up. Do you see?

Now, we probably also could run the engram out so that he *couldn't* be there, and then have him look at the room, and we would accomplish more or less the same end product, either of which would increase his certainty as to the isness of his current location. And certainty is, of course, trust and so forth mixed up again—similar to confidence. But when you're walking down steps and there isn't one there and you were certain that it was, this is a betrayal the end of which you never heard of. And it does more than jar your spine. You also get into ARC breaks. One quite often ARC breaks because one's certainty suddenly is shifted. He thinks he's looking at a gillywhobbit, and he actually finds himself looking at a goolawhobbit.

One of the ways of teaching people so as to render them into a total hypnotic state is practiced in most universities, and that is to qualify every statement in such a way as it's not quite graspable. „The 'allahipatoodrum' lived in the 'cleocene' period except where he was in the 'mongoic' period, and Professor Whomfdygumph challenges that he lived at all.“ Typical, typical one of this type of operation, typical. The actual statement should be made is, „These bones was found in tar pit X. In order to be able to talk about them, we call them whoosis bones. Now take it from there, kid. Build yourself a *Tyrannosaurus rex* if we want to, but as far as we know it's whoosis bones.“ Big certainty, see? You'd probably have developed a terrific paleontologist if you did it.

Generality: Any unspecificity or unspecific statement or indication tends toward a generality. It is a substitution of a plural for a singular, or a substitution of a greater for a lessen. It implies that a generality is used more or less purposely. Actually individuals who are pretty dispersed or, you know, sort of all around and hazy and so forth, tend to talk in generalities. Bill, who just talked to them, becomes „they.“ A letter just received from the public about the magazine becomes „the public.“ Unspecific, and it's actually blowing up a smaller to a larger or a singular to a plural. And that's what's known as generalizing.

Now, the whole system and subject of classification comes under the head of generalizing or generalities but isn't looked upon normally as doing so and is called classification. In other words, the word *boys* includes all boys. The word *girls* includes all girls. Well, now, that word itself, of course, is a generality, and you naturally, to converse at all, must *have* that word. But because you do have a generality when they are in actual fact boy, boy, boy, boy, boy, boy and girl, girl, girl, girl, girl, girl, girl and really not girls—there is no such thing as a girls. Really. Really. There's just a

bunch of girl, see, repeated several times. Because that generality has been condoned, then you get into a further generality, a much larger generality. And you get „Men are no good,“ you know? „Everybody“ or „Boys don't like me.“ You see? That's a hell of a generality.

I've never failed, by the way—in exploring with a meter—I have never failed to find out who „they“ was, and it was always one person. See? „They“ instead of „Joe.“ Very interesting. Generality. You have, in actual fact, one of the sources of aberration, and you certainly have a big answer to suppression when you have this whole subject of generality explained and understood.

Suppress: And we immediately have—the primary mechanism of suppression would be generality. But suppress means „to squash, to sit on, to make smaller, to refuse to let reach, to make uncertain about his reaching, to render or lessen in any way possible by any means possible to the harm of the individual and for the fancied protection of the suppressor;“ and that is what it means technically in Scientology.

The suppressor, considering himself in danger from something, will try to suppress it. And suppression of it, and so on, is done in many ways and covertly is done by expressing generalities to it. „You are surrounded by dangerous space“—typical. Fellow is standing out in an open field full of daisies, and somebody tells him, „Don't move!“ And the fellow says, „Why, why?“ He doesn't ever tell him.

Matter of fact, invention of things or the outlining of things, like germs, that nobody has seen tends to be a bit suppressive, see? You get a mama who tells you that „Everything is covered with germs, Johnny.“ See, these are all tricks and mechanisms to prevent reach. Tricks and mechanisms.

Postulate means to generate or „think“ a concept. A concept is a think, a thought. And *to postulate*, however—to *postulate*—*infers* a requirement that something goes or it stays, or it turns white or goes blue or remains blue, or that it is something or that it isn't something, or that some action is going to take place, and so forth. In other words, a postulate infers conditions and actions rather than just plain thinks.

Now, when an individual says, „Ah, lovely day,“ he's not making a postulate. But when he says „Lovely day!“ and the sun doesn't instantly turn on and move up in three or four shades of brightness, and if leaves don't immediately start appearing on the dead trees and so forth, why, he would consider his postulate hadn't worked.

Postulate is associated more with intention than it is with a thought. It has a dynamic connotation.

And *havingness* simply is the feeling that one owns or possesses. Having—ness. Now, a fellow actually can be wearing a coat without having a coat. So it must be the feeling that one owns, has or possesses, or that the group owns, has or possesses, see? And then it becomes havingness. Mere possession does not make havingness.

And *confronting* means the ability to front up to. That word *front* is very important in *confront*. Now con—fronting by derivation would mean „with—fronting. „ So it sort of has a dim implication that if you confront the door, the door is confronting you. *Co* action is implied here, but in actual fact doesn't exist in our meaning of it. It means the ability of the individual to face up, look at, stand in front of, be near, see, visualize or otherwise perceive something. So you say he isn't confronting cats. That means one does not look at, stand up to, and so forth, and—by extension—won't handle cats. To handle things you have to stand up to them, you know?

Now, there's many a thetan has been very badly steamrolled by confronting, and he learns this rather easily in a body, and he can also learn it as a thetan. There's times to stand up and glare, and times not to. So the total answer is not total confronting. Total confronting is not implied. But when an individual can selectively confront or not confront anything, why, then he of course is total power. And it happens that these do go together When a thetan does not want to confront something,

he tends to mask it or turn away from it, and it tends to make him an effect. Now, if he cannot bring about—make an effect on it, it can make an effect on him. That is the connotation. But as a matter of fact—as a matter of fact—to stand in front of a sixty-mile-an-hour automobile and let it run over you just to demonstrate that you're not afraid of confronting it is not sanity; that's asininity.

Now, you ask the individual, „Are you willing to confront being run over by a sixty-mile-an-hour traveling individual—or by an automobile or something?“ And he, of course, get very very searching about this. Well, if he gets too searching about it, you can realize his confront is out just on the basis that he is already obsessively confronting, and he thinks that there is some sense in your asking him to do—what—this... And he counter—he has the idea that there's something wrong with him that he won't go do this! Well, I assure you, there'd be something very wrong with him if he did.

So willful and knowing act, or willful and knowing confronting, or willingness to conceive the idea of; or to confront or not to confront—all are contained in this single idea. Don't get the idea that—on confronting—that you've got to be able to stand up to *any* circumstance in *any* action in *any* anything can *ever* happen to anybody, because that would simply be to confess that you couldn't stop anything from occurring.

Now, you see, I'm perfectly willing to confront being able to put out my palm (quote, unquote) in a straight—arm on a sixty—mile—an—hour traveling automobile and have it stop, and then, therefore, to that degree perfectly willing to confront. See? Now, this doesn't mean conditional confronting. What would be the conditions under which you would be willing to confront this? These are really not fair questions. Well, who wants to live a life of ruin? Nobody. Well, now, some people have made it a virtue to be able to confront living a life of ruin. Well, it's a kind of a philosophic booby trap and they persuade individuals that they should be perfectly willing to live a life as dope addicts, bums and in total ruin in order to demonstrate that they can confront living this kind of a life. But that's simply suppression.

Actually it has precious little to do with sanity, but is a terrific process in that the individual will come up and find out what he is obsessively confronting as well as what he is willing to confront and what he doesn't *have* to confront. And the big thing he normally finds out about something like this is, good heavens, he doesn't have to go on and keep confronting forever! He's, matter of fact, quite tired of standing there!

As the power to confront and not to confront arises selectively, an individual's self-determinism arises accordingly, because very often the thetan who never likes to be wrong explains the fact that he got run over by X by saying he was perfectly willing to confront it, and he was perfectly willing to confront the experience, and he's very happy that he got run over by X because he's now got such an experience. And he could never have another experience. And you often hear him say, „Well, it was good experience, but I never want to do it again.“ Well, what was the matter with his arrangement of spatial objects and velocities and so forth that he had to stand there in the first place? See, that is a much more burning question.

To purely a humanoid-type thinking that you can't do anything about anything, this is deadly and disastrous in its connotations—telling him that he must be able to confront anything. See? All right, he must be able to confront anything. Great. Now to imply that because he is willing to confront everything, he *must* confront everything, we have an SP at work—nothing but. Because the truth of the matter is, above this level the individual has some control over his environment and so would find it utterly silly to confront the soup kettle falling off and spilling all over the floor and burning the baby as a necessary thing to confront. As a matter of fact, it is a—it's rather a comment upon one's ability to pick up soup kettles in midair, scoop them down, pick up the soup that is also falling in the air and set it on the stove and not waste all the dinner.

But when one loses that ability, then he says, „Well, at least I can confront it.“

sins. All right. Well, we've run out of time and there it is. And I will leave you confronting your

Thank you very much.

Audience: Tank you. Thank you.

Thank you.